

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

Pagination is as follows: [2], [1099]-2026, [i]-l p.

There are some creases in the middle of the pages.

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

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
BY
T. J. RICHARDSON.

SECOND SESSION—FOURTH PARLIAMENT.

43^o VICTORIÆ, 1880.

VOL. IX

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF APRIL, 1880 TO THE
SEVENTH DAY OF MAY, 1880.

SECOND VOLUME OF THE SESSION.



OTTAWA :

PRINTED FOR THE PUBLISHER BY C. W. MITCHELL, ELGIN STREET.

1880.

CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA.

VOL. IX.

Page 1151, 2nd col., before adjournment of the House, *insert* :

“ The following Bill (*from the Senate*), were severally introduced and read the first time:—

“ Bill (No. 95) To amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1879.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

“ Bill (No. 96) To repeal the Act extending the Dominion Lands Acts to British Columbia, and to make other provision with respect to certain public lands in that Province.—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)”

Page 1492, 1st col., line 32, for “water,” *read* “canal.”

Page 1501, in table of “Casual and Territorial Revenue,” under “1874-5,” *read* “12,264.11”; “2,975.12”; “9,489.18.”

Page 1699, 2nd col., line 2, for “XII,” *read* “XXXV.”

Page 1919, 2nd col., line 29, for “8·2,” *read* “·802.” Line 31, for “American oil introduced into,” *read* “Canadian oil manufactured in.” Line 33, for “Canadian,” *read* “American.” Line 56, for “Inland Revenue,” *read* “Customs.”

THE DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF CANADA

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE FOURTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA, APPOINTED TO MEET FOR THE DESPATCH OF BUSINESS
12 FEBRUARY, 1880, IN THE FORTY-THIRD YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

SECOND VOLUME OF THE SESSION,

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 6th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MANITOBA LANDS CLAIMS BILL.

(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

FIRST READING.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, in introducing a Bill (No. 94) For the final settlement of claims to lands in Manitoba by occupancy, under the Act 33 Vic., cap. 3, said: A considerable number of claims are still outstanding of those intended to be provided for by the original Manitoba Act. It was proposed under this Bill to put a limit to the time allowed for these claims. A considerable portion of country is kept unproductive on account of claims which are said to exist not having been sent in; and this Bill provides that they must be sent in on or before the 1st day of May, 1882.

MR. MACKENZIE: Has this any reference to the half-breed lands?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes; to all the claims outstanding of every

kind that were set up under the Manitoba Act.

Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES CRIMINAL TRIALS FEES.

RESOLUTIONS CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the fees to be paid to coroners, jurors and witnesses attending criminal trials and inquests, and the salaries to be paid to officials in the North-West Territories.

(In the Committee.)

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This resolution is nearly the same as the present law, but there are a few exceptions. There are now no means whatever in the North-West for trials before a Stipendiary Magistrate. There are no fees fixed by law for coroners, jurors and witnesses, and this Bill proposes to give power to the Governor-in-Council to fix such fees. There are two Stipendiary Magistrates now, and it may be necessary to appoint a third. The Chief of Police is made, *ex officio*, a Stipendiary Magistrate under the Act. It has been represented to be absolutely necessary that that country should be divided into a certain number

of judicial districts. District Registrars are to receive each not more than \$1,000. During the next year most likely two District Registrars will be appointed.

MR. BLAKE: In this connection I desire to make a remark bearing upon the future interests of that country. I think no more important measure could be devised for those interests than the one which would carry out the general principles of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), to promote the creating of evidence of titles to real estate there. It is time for the Government to consider that subject, with the view of adopting a policy for the easiest possible mode of transmitting real estate. It is obvious that the difficulties that beset the adoption of that system become greater with the lapse of time from which the patent issues. While we do not expect that a great deal of land will be patented, yet it is extremely important that the permanent system upon which that vast country is to be settled and estates transmitted for all time to come should be determined at an early period.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I agree that every means should be adopted to simplify and expedite the mode of transmitting estates and property in the North-West. That is the tendency in England and has been here.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.
House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

Order for the House to go again into Committee of Ways and Means (*Sir Samuel L. Tilley*) read.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Before asking you to leave the Chair, Sir, I beg to state, for the information of the House, that, when we are going into Committee, I shall ask them to consider and adopt the following resolutions in amendment to the Tariff. I may say that two of the items contained in these amendments were omitted in the preparation of the schedule submitted on a former occasion. The others are matters that have received the consideration and the attention of the Government since the former resolutions were submitted.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

1. *Resolved*.—That it is expedient to provide, in addition to the provisions contained in the resolution of 10th March last, to further amend the Act 42 Vic., cap. 15, by the following additions to and alterations in the Schedule A of the said Act :—

1. After the item "Electro-plated ware," insert the words "Emery Wheels," twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

2. After "Gloves and Mitts," insert the words "Gold and Silver Leaf," twenty-five per cent *ad valorem*.

3. In the item concerning "Malt" strike out the words "two cents per pound," and insert the words "fifteen cents per bushel, upon entry for warehouse, subject to Excise Regulations."

4. After the item "Paints and Colors, ground in oil," insert the words "Paris Green, dry," ten per cent. *ad valorem*."

5. Under the heading "Wools and Wool-lens," in the item "Felt for Boots and Shoes," after the word "Shoes" insert the words "and Skirts."

6. Under the heading "Gunpowder and other explosives," after the item concerning "Nitro Glycerine," insert the words "Provided that a draw-back of one and a-half cents per pound may be allowed and paid on all blasting powder actually used by miners in the Province of British Columbia, during three years next after the first day of April, 1880."

7. In the item "Soap, common, brown and yellow," after the word "cent," add the words "and a-half."

2. *Resolved*.—That it is expedient further to amend the Schedule of Free Goods, as follows :—
Embossed Books for the Blind.

From the item concerning "Colors," strike out the word "Castile" and the words "Paris Green."

These are the propositions that, when we go into Committee, I intend to ask the House to consider; but, before requesting you to leave the Chair, Sir, I wish to take advantage of the present opportunity of answering the strictures of hon. gentlemen opposite on the financial and trade policy of this Government. It has been my custom, as a member of the House, and as a member of the Local Legislature, in which I had a seat for many years, to discuss questions solely upon their merits. As in the submission of my financial statements in 1873 and 1879, so, in submitting my financial statement a few nights since, I avoided any reference, though my language has been designated as vituperative by hon. gentlemen opposite, to our predecessors, or the acts of the late Administration, feeling that it was only right and proper, in making a grave financial statement, to rest my case upon its merits and not fall back upon the shortcomings of our prede-

cessors. My hon. predecessor (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), who, I regret, is not in his seat, thought proper, as on former occasions, not to meet fairly and argumentatively my case, but by sneers and insinuations; and were he present I would feel constrained to make some remark upon his course of dealing with my statements, although my hon. friend the Minister of Railways dealt with him on that occasion in a manner highly approved on both sides of the House. I will, in his absence, Sir, defer any special reference to him until I come to my closing remarks, when he may be in his seat; and I will, therefore, at once proceed to the consideration of the subject on its merits. In the discussion that has taken place, it has been stated, with reference to the financial affairs of the Dominion, that the Estimates of expenditure submitted for the next financial year are largely in excess of any previous Estimates submitted to this House, and gives evidence of extraordinary extravagance in the present Administration. It has been stated that the debt of the Dominion of Canada has been increasing to a very remarkable extent since the year 1873 down to the present time, and it warrants the most careful consideration, not only of the Government, but every member of the House, and is alarming in the extreme. It has also been said that the taxation of the country in 1867-68, the first year of Confederation, was much less than at present; and I desire to show what that increased taxation really is, and what has led to that increased taxation. I desire also to state what our prospective expenditure for railway purposes will be during the next ten years, and the prospect of being able to meet that expenditure. Having dealt with these, I then propose calling attention to the arguments and statements made with reference to the working of the Tariff during the past twelve months. In the first place, I will deal with the Estimates for the next year, which have been declared excessive. As far as the proposed expenditure is concerned, I purpose proving that, taking into account new expenditure, additional expenditure of an entirely new character, the expenditure proposed for next year is less, as far as controllable expenditure is concerned, than in any year since 1873. The

estimated expenditure for next year is \$25,207,203, which includes \$200,000, the outside figure for Supplementary Estimates to be submitted, including provisions for public buildings in Manitoba. I proceed to compare that proposed expenditure with that of 1873-74: if we deduct from that expenditure of \$25,207,203 the increased interest on the debt, the sinking fund and subsidies to Provinces, amounting to \$2,294,883; if we deduct \$186,000 estimated expenditure on the Prince Edward Island Railway, as expenditure that did not exist in 1873-74; if we deduct \$500,000 for the section of the Intercolonial Railway between Moncton and Quebec, which was not operated in 1873-74, because it was not then opened; if we deduct \$200,000 asked for next year for the management and maintenance of the Pacific Railway, which will then be in operation, we find that we have a total deduction to make of \$3,180,838, leaving \$22,026,360 against an expenditure of \$23,316,316 in 1873-74. If we deduct from the expenditure of 1873-74, \$540,000 properly chargeable to railway construction; if we deduct drawbacks or refunds of duties improperly returned during that year; if we take certain other items, which do not properly belong to that year, the outside being \$1,000,000, you will find that, giving the late Government the benefit of that million, it will still reduce the expenditure for the next year in the items over which we have control, to \$22,026,000, as against \$22,313,316—a sum less, after making these deductions, than was expended that year. Then we come to the expenditure for 1874-75, for which the hon. gentlemen opposite certainly were responsible, and we find that, taking the Estimate of the next year, as before stated, as at 25,207,203, and deducting from that the increased interest and sinking fund, and the increased subsidies between 1874-75 and 1880-81, being \$1,418,428; the expenditure estimated on the Prince Edward Island Railway being \$135,000 more than we expended in 1874-75: deduct \$450,000 for the management of the Intercolonial Railway, that was not opened at that time, and also \$200,000 to be expended in the management and running of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba and you have a total deduction of

\$2,203,428 from \$25,207,203 asked for 1880-81, leaving but \$23,003,775, against an expenditure of \$23,713,071 for 1874-75, or \$710,000 less. Then we come to 1875-76. Again, if we deduct from the estimated expenditure for next year the increase in the interest and sinking fund, and the subsidies, which make up \$1,401,742; the estimated expenditure on the Pacific Railway, \$200,000; the working expenses on the Rivière du Loup section of the Intercolonial, \$200,000, we have an expenditure of \$23,405,461, against an expenditure in that year, 1875-76, by our predecessors, of \$24,488,372, or \$1,000,000 less. If we take 1878-79, and deduct from the estimated expenditure for next year the difference in the interest and sinking fund and subsidies, \$631,235; for the expense of the management of the Pacific Railway, \$200,000; Rivière du Loup Branch—formerly Grand Trunk—\$200,000, we have a total of \$1,081,835, leaving an expenditure of \$24,175,968 to set against the expenditure of \$24,451,481 for 1878. We are looking to an increased expenditure from year to year, as we extend the Pacific Railway. But if, as in the present case, from this increased expenditure, we obtain a revenue equivalent, in return, which we expect, there will be no increase of the burdens of the people. When we make those deductions on account of the sinking fund and other exceptional expenditures, you will find that there has not been a year, from 1873 to the present, that the outlay has not been largely in excess of the estimate for 1880-81. I come to another point of some importance, the increased taxation of the people of Canada since Confederation. Now, in 1867 and 1868 the Customs and Excise, which are the measure of the taxation on the people, yielded \$11,700,681, or, in proportion to the population of that day, there being but the largest four Provinces in the Union, \$3.55 per head. In 1878-79, we received from Customs and Excise \$18,476,613, or, in the estimated population of that year, \$4.55 per head, which was an increase of \$1 per head.

MR. BLAKE: What was the increase of the population?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I estimate it now, with the new provinces

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

added, and the ordinary increase, at 4,000,000.

MR. BLAKE: Is the ordinary increase estimated at the rate that existed between 1860 and 1870?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes. The number must be about 4,000,000, upon which my calculations are based. It is very important to show what has led to this increased taxation of \$1 a head. The first cause was a measure submitted by the Government of which I was a member in 1873, which was carried by an overwhelming majority, and which has been criticised with great severity by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite—the assumption of the whole debts of Ontario and Quebec when we entered Confederation, and the grant of equivalents to the other Provinces. The late Finance Minister condemned that proposal, declaring it would impose heavy burdens upon the people. But whether it was right or wrong, it was sustained by a large majority, and it did not entail increased taxation on the people as a whole. It involved practically the taking of money out of one pocket and the placing of it in another. It was, it is true, assuming the debts of Ontario and Quebec, and giving the other Provinces an equivalent for it, but, at the same time, it was relieving those Provinces from additional local taxation. It also enabled the Local Governments to develop the railway systems of the country, which was a great assistance to those Provinces, and in the adjustment of these claims we added \$900,000 a year to our expenditure. Then, Sir, there has been added to the annual expenditure of the Dominion, for which provision had to be made, \$1,115,000, the interest and sinking fund for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. Is there an hon. gentleman on the floor of this House who will say that the construction of that road was not necessary? Did it not form a portion of the Terms of Union upon which we came into this Confederation? Therefore, the construction of that work became necessary, and the amount of \$1,155,000, for interest and sinking fund, had to be provided for. In addition to that we have had to pay an average of \$500,000 a year for the maintenance of that Railway, over and above the receipts. I hope and believe the day is

about past when the Treasury will be called upon to continue the payment of that sum, but down to the present time that sum has had to be provided for, and in 1878-79 an additional sum of \$200,000, although I have only taken the average into consideration. Then there was an increase in the Post Office expenditure, over and above receipts, of \$500,000. The expenditure has increased by \$1,100,000 and the receipts by \$600,000. It may be a question whether it was desirable on the part of either or both Governments to give the extended facilities which have been given to that service, but still the money has been expended, and we have the advantages of that expenditure throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Then there is the interest and sinking fund of expenditure on the Pacific Railway and the Canals, amounting to \$1,250,000. The whole of this makes a total of \$4,265,000, or more than \$1 per head of the additional necessary taxation imposed in 1878-79. I think it is important to bring this out, because we must take into account, in regarding the increase of the Public Debt, that we have added three or four new Provinces to the Dominion; that we have purchased a vast territory, and are opening it up; that we have constructed and are working a railway in accordance with the terms of Confederation, and that the increase of \$1 per head has been caused by expenditures which, in the main, could not be avoided, but were absolutely necessary. I now come, Sir, to another statement. It is a statement of the increased expenditure, and is something of the same character as the one I have just submitted. We have heard, more than once from the other side of the House this Session, that the expenditure of the Dominion of Canada has increased with rapid strides; that when we came into Confederation we had an expenditure of but \$13,486,000, while last year it amounted to \$24,455,000. It is important, in this connection, to show how this expenditure has been increased, for what purposes it has been made, and the objects which rendered it necessary. The increase in the payments for interest on debt and sinking fund for subsidies, the readjustment of the debts of the Provinces, and the increase on the debt incurred for the Canals and Pacific

Railway alone, amounted to \$3,982,651. The expenditure under the head of Intercolonial Railway, that is, the increased working expenses (because, as the receipts form an item in our revenue, so the expenditure forms an item in our general expenditure), over and above what was expended in 1867, on the section of Intercolonial Railway then open from St. John to Shediac, and from Halifax to Truro, amounted to \$1,873,535. Then we come to the item of Public Works. During the first two years of Confederation, we expended very little on Public Works, Sir John Rose, then Finance Minister, having laid down the principle that the expenditure should not exceed the income. In the first year of Confederation, the amount expended on Public Works was only \$269,000. Last year, the expenditure reached \$1,130,000, being an increase of \$740,000. On Lighthouse and Coast Service, the expenditure has increased \$270,000. The policy of both Governments, and I think it was a wise policy, has been to expend liberally on the construction and maintenance of lights, which are for the benefit of our commerce, and especially our importers and exporters. On Fisheries, the expenditure in the first year of Confederation was \$30,572; last year it amounted to \$82,319, and the average expenditure for Fisheries, since 1871, has been \$90,000 a year; the propriety of encouraging this industry will always be recognized by the people. Then we come to a large expenditure, last year, in connection with the Indians in the North-West, and the Dominion Lands. The expenditure under that item has become very large and serious. It is a question whether any other policy could have been adopted, but I think it will be admitted that the money which has been expended under Treaty arrangements with the Indians, to secure peace with them, or to relieve them in the hours of their distress, is far better expended than in an increased armed force. The expenditure under this head reached \$680,000 last year. Then there is an increased expenditure in British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and the North-West, not included in the items referred to above, of \$700,000. On Ocean and River Service, we expended last year \$130,000 in excess of what was expended in 1867; and the increased ex-

penditure on the Post Office was \$1,168,000. On Legislation, a part of the increased expenditure was caused by the accession of new Provinces, the increased number of members of the House and of the Senate, and a part was the result of an increase in the indemnity to members. That item was \$153,000 more last year than it was in the first year of the Union. An increase of \$31,000 was caused by the salaries paid to the four additional Lieutenant-Governors. On Weights and Measures there has been an increase of \$84,000; and \$100,000 has been added to the cost of management of canals, though they have brought an additional revenue of \$90,000. This makes, altogether, an increase of \$10,104,190, leaving about \$865,000 to be accounted for by the increase in the cost of the Civil Service, Immigration, Pensions, Superannuation, Marine Hospitals, Customs and Excise, Insurance, Geological Survey and Observatories, the result of the admission of new Provinces, or new items of expenditure. These are the items which compose the increase since Confederation; but, if hon. gentlemen will take them up and examine them carefully, they will find that, although, probably, there are some expenditures which could have been avoided, there is a satisfactory reason, in most cases, for the increased expenditure since 1867.

MR. MACKENZIE: You have a revenue equal to the expenditure for Insurance, or a little more.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: O, yes; and in several of these items our revenue has gone on increasing. From 1867 to 1873, the increase in the revenue was much larger than that in the expenditure, which left us a surplus, and since then there has been an increase in many items, but it all goes to swell the general expenditure, and I think hon. gentlemen do not always take that as much into consideration as they should. Some state to the country that there has been an increase in the expenditure from \$13,000,000 to \$24,000,000, without saying anything about the increased revenue—from Public Works—received in return for those increased expenditures. Now, I come to what, I think, requires to be cleared up a little, and that is the increased debt from 1867-8 to the present time. The gross

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

debt of the Dominion appears from the Public Returns to have been, in 1867-8, \$93,046,000, or deducting the assets, namely, \$17,317,000, it leaves a net debt of \$75,728,000. The net debt in 1872-3 amounted to \$99,848,000, as against \$75,728,000 in 1867-8, leaving \$24,119,820 as the net increase from 1867-8 to the close of 1873. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite say that the increase in the debt during our Administration was enormous; and, the other night, one of them said that since 1873-4 the debt had been increased little or nothing, only, in fact, about \$7,000,000.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I think the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) said so.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: He said there was no increase in the debt.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said there was no increase in the debt except what was caused by the obligations entered into by our predecessors.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron): That is stated in *Hansard*.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The hon. member for South Huron said more than that. One of the items of increased debts is \$14,520,000, expended on the Intercolonial Railway. Was not that an increase demanded by the terms of Union? Then there was an amount of \$13,859,000 caused by the readjustment of the debts of the Provinces. That did not increase the taxation of the whole country, although it increased the debt and liabilities of the Dominion of Canada, but it was returned to the people through the Local Governments and Local Legislatures. There was an increase of liability of \$28,379,000 on these two items alone, to say nothing about the expenditure on Canals, the purchase of the North-West, and the Surveys of the Pacific Railway, and other similar matters. These two items alone amount to \$4,200,000 in excess of the total increase of the debt during that period.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: If my hon. friend will allow me, I will call attention to the statement of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), which will be found on page 705 of the *Debates*, as follows: "Scarcely a dollar was added to the public debt during the existence of the late Government."

MR. CAMERON (South Huron): If the hon. gentleman will refer to the speech he will find that I was referring to the large obligations which had been previously undertaken.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Now, let us look at what the obligations were at the close of last year. We find that the net debt, at the close of 1879, was \$147,481,070, making an increase in that period of \$47,632,607.86.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) said the Public Debt of the Dominion was \$147,481,557, when my hon. friend from Lambton left power. When he took office it was \$140,000,000.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That is just exactly what I said. *Hansard* may be right or wrong, but, as a rule, *Hansard* passes through the hands of members, and, I venture to say, that passed through the hands of my hon. friend opposite. Now, then, there is an increase, in that period, of \$47,632,000, to which must be added the expenditure that is to be made under contracts that were entered into by our hon. friends opposite. From the first of July, last, their engagements for the Welland Canal, the Lachine Canal, the Cornwall Canal, and for the Canada Central Railway, amounted to \$6,951,000, making in all \$54,500,000. If we add to that \$4,500,000 of the Fishery Award, it makes the increase of expenditure over income nearly \$60,000,000 in six years. The hon. gentleman quoted from my speech in 1873, when I spoke of the prospective liabilities of the Dominion of Canada, when I spoke of the \$10,000,000 to be expended on the Intercolonial Railway, of \$20,000,000 as the prospective expenditure for Canals, that, under the recommendations of a Commission, was not bound to be made within five or six years, or within any given period at all. It was a Commission appointed for the purpose of examining into and enquiring as to the general system of canals, so that no money should be thrown away, but expended with reference to that general system. I estimated that the expenditure under that report would be about \$20,000,000. And then, the engagement that we were under, of \$30,000,000 for the completion of the Pacific Railway, made altogether \$60,000,000. So it appears, from the end

of 1873 until the end of last year, \$60,000,000 has been added to the debt since we left office, and still hon. members opposite will say that the debt has not been increased, or not more than something like \$7,000,000. What is more, when we came into office, we found not only these engagements entered into which required \$6,900,000 to complete them; but we found the Railway contracts so let that the money expended on the two sections, one east of Winnipeg and the other west of Lake Superior, that if the expenditure made upon them was to be of any benefit at all, it became absolutely necessary for the present Government to provide for the missing link. In order, therefore, that these expensive sections might be at once proceeded with, and that the expenditure on the 400 miles from the head of Lake Superior to Winnipeg should be of value afterwards, it was deemed of the utmost importance that 200 miles at least beyond that, into that fertile territory, should be constructed in order to secure some benefit out of the enormous expenditure previously made. These expenditures, therefore, were necessarily demanded of us. In accordance also with the conditions that my hon. friend opposite entered into, we took steps to carry out in good faith the negotiations they had entered into with reference to the construction of the Pacific Railway. My hon. friend opposite said the other night that, when he asked for tenders, unless I misunderstood him, for the British Columbia section of that Railway, the location of which by the late Government was accepted by the present Government, he did it simply to ascertain what was likely to be the cost. I must have misunderstood my hon. friend, because, when I recollect the negotiations that were entered into between hon. gentlemen and British Columbia, when I recollect that Lord Carnarvon and the Imperial Government were taken into their confidence, and they engaged to construct it by 1890, if they could not do it sooner, and, in addition, they engaged to give British Columbia \$750,000 in lieu of the portion of the road that was to be built on the island, or in lieu of that section, which proposition was subsequently rejected by the Senate; when I recollect all this, and when I find that there is a notice given by gentlemen opposite, of a

proposition to stay proceedings in that section of the country, I confess that I am amazed, considering the position of my hon. friends opposite are in with reference to the obligations they solemnly entered into with British Columbia and with the British Government, through Lord Carnarvon. It is now a grave and serious question in dealing with this expenditure; and, I must say, I was surprised, when the vote was taken a few nights since, to find, on the other side of the House, gentlemen voting for a proposition that would, if it had been adopted, deprive the Dominion of Canada of the means, available from the sale of lands, for the construction of that Railway, and thus subject the older Provinces to increased taxation for the whole of that expenditure; and those gentlemen will, no doubt, vote for the proposition of the hon. member who is to move a resolution that these works are not to be constructed, knowing, at the same time, that our Treaty engagements must be carried out. When the right hon. Premier referred, yesterday, to a statement that had been put into his hands with reference to the revenue that was likely to be received from the lands of the North-West, there was some little laughter on the other side of the House; and, no doubt, in justification of their vote on the land question this morning, they will say there was no money in it, and, therefore, they did not sacrifice anything in voting against the sale of the lands. But I hold that that estimate was not an exaggerated one. But suppose it was large, taking but one-half the population that is estimated to go into the North-West, making this year 12,000 instead of 24,000, and adding 2,500 a year instead of 5,000, and then provide for the sale of but one-half of the lands estimated by the Premier, and what is the result? It produces in ten years, in money, according to that statement, \$19,500,000 instead of \$39,000,000, and it would leave a balance of payment due on the lands of \$16,000,000 towards the payment of the debt. The hon. member for Gloucester called attention to the fact, that my hon. friend the leader of the Government did not refer to the interest that is to be paid in that time. Well, our calculation is this: that, in order to complete the Railway from the head of Lake Superior to Winnipeg and

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

the 200 miles beyond it, we will have to spend \$10,000,000 a year for two years. After that the Government policy is not to expend on public works over \$5,000,000 a year; and you will find, by making the calculation, that the expenditure for the two years, when we have completed it from the head of Lake Superior to 200 miles beyond Winnipeg, together with that in British Columbia, will not exceed \$5,000,000 a year. In the ten years, according to Mr. Fleming's estimate under this expenditure, it will be completed, involving an outlay of \$60,000,000. Now, then, if we calculate the interest on the \$10,000,000 for this year, \$10,000,000 for next year, \$5,000,000 a year afterwards, it amounts to \$18,500,000 in ten years; \$1,000,000 less than half the estimate of my hon. friend for the payment of the interest, and leaving \$16,000,000 as a balance due, besides over 80,000,000 acres of unsold land to complete the road. Is it unreasonable to suppose that in ten years 250,000 people will be placed in that country? Mr. Fleming's statement is, that the road from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains will cost at the outside \$15,000 a mile; \$13,000 is his estimate, making the whole expenditure something like \$13,000,000 or \$14,000,000 for that section. I have heard the hon. member for Gloucester say that the experience in the other Provinces is that railways have not developed the country. Why, suppose we had put a railway through any part of New Brunswick that was difficult of access, and through such lands as we have on the banks of the River St. John—and this is the kind of soil we have in the North-West—I would like to know if that Railway would not be an effectual means of developing and settling the country? Well, Sir, if that be the case, I think there is every reason to hope, and be hopeful, with reference to the great future of this country. Our financial difficulties, as I stated in my Budget Speech, will be for the next year or two; after that our course will be clear, and the Government will have the control in their hands. If they find there is a difficulty with reference to the expenditure, they can limit it; but I believe they will find that \$5,000,000 a year on that road, and upon the 900 miles beyond Winnipeg, will not be an

unreasonable expenditure. This is a grave and serious question, no doubt, but I feel that the possession of that magnificent territory, affording the facilities it does, and the inducements to emigrate from the Old World to come and settle it, places us in an entirely different position from that we occupied before we came into possession of it. So much with reference to the financial view of the question. I come now to consider the Tariff and its effects during the last twelve months. I stated, when I made my first Budget Speech, that the most serious effect predicted of the policy the Government had inaugurated was that it would operate injuriously to certain Provinces. Well, Sir, I undertook to show briefly that the Province especially to which that reference was made would not, in my judgment, suffer very materially under the operation of that Tariff; that was the Province of New Brunswick. An hon. member of this House made an effective speech on this subject last year, and he made an effective speech this year; but as his statements did not happen to be consistent with the facts, the effect of that speech will not be as great as it was at the moment of its delivery, when he was surrounded by his friends and congratulated upon his speech. That hon. member (Mr. Ross), in order especially to show that this Tariff operated injuriously to Ontario and New Brunswick, stated that, in consequence of it, the duties collected per head of the population in Ontario had been increased last year \$1.16 per head, whereas in Quebec they had only been increased 27c. per head; in Nova Scotia they had been diminished 9c. per head, but in New Brunswick they had been increased \$1.40 per head. Now, though the returns for last year only embrace some four months' operations of the Tariff, if such had been the actual results of that Tariff, then the hon. member would have made out a case with reference to the unequal bearing of this Tariff upon the Provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick. But, when I tell this House that the difference per head of the population during last year was 16c. instead of \$1.16 for Ontario—

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex): Last year? My statement was correct.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Your statement for last year is correct. I

have the returns for last year to show that the increase in Ontario was but 16c. per head, instead of \$1.16. It was 27c. in the Province of Quebec; and instead of its being in New Brunswick \$1.40 more per head, it is \$1.40 less.

Mr. MACKENZIE: How does the hon. gentleman count the entries at Montreal?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I am merely taking his statement, in which he refers to the increase of duties per head of the population.

Mr. MACKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman is giving figures; of his own, I want to know how he arrived at it.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: They are from the Trade Returns. If you turn them up, I will show you the figures; they speak for themselves.

Mr. ROSS: I referred to percentage.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Turn to the Trade Returns of last year, where there is a comparative statement of the *per capita* rate of Customs duties—it was from that, I suppose, the hon. gentleman obtained his data, and, if the hon. gentleman expects his statements to have any effect upon the country, he must not make statements so inaccurate and so open to contradiction. I advise him to state things as they are instead of reversing them, and stating there is an increase of \$1.40 instead of a decrease. That decrease took place in this way: In 1877-8, owing to the fire in St. John, there was a very large increase of imports into the Province of New Brunswick. That increased the rate per head on its population, and the result was that last year it was \$1.40 less. Then the hon. member stated, and the statement was responded to by the members of the Opposition around him, that that was a point it was hard to get over. It only shows to what the hon. member will resort to make a point against the Tariff. I desire to enlarge a little upon the effect of this Tariff on the Province of New Brunswick. An hon. member for Ontario referred to a petition from St. John complaining of the operations of the Tariff laid on the Table of the House, and having about 2,600 or 2,700 signatures. I find that the signatures to that petition numbered just the same as the votes recorded by the late Minister of Customs at his last election. Then, the petition had

this advantage: that, in a population of 40,000, where there would be 10,000 male adults, many of them not electors, many non-electors' signatures could be obtained. Moreover, I find that this petition was sent to every section of the country. This petition does not denote any great change of opinion. The petition is a very remarkable one altogether. I wonder it was not signed by everyone to whom it was presented. It asks that the duty should be taken off sugar, flour, meal and almost everything imported. I see that one gentleman, a supporter of the gentlemen opposite, was quite willing that the duty should be taken off everything but one article, in which he was largely interested, as he is a large stockholder in the Spring Hill coal mines, and he marks on the margin, "except coal." It is necessary to look carefully into a petition, in order to discover what value is to be attached to it. I notice that there is a marvellous similarity in the handwriting of the signatures, and an important feature in connection with the petition is that portions of it are much worn, and in a soiled condition, which is an evidence of the amount of labour expended in hawking it about. The parties signing this petition also signed a joint letter to myself and the county members, asking that the petition should be complied with. I did not receive the letter until several days after I made my financial speech, when it was not possible to take these subjects up and deal with them. I now come to a matter of somewhat personal character. The hon. member for Queen's, (Mr. King) who has taken charge of the city and county of St. John, read an elaborate paper, showing the number of mechanics and tradesmen in the city of St. John, and he took me to task for having made calculations, with reference to the effect of Confederation, financial or otherwise, that were proved to be entirely erroneous. I may say, in this connection, with regard to the question of Confederation, the hon. gentleman did, as he did upon a former occasion, refer to the fact that, I stated the probable Customs and Excise tax, under the arrangements made in Quebec, would be \$2.75 or \$3 a head. But what was the fact? If we bear in mind the arrangements made after the Quebec meeting, and subsequent concessions and readjustment of debts,

we will find that the sums we are now receiving in New Brunswick, as interest on debts and subsidies, is \$3 per head of the present population—a greater sum than it was supposed the necessary taxation would be under the original arrangement. I do not hesitate to say, and it is susceptible of proof, that New Brunswick has received a sum equal to what she has paid year by year into the Dominion Treasury, without paying, to this moment, one cent of interest on the expenditure in connection with the Pacific Railway, the Canals or the Civil Service. Notwithstanding this, I am held up here as entering into an arrangement that has been financially injurious to the Province of New Brunswick. With reference to the condition of that portion of the Dominion, I made some statements the other day in relation to the effect of the National Policy on the manufacturing industries of that Province. At the close of last Session, I stated that a charter had been asked for the establishment of a sugar refinery. As nothing had been done under that charter, my reference to the proposed refinery at Moncton was ridiculed. The other day, I thought I would telegraph to Mr. Harris in respect to this refinery, and I received a reply from his partner, stating that they had commenced the construction of the sugar refinery, and that Mr. Harris was in England for the purpose of purchasing machinery.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: How many men will it employ?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It will employ enough men, so that, by its influence in the town of Moncton, and by the impetus it will give to the trade of Moncton, my hon. friend opposite, at the next election, will not be able to obtain as large a support as he has hitherto done in that town. Then I telegraphed to the Vice-President of the Lock and Brass Company, which has been established with \$200,000 capital, \$60,000 paid up. He says the building is all up, and they will commence work on the 1st of May. The hon. gentleman said: Oh, that is an enterprise that has been contemplated for a long time. An ingenious man residing at Moncton invented a lock and patented it, but he was never able, until this policy was adopted, to manufacture the article.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

They are not only manufacturing that lock, but an American capitalist has gone in with them, and they intend making all kinds of brass and plated ware. With regard to the cotton mill at St. Stephen's, which has been referred to by Mr. Weldon, I have received a telegram from the secretary authorising me to state that \$80,000 capital has been subscribed, that the success of the concern was assured, and that the statement made by Mr. Weldon was entirely without foundation. Then there is the Nut and Bolt Company that was referred to. I telegraphed to Mr. Levy Young, the promoter of the Company, and he states that the building will be commenced by the first of May, and that they have orders ahead for all the work they can do for six months. I think this looks as if there was some vitality in the Province, that is said to be doomed and destroyed by the policy of the present Government, and I am satisfied the people of that Province will show as much enterprise as any other part of the Dominion. With reference to the alleged poverty-stricken character of that country, I have returns of the Savings Bank deposits during January, February and March. The returns of these Savings Banks give some idea of the condition of the working classes. What are the facts? These returns show that, during these months, \$88,000 more have been deposited than withdrawn against \$16,000 withdrawals in excess of deposits during the same period of the previous year. What has been the effect of the policy with references to the revenue? The revenue collected during the first six months of this year is \$100,000 less than for the same period in the previous year; and add to that \$40,000 on the sugar duties, collected this year at Montreal instead of St. John, and you have \$60,000 less taxation on the people, in shape of Customs, than the year before. It may be said, on the other hand, that is a proof of the poverty of the people. If that be so, then the revenue collected in March, being \$13,000 more than the previous March, and in excess of any March collections for ten years previous to the fire, is evidence of returning prosperity. The hon. member for Queen's says that all supplies cost him more this year than last. At the same time, he admitted that the

reduction of the duty on molasses and tea paid the duty on cornmeal. Now, there is a rather conflicting testimony here, because he says there is no increased price in regard to oats, provisions and pork; and, if tea and molasses are cheaper than they were, how is it that the lumberers' supplies can be so largely increased in price? The hon. gentleman, and also the hon. member for Northumberland, declared that their predictions that wages would be increased had not been fulfilled; that wages had not increased. Well, I do feel that if they are getting a larger price for their lumber than they did last year, and the supplies cost the men more than formerly, as they allege, and as these gentlemen largely control the labour and the price of labour in their counties, they ought, in common fairness, to have advanced the wages of their men; such a course would have been more consistent with their great professions of regard for the poor man. With reference to the West India trade, I must say here that that interest has largely improved the value and paying capacity of small vessels, and coasters are now receiving freights such as they have not received for many years.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Where?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Out of the ports of New Brunswick. At St. John, a large number of vessels are, at this moment, being specially built for this trade with the West Indies, and for trade with the United States. The rates of freight are larger, and I have it from undoubted authority that, since December last, there have been more vessels in the port of St. John than for ten years, during the same months. I do not say that this all due to the National Policy, but it certainly does show that the National Policy is not ruining St. John or New Brunswick, and that St. John is not in the bankrupt and dilapidated condition that it has been represented to be by non-gentlemen opposite. You may go through that city and that Province, as I have had the opportunity of doing, and I do not hesitate to say, speaking of that Province with reference to its condition to-day, and the bankruptcies which are alleged to be the result of this Tariff, that the bankruptcies there are less than in any other portion of the Dominion, according to the popula-

tion, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to name two men, or one man even, who has been forced into insolvency through the National Policy. They cannot do it. It is when they are called upon for details that they fail to establish their assertions; when they attacked the industries of St. Catharines they were met with their answer, and so it is whenever we bring them to particulars; they are met with a distinct and positive answer to the statements they make. And so it is with reference to St. John. The information on these points can be obtained, if it exists, in twenty-four hours. I ask for the name of one man who was forced into bankruptcy by the National Policy.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: How can this be shown?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: How can it be shown? Why, the opposite statement has been made; but, if hon. gentlemen who have made that assertion know nothing about it, if they have no evidence of it, if no evidence can be given that one man was driven into insolvency by the National Policy, how can it be stated that many had been made bankrupts by the National Policy? If it cannot be shown, then I ask how can the opposite be asserted, and why was it asserted? The fact is that there was scarcely a man in St. John, who has since failed, who was not insolvent the day after the fire. I would ask, Sir, what would have been the result through the length and breadth of the Dominion, if we had not had the National Policy, and thus given vitality to the various interests of this great Dominion? Now, passing from New Brunswick for the present, because I have the advantage of replying to anything that may be said on the opposite side, I come to the question of manufacturers. I stated in brief, with reference to manufactories throughout the country, that, from my observation, after visiting a great many of them, I found that the result of this policy was satisfactory to them. The hon. the leader of the Opposition said that one-half of the manufacturers objected to the Tariff; reference was made to my visit to London in proof of it. I visited in all nineteen manufacturing centres, and some of these are the most important manufacturing districts; and, after visiting them, I was satisfied with what I saw, and that the

great bulk of the manufacturers of the country were satisfied, and nearly all declared that the policy had been beneficial. Something was said about my being besieged in London by a number of persons dissatisfied. My visit there was very satisfactory. It is quite true I met some gentlemen on Saturday evening who had some representations to make, and I arranged to meet them at the City Hall on Monday, and discuss the various matters they had to present for consideration. I met them there; one complained about the tolls in the harbour of Port Stanley, and asked that they should be reduced; another, engaged in the slaughtering of hogs, thought that they were not fairly dealt with in respect to the difference of weight allowed between the live hogs and exported pork; and this complaint was dealt with in due course by the hon. the Minister of Customs, and concessions made. Another gentleman, in the cap and fur trade, had a grievance with reference to duties on a particular description of felt; but he told me that his friend in the same line of business opposite to him was perfectly satisfied with the Tariff; this I knew already, for I had seen the gentleman in question, who, by-the-by, was a firm supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and he had told me he was quite content with the Tariff, and had no suggestions to make in regard to it. I visited the carriage manufactories referred to by the hon. gentlemen opposite. The carriage-makers did object to the 30 per cent. on certain materials entering into the construction of carriages. Hon. gentlemen, however, had said that the Tariff had destroyed this trade with Australia. How could this be, as a drawback would be allowed on materials used in carriages exported? It was, probably, the imposition of a similar duty, and the adoption of a similar policy by Australia, that destroyed our trade in this respect—not our own National Policy. Our manufacturers would pay no duty on goods exported. A great number of waggons and agricultural implements are being sent out to Manitoba. A gentleman engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements told me, when in London, that he had received orders from Manitoba for \$60,000 worth of agricultural implements and wagons, to be

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

delivered this spring. I visited a furniture factory that had just re-opened, and I found the men in great spirits; I found the words "Success to the National Policy" posted up in every conceivable place. And what did I find them doing in this factory? I found them manufacturing the frames of sofas, an article that had never been manufactured there before, but had previously been transported from Chicago, and which they now manufacture for smaller manufacturers in the upholstery line. This was a new industry in this branch. I then went to a rolling-stock manufactory, and found them engaged in the manufacture of cars for the Southern Railway. Let me say here that the National Policy has had this effect of causing to be manufactured in Canada cars and locomotives that would otherwise have been manufactured in the United States. In Montreal there has been an immense number of men at work on rolling-stock. I was not only in London, but I was in Brantford, on my way from London, and at Brantford I met a great many who had formerly been supporters of the hon. gentleman opposite, and one, who had, according to his own statement, been a constant supporter of the Liberal party, who said, in the course of speech made by him at a dinner, at which I was: "I have been a supporter for twenty-seven years of the Liberal party; I have not agreed with them in the policy of Free-trade, but I have supported them with every vote; I am engaged in a business in which we have scarcely held our own for the last four years. I visited Ottawa; I appealed to the Government; I stated to the ex-Minister of Finance our difficulty, our sinking condition; and what the consequence would be if no relief was given; and I said to him: 'See, we are sinking; we must have some assistance.' 'Go back,' said the ex-Finance Minister, 'and sink, then.' Am I then to be called a traitor to my principles because I have in that sinking condition, laid hold of the lifeboat that has been prepared by Sir John A. Macdonald to save us? I have a living now; my profits are small, but, nevertheless, I am able to keep my mill going and keep my men employed." I visited another manufacturer with the political proclivities of hon. gentlemen opposite. As we passed through his

place, there were many smiling faces. He said to me, before we went through: "You have a great many friends here, and I should not at all wonder if they give you a cheer; if they do, I will not object." I visited an establishment in another town. I was shown through by one of the partners, and general satisfaction was expressed. I will tell you the conversation that passed in the evening after being through this establishment. A gentleman asked me, "Did you see Mr. So-and-So?" I answered "No." He said, "I saw him the other day and I said to him 'Mr. Tilley is coming here in a few days, you will, of course, show him through your place'; he said, 'I do not want to see Mr. Tilley; I do not want to admit that the National Policy has done us any good, and I would have to do so were I to see him.'" Now, though giving unwilling testimony, that same gentleman had expressed himself satisfied, and that his business was in a prosperous condition. I visited Gananoque, where I went over several establishments, where the proprietors were of one or the other side of politics, and, with one exception, all admitted that the change in the Tariff had benefitted them, and I have not been in any town of the Dominion of Canada of the same population that showed more vitality than that town. I visited the principal manufacturing centres, including Oshawa, Belleville, Toronto, Montreal, Sherbrooke and Almonte, and conversed with their manufacturers and merchants. Almonte is an important manufacturing centre for woollen goods, partly owing to its magnificent water-power. I found the three leading establishments working after hours, though they had been shut down for some time before. The largest had been bringing in new machinery, to take advantage of the best inventions for the manufacture of new kinds of cloths. The other establishments were working overtime. The weavers received, the day I was there, or the following day, some 10 per cent., or 10c. a day additional to their wages. I was pointed out the building erected for a furniture factory, and have been asked here if I visited it. Yes, it was shown me; and I was told it had been burned out in 1876, and that the town of Almonte had agreed to give \$10,000 as a bonus for its recon-

struction. The building was reerected, and the town having failed to give the bonus it stood there awaiting use; but it will not wait long, I trust, under Protection, for an occupant. It stands idle because the capital of the company was lost by the fire, and the promised bonus was refused. The other interests of the town, especially the woollen, were in a most flourishing condition. Wherever I went I found improvement. Take, for instance, Montreal, where it is estimated there are to-day 4,000 more operatives employed, and at better wages and at full time, than there were this time twelve months. A large machine shop is manufacturing machinery for the sugar refinery, and producing machinery for other manufactories being established; you will find in different parts of the country, workshops turning out new machinery. They have had an impetus given to their trade, as they are building engines, locomotives and machines for the new industries. I want no better proof of the success of the National Policy than in the construction and enlargement of cotton and woollen mills. A gentleman who was here last Session, and had opposed the duty on coarse woollen goods, afterwards went to England and brought out machinery formerly in use there, for a woollen mill erected at Montreal, and he had 100 hands employed in it in three months after the change of Tariff. One ready-made clothing establishment in Montreal has 900 hands employed. You find in factory after factory all the hands now fully employed, and in increased numbers. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that those are immense monopolies, taking, unfairly, the hard earnings of the masses. I have statements from the manufacturers showing that cotton goods, bleached and unbleached, were, on the 21st February last, for sale in this country as cheap as they could be bought in Boston, and the duty saved on them. I requested and got reliable statements from the manufacturers. There is a difference of less than 1c. per pound on the weight of the cotton manufactured in favour of Boston; but the manufacturers here give three months' credit, and 10 per cent. discount, while in Massachusetts but two months are given, and 5 per cent. discount, which makes the price about the same in both countries. With refer-

ence to woollen goods, taking the price of wool for 1873 to the present year, let us look at the profits on the manufacture of a pound of wool; in 1872, 52c.; in 1873, 42c.; in 1874, 43c.; in 1875, 47c.; in 1876, 48c.; in 1877, 46½c.; in 1878, 41½c., and in 1879, 30c.—that is down to the end of 1879. Then, here is the statement for 1880, so far as it has gone. The difference between the price of wool per pound and the price of 12½ ounce cloth per yard, in 1870, 55c.; in 1871, 35c.; in 1872, 40c.; in 1873, 45c.; in 1874, 40c.; in 1875, 40c.; in 1876, 40c.; in 1877, 35c.; in 1878, 35c.; in 1879, 30c.; in 1880, 35c. The duty was 15 per cent. in the earlier and 17½ per cent. in the latter years; but those goods are sold at present at a lower rate of profit on the manufactures of the wool than before. I have a statement in reference to grey and white blankets, and the profits per pound stand in the same proportion; and, in conversation with a gentleman, within the last few days, who deals largely in that article, he stated that, until the recent increase in the price of wool, the price of Cornwall blankets, notwithstanding the increase of duty, had not been increased to the purchaser. When wool rose from 22c. to 35c. per pound, the manufacturers of woollen goods had to increase their price in the same proportion. This gives cotton and woollen goods manufactured in Canada to the consumer at a less price than if the former tariff were in force. We come now to the price of sugar. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. White) made some statements that were very full and clear. He referred to the number employed in the refineries, and the additional work sugar gave, not only in refining, but in the manufacture of barrels, cartage, etc. One important point has been kept out of sight by hon. gentlemen opposite. Under the late Tariff, sugar above No. 13, paid 1c. per pound and 25 per cent. duty. Now, what did we do when we re-adjusted the Tariff last year? We said that all sugar, No. 14 and below, down to No. 9, should pay ¾c. per pound and 25 per cent. This description of sugar that I hold in my hand is very fair grocer's sugar, that may be consumed by any family. A very good and desirable sugar pays, to-day, ½c. per pound less

than it paid under the Tariff of the hon. gentlemen opposite. It pays $\frac{1}{4}$ c. per pound specific duty less, and, when imported direct to the Dominion, the 25 per cent. levied on it is not charged on the cost of the packages and other charges, but on the first cost, which makes the rate to-day, to the consumer, $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound less than under the old Tariff; and on all grades between thirteen and nine, which can be used by any family, pays $\frac{1}{4}$ c. per pound less, because they do not pay the 25c. on the charges.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not refined sugar.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Certainly not; but the hon. gentleman told us the Tariff operated against the poor man. When we can establish that the rich man's sugar, as well as the poor man's, is admitted at $\frac{1}{4}$ c. less per pound than formerly, and the sugar between No. 13 and No. 9 at $\frac{1}{4}$ c. less than before the present Tariff, the cry with reference to the poor man's injuries by the change of duty on sugar is absurd. This trade involves far more than the employment of a large number of men in Montreal, Halifax, Moncton, Hamilton and other cities—more by the direct trade with the St. Lawrence, and New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, with the West Indies. With this trade, a vessel leaving any of our ports with a cargo of lumber or fish for the West Indies, can find a return cargo of sugar for Halifax, St. John or Montreal. The party shipping the Canadian cargo can thus obtain a lower rate, giving increased profits to the shipping interest, or reduced freight to the shipper, by which his profits are increased. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), said the difference between the quantity of sugar imported from England and that brought to Canada from the West Indies, under the new Tariff, was about 4,700 tons a year. He will find it amounts to 26,000 tons. Vessels from Canada can accept lower rates to the West Indies when they have those return freights, and they can get higher rates and more profit when there is competition among merchants. It is true that foreign vessels come to Montreal with cargoes from Cuba; but that has its advantage, as they load with our grain, and foster trade between Canada and other countries. These vessels, with

sugar and coal required for refining, provide tonnage at Montreal at rates that enable them to compete with vessels offering at New York, and thus secure our exports *via* the St. Lawrence. It may be said you are interfering with the extent of the outward-bound freights by your National Policy. I answer: does it not take more tonnage to bring here 100 tons of wool than it does to bring the products of 100 tons? Does it not take more tonnage to bring iron here, in the raw state, than if manufactured, and the same with other articles of trade? Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) gainsay this if he can. The National Policy is encouraging our shipping, and developing the North-West as well. We are spending a large amount to improve our inland navigation and trade by the St. Lawrence. We find the Americans in sharp competition with us, as the large emigration to that country gives its vessels return business. But we shall hereafter have steamships carrying European emigrants to settle in our North-West, and carrying back the products of that region and of the older Provinces, at lower rates, and thus enable us to compete with our neighbours. In that way also, we will see the advantages of the National Policy. Let it be properly worked out, and the country sufficiently developed, and we shall have a larger outlet by the St. Lawrence than ever before, and the benefits of an increased carrying trade. With regard to the statement that $\frac{3}{4}$ c. to $1\frac{1}{4}$ c. per pound is the addition to the price of sugar under this Tariff, the quotations of November, December and January last will show it has been selling at a little less than under the old Tariff. We will do still better if we buy when prices are higher and there is a larger balance in our favour. We shut out the American article, by adding to the value of this sugar the amount of their drawback. Our American neighbours can remove this difficulty at any moment by reducing their drawbacks. But there is no objection to a competition to keep our refined sugar at a reasonable price. The competition of the Mother Country will be strong enough. It has no duties on raw sugars, which her merchants buy on the most favourable terms, with capital at 3 or 4 per cent. Labour is low, and they can get their

freights from the West Indies and to Canada at a little more than we pay for freights from the the West Indies to the Dominion. With this British competition, our manufacturers could not, if they desired to do so, take from the people of this country any undue profit. And, in this connection, let me say that the remark I made on one occasion, when reference was made to the increase in the price of sugar and tea, that I was pleased to know, that, under our policy, the country was full of sugar, that Montreal and Halifax warehouses were well stocked, and that it was not only in the hands of Messrs. Redpath, but of merchants in the leading cities as well, who had this description of sugar brought in under this favouring Tariff, which they were selling to their customers, and that instead of twenty million pounds, they had three times that amount, and the profit went into the pockets of Canadians instead of the pockets of the people of the United States. I was ridiculed, and it was said that it was most extraordinary for the Finance Minister, or anyone else, to say the people were to be congratulated because the price had advanced. Mr. Speaker, it would have advanced without reference to the Tariff arrangements, but we would not have had the profit. When visiting a warehouse in Hamilton, I said to the proprietor, "So the price of tea has greatly advanced," and he told me that it had. Under the system of the last two or three years, a large portion of the stock then in Canada would have been lying in Boston and New York, and in the hands of American traders there, while now the profits on the advance were in the pockets of Canadians. Is there anything wrong in congratulating Canadians on Tariff arrangements which have given them the profits instead of giving it to the Americans? With reference to the farmer, if his sugar costs him no more, and the sugar which most of our people consume costs less; if the cottons furnished to them cost no more; if the woollen goods cost no more, what difference does it make to him? With reference to the cost of flour, I have a statement here as to the flour brought into the markets of New Brunswick during the past year. The writer says:—

"The accompanying statement gives the
SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

comparative cost in St. John, New Brunswick, of a brand of American flour and a brand of Canadian flour, the quality being equal:—

		Am. fr.	Can. fr.
January,	1879, 13th to 20th	\$6 00	\$5 70
February,	" "	6 05	5 75
March,	" "	6 05	5 75
April,	" "	6 10	5 85
May,	" "	6 10	5 85
June,	" "	6 10	5 85
July,	" "	6 10	6 10
August,	" "	6 10	6 10
September,	" "	6 50	6 30
October,	" "	7 75	7 20
November,	" "	7 75	7 20
December,	" "	7 75	7 20

"The flour imported from the United States, and the quantity was limited, was strong bakers' flour, made from Minnesota wheat, a quality of wheat not grown in Canada, except in the North-West, and an inferior flour used for ships' bread. The quotations given are actual transactions, and show that the duty of 50c. per barrel has not materially increased the price to consumers."

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Is this gentleman in favour of the duty?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I do not know whether he is in favour of the duty or not, but he is in favour of the policy, and he is one of the largest dealers in New Brunswick, and gives this as his experience of the result of the policy.

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

After Recess.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: When addressing the House, before separating at Six o'clock, I was anxious to place my hands upon some papers that I could not find at the time. I now have them before me, and, as the statement I made was without reference to the documents, perhaps the House will bear with me if I make reference to them now. In reference to the statements made by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), I have here a table taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1879, No. 8, page xxv., showing the rates of Customs duties per head of the population, paid in each Province and in the Dominion, from 1868 to 1879. I find by this that, in 1878, the amount per head in Ontario was \$2.90, while, in 1879, it was \$3.06, leaving a difference of 16c. instead of \$1.16, as stated by the hon. member for West Middlesex. In New Brunswick, the Customs duty in 1878, was \$5.07 per head, and, in 1879, \$3.67

per head, making the *per capita* for 1879 \$1.40 less than in 1878, instead of \$1.40 more, as stated by the hon. member for West Middlesex.

MR. ROSS: The report of that speech, from which the hon. gentleman has quoted, is not correct. The *Hansard* report is not correct. I remember perfectly what I said. It is not so reported in the *Toronto Globe*, nor in any other report that I have seen. It is a misstatement as to the difference between per head and per cent.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I looked at the *Toronto Globe* the next day, supposing that a speech delivered with such force and with such effect as that of the hon. member would have appeared in full; and I venture to say that no one was more congratulated by his political friends than he was in reference to that speech, and for the reason that he made reckless statements, of which I have given an example. I took down the remark at the time, and it was a question with me whether I would then refer to it, or wait until I had an opportunity of replying. When I looked in the *Globe* the next day, to my astonishment, I found the hon. gentleman, who was entitled to at least two or three columns, was favoured with very little space. I could not understand it, unless the explanation was that some of his colleagues had given the hint to the reporters that it would not do to publish the speech in full. I saw the *Hansard* report, and found that my impression of the speech was correct. The hon. gentleman said (*Hansard*, page 644):

"Let me give you a fact or two, which will illustrate the working of the tariff. The percentage which Ontario paid upon dutiable goods she consumed last year was increased by 2½ per cent.; the Province of Quebec, 1¼ per cent.; Nova Scotia, 2½ per cent.; New Brunswick, 3¼ per cent.; British Columbia, 21.5 per cent.; Prince Edward Island, 2 per cent. So unevenly does this tariff rest upon the various Provinces that the Customs duties paid by Ontario have increased by \$1.16 per head; those paid by Quebec only 27c. per head; New Brunswick, \$1.40 per head; British Columbia, \$1.80 per head; Prince Edward Island, 27c. per head."

I noticed the statement at the time, and, if my memory serves me, called attention to it across the floor of the House, and the hon. leader of the Opposition called to the hon. gentleman, as if to say, "the hon. the Finance Minister wishes to

speak to you," but I stopped. I thought it would be better to take it up afterwards. An error of that kind is very grave, and it is very important that these comparisons should be accurate and perfectly reliable. I did not find the remarks in the *Globe*, but I looked in the *Hansard*, and found that, after it had received the hon. gentleman's revision, it corresponded with my notes taken at the time. Therefore, I read from these returns to show that, instead of the amount being as stated by the hon. gentleman, it was very different. As far as New Brunswick was concerned, if there was anything in the argument of the hon. gentleman at all, the National Policy affects it beneficially. I do not claim that, but for peculiar circumstances in 1877-8, the large importation of goods to replace those destroyed by fire, made the revenue larger than usual, and the population larger, and the difference in the duty was \$1.40 between that year and 1878-9, but it was a decrease per head instead of an increase. I have here a telegram which was sent to me from the Secretary of the Cotton Manufacturing Company, in St. Stephens, which I will read:

"ST. STEPHENS, N.B., March 25th.

"Sir Leonard Tilley:

"Weldon's reference to St. Croix Cotton Factory excites great indignation here. Cotton mill enterprise progressing most favourably. Subscription list upward of \$30,000. Capitalists, regardless of politics, promise good additions. Town Council of Milltown vote to issue detentures for \$50,000 in aid. James Murchie, Judge Stevens, the Eatons, Boardman's, Charles F. Todd Chipman, and other leading men, all taking active part. The Committee wish this to be made as public as Weldon's statement.

"DAVID MAIN,

"Secretary to Committee."

Then I took the liberty of telegraphing to three gentlemen connected with proposed new industries in New Brunswick, as my statements with reference to them were said by hon. gentlemen opposite to be all moonshine. I wrote to Mr. Stephens, of Moncton, Vice-President of the Lock factory there, and asked what the condition of that concern was, and here is what he said:

"Machinery will be in and work commenced by the 20th April.

"H. T. STEVENS,

"Vice-President, Lock Company."

I then sent a telegram to Mr. Harris, a gentleman who has taken a deep interest in the establishment of the sugar refinery at Moncton, and a warm political and personal friend of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith). While I am upon this subject, I am reminded that one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side said it was no wonder a sugar refinery was being established at Moncton, because it was understood that the Company would have the Government at their back. Now, this was an implication, at least, that the Government were, either at the expense of the public or in some other way, offering help in that undertaking. I may say that the difficulty the Company had was with reference to the difference in the freight charged on the Intercolonial for raw and refined sugar. That Railway, for the purpose of taking the business as far as possible between Halifax and Montreal, had placed a charge of something like 17 cents per 100 pounds upon raw sugar, being less than that on refined; and it was for the purpose of making the rates more equitable, a reduction was made on the rates of refined sugar taken to the different parts of the Dominion from that refinery. Therefore, there was no concession made beyond what was granted to others, and what was reasonable, and no peculiar advantage was given to that industry. I sent a telegram to this firm, and here is what Mr. Harris says:

“March 29th.

“Put in foundations for buildings; will commence bricklaying about the 1st of May. J. L. Harris in England purchasing plant. Will commence operation 1st September.”

Then, with reference to the Nut and Bolt Company, here is Mr. Young's answer:

“Company have started four weeks since, and is incorporated. Half the stock taken up and Directors appointed. Expect to commence building as soon as frost permits. Six months' orders ahead.

“LEVI H. YOUNG.”

These telegrams give some evidence of something tangible and reliable, and is likely to produce a marked effect on the industries of that section of the Dominion, under the operation of the National Policy. I now return to the point I was discussing of the cost to the

consumer of the articles manufactured in the Dominion of Canada. I have spoken of Canadian woollen goods and of flour. An hon. gentleman endeavoured to show that the National Policy had really diminished rather than increased the difference of prices of wheat in Toronto and Chicago. It will be quite apparent to every hon. member that the imposition of 15c. duty per bushel on wheat could not decrease the difference between the prices in Toronto and Chicago; such a result could only be produced by exceptional causes. What were the facts of the case? The circumstances were of an exceptional nature, and they arose from two causes. There was for months a corner in the wheat market in Chicago, and parties were keeping the price up higher than it was in Canada, much higher, in fact, than they were warranted in holding it at even for the English market. Then there was another difficulty, and one that it would be exceedingly difficult for any Government to remedy. It is a fact that any Tariff enactments we may make here will, to a certain extent, be interfered with by arrangements made by the railway companies for carrying freights between certain points in the Dominion, and from the Western States to points in the Dominion. The low freights that existed for a long time last year between New York and Chicago had a great deal to do with keeping up the prices in Chicago, as compared with those in Toronto, because there were times when you could carry from Chicago to New York freight as low as you could carry the same quantity of wheat between Toronto and Montreal. It is under these circumstances possibly that a repetition of such a state of things as existed during the last four months may occur. The whole thing has, however, entirely changed recently; this corner has been broken up, and prices have gone down, and the difference now is three or four times as great as it was. Now, I do not hear hon. gentlemen rising on our side of the House and exclaiming that the imposition of this duty has made the difference, nor do I hear hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House calling attention to the great difference, and giving us credit for that change. Now, let us go a little further with respect to prices. I reco-

lect visiting a most interesting establishment for the manufacture of leather, opposite the city of Fredericton, in New Brunswick. This company has not a large capital, it is true; they could do more if they had more capital. They manufacture a particular kind of leather, for the lining of carriages and railway passenger cars. Since the establishment of that factory, that description of leather has been sold for from 20 to 25 per cent. less than it could be bought in the city of Boston. Now we come to another important industry that has been referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite, that of agricultural implements. That is an important industry in this country, and gives employment to immense numbers of men. Under the present Tariff, they have nearly the whole of the market of the Dominion of Canada. With reference to Manitoba I think that during the first six months of this year only \$3,000 duty was collected on mowers and reapers imported from the United States, as against \$70,000 in the same period of the year before. That industry has so developed that the manufacturers now control nearly the whole of the home market. They are, however, asking for the free admission of a description of iron not made in the country. They also ask that the regulations of the Customs Department should be so construed as to put on the free list certain kinds of steel for use in that manufacture. There was a question as to whether that description of steel was subject to duty or not. The Government felt disposed to make every reasonable concession in that respect, and gave them the benefit of that. But what do they represent to the Government? One gentleman brought me a memorandum showing that under our Tariff they would have to pay \$6,000 a year more of duty on the iron and other materials that they imported than they had paid the year before. The question was asked, can you not increase your prices? and they answered that they could not. I visited one establishment where the proprietor told me that in 1878 they turned out 1,800 mowers and reapers, last year 2,500, and this year they are manufacturing 4,000. They pay into the revenue on the material which is used more than they paid under the old Tariff; the mowers

and reapers cost no more to the farmers who require them, and the men who manufacture them make a larger profit on the increased number they are producing, and an increased number of men receive employment in their manufacture. Why, some of these gentlemen ask for an increase in the present Tariff, in order to exclude from Manitoba American machines, and I, for one, would have no hesitation in recommending to my colleagues an increase in the duty, so that the Tariff might prevent importation from abroad, if the present Tariff should not be found to do so, in order that they should have the entire home market, as they are producing articles at such a moderate price. Now, we will come to the nail industry. It was stated in my own Province and in Quebec that an increase of the duty from 5 to 17½ per cent. on the iron would compel the manufacturers to raise their prices, but I found that in those Provinces they were selling nails for less than they could be bought in Boston.

MR. MACKENZIE: What has Boston to do with it?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That is where the sharpest competition is. They manufacture a larger amount of nails, the consumer pays very little more for them than formerly, we get a duty on the raw material, and they make profits on the increased manufactures. There is an illustration of how our industries really are benefitted and the Treasury not injured, because we get in return a considerable increase on the raw material and duty on goods consumed by the operatives as an equivalent for what we lose on the articles that were previously imported. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith), asked me, in reference to the flour duty, "Is the gentleman who wrote that letter in favour of the duty?" I answered that he was; and, from his manner of putting the question, I inferred the hon. gentleman placed less importance on his testimony on that account. On this point I will give the testimony of a gentleman who is well known to be a most determined opponent of the National Policy. That gentleman resides in the Province of New Brunswick, and publishes a paper there, the leading organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I will quote from

that paper, with reference to the furniture manufactures, upon which, they say, the duty has been doubled. I will read a very inconsistent article, after this declaration, that the manufacturer can sell cheaper than the same furniture can be bought in the United States. Now, when running the late election in St. John, a message came to me from one of the gentlemen referred to in this article. He was a large commission merchant and importer of furniture from the United States. He had been a life long supporter of mine. The message was to this effect: "Mr. So-and-so has supported you ever since you entered public life; he is anxious to do so still, but he requires one promise from you." I said, "What is that promise?" He answered, "Unless you promise not to increase the duty on American furniture, an article in which he is dealing, he cannot support you." I said, I would be sorry to lose his support, because he had stood by me through evil and good report, but I could not give that promise. When the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was scolding the House the other night, he gave me a passing notice, and said that I had made statements in St. John that were not consistent with the policy we had introduced to this House. I stated distinctly the policy I advocated was a readjustment of the Tariff in such a way as to give Protection to just such industries as this, and that being part of the National Policy. I declined to give any promise of the kind, because I felt it was one of the industries that required and would receive protection from Parliament. More than that, if I erred at all in my calculations or in my statements, when I stated it was a readjustment of the Tariff and not an increase of taxation we had in view, it was because I believed in the correctness of the Estimates of the late Finance Minister, which turned out to be for Customs and Excise, \$2,500,000 over and above what would have been received if there had been no change in the Tariff. Therefore, if the receipts had been \$13,750,000 for the one, and \$5,250,000 for the other, making \$19,000,000 in all, that would have been sufficient for this Government, without necessitating a resort to additional taxation. But, when we were face to face with this deficiency, it became necessary not only

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

to readjust the Tariff for the purposes which we declared, and which we advocated, but in order to get an increased revenue, so that our expenditure might not exceed our revenue. I will read from the article referred to from the *St. John Telegraph*. Mr. Elder is the editor, a gentleman of great energy and ability, and a most determined advocate of Free-trade and an opponent of the National Policy. He says:

"MESSRS. STEWART & WHITE'S ESTABLISHMENT.—Messrs. Stewart & White, who gained such a reputation prior to the National Policy, by their importation of splendid furniture from abroad, have now in their fine ware-rooms on Charlotte street, probably the finest display of parlour and bedroom furniture ever seen in St. John. Much of this has been made by their own workmen, and most of the remainder has been upholstered here. The display comprises magnificent sets of the various celebrated styles, upholstered in gorgeous silks and plush, and handsome sets equally beautiful and highly finished.

"The National Policy forced Messrs. Stewart & White to abandon the importation of furniture, doubling, as it did, the duty. They saw that if they were to remain in the furniture business, they must do so as manufacturers. Their experience as such in this line has proved that the enormous duty of 35 per cent: was wholly unnecessary, and that the Canadian manufacturer without it could compete on even terms with the best makers of New York and Boston."

How contradictory. They could not compete with them before, but, under this Tariff, they have abandoned importing, and turned to manufacturing themselves. He summed up as follows:—

"One of their workmen is now making a bedroom set which will be shown at the exhibition, although it will be completed much earlier, which will challenge comparison with any \$1,000 set made by the most celebrated manufacturers in Boston, although they will be able to produce it for about half the Boston price. Persons desiring elegant and beautiful furniture need not go abroad for it, for they can buy it as cheaply in St. John as they can in New York, and save 35 per cent. duty besides."

Now, there is a declaration from an authority who is an out-and-out supporter of Free-trade. That ought to be considered as valuable testimony by our friends opposite.

MR. GUTHRIE: Is not that an advertisement? Is it not a paid business notice?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: No, it is not an advertisement. I will tell you

what I have observed. You may take up local articles in any of the Grit papers giving an account of what is taking place in Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal, or elsewhere, pointing out the great impetus given to the industries of the country, and you will find editorials contradicting and making statements directly opposite to the local reports. Then my hon. friend says, in connection with the editorial I have read, that the editor was paid for it. I do not think my hon. friend, the editor of that paper, will thank my hon. friend opposite for the supposition that he was paid to make this statement.

MR. MACKENZIE: An editor is not bought because he takes pay for advertisements.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Here is a distinct statement, and no doubt true, that furniture can be bought in the city of St. John, to-day, of that description as cheap as can be bought in New York or Boston, which is a saving of 35 per cent., or 17½ on the old Tariff.

MR. ANGLIN: That is not true.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Well, I venture to say that there is a great deal of furniture that can be so bought; there may be some few special kinds that cannot, but there is no question about a large portion being required for common use. I might occupy the attention of the House for a longer time in giving the result of my visits to London, to Brantford, to Berlin, etc. I was greatly surprised to find in Berlin a very important industry, employing 250 people, making buttons, and the gentleman who was in charge of one of the manufactories said the number would be increased by fifty or seventy this year. In that town alone there are three establishments for the manufacture of buttons.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long have they been established?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: They may have been established for years, but have been in a declining condition for some time past, but new energy has been given to them by the operation of the Tariff. The number of persons employed in them has been increased or doubled in many cases. The hon. gentleman maintained that, because these manufactures were established in 1872 or 1873, no credit is due to the National Policy for

an increased prosperity. I will not occupy the time of the House by relating my experience in Hamilton, one of the largest and most important manufacturing centres of the Dominion; in St. Catharines, where there are two large flour mills, grinding about 400 barrels of flour each per day. The gentlemen owning these mills are politically opposed to us, and one of them said to me that times have not been so prosperous with them for the past four years as they have been lately. I accompanied them to see the capacity of their mills, and to ascertain the extent of their operations, and I found that they were in a very flourishing and satisfactory condition. Then, in Dundas, we found cotton mills in a most flourishing condition; we found that the tool factory was in a good condition. In the oatmeal mill we found them grinding for the home market, and also doing a large quantity of work for the export trade. Though I did not visit the St. John market, as suggested by the hon. member for Queen's, I met with gentlemen representing the agricultural interest in various parts of the Dominion, and I may say that, notwithstanding all that has been said to dissatisfy the farmers and make them believe that their tea is taxed more than formerly; that their sugar costs more than formerly, under the new Tariff; that all the articles they purchase, such as cotton and woollen goods, cost more, and that they themselves get no benefit whatever, let me say this: they appeared satisfied. I met a gentleman in Toronto, engaged in the grain trade. He was on the other side of politics. He admitted that he had an increased demand for Canadian oats, for a portion of the Dominion, formerly supplied from the United States, and he said: "We are now supplying Canadian oats, and Canadian oats alone." He also said, speaking for the farmer, whatever else the National Policy may have done, it has benefitted him. I was a little surprised to hear the statement made that, because our harvest had been a magnificent one during the past year, and because the farmers had been directing their attention to the fattening of cattle for the English market, and thus causing an increase of exports, it was argued that the home

market for the farmer had not been increased. We know there is no way in which the farmer would be more directly benefitted than by the increase of the home market, which must necessarily be improved for farm products, by the development of the manufacturing industries of the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) made a speech, in which he called attention especially to agricultural products. His arguments have not been answered. He showed, step by step, the increase which had taken place in the price of agricultural produce, and the great benefit the farmers of the Dominion derived from the operation of the Tariff, and, with the home market for perishable articles, was largely increased. Then, my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, or some other hon. member, read from my speech, and criticised my reference to the fact that this year our exports are likely to equal our imports. He also read from my speech in which I pointed out, in 1873, that our imports were considerably in excess of our exports. He read a statement, by which I undertook to show that, from the freights we receive from our ships, and from various other sources, we would make up, to a considerable extent, the difference between the exports and imports, and prevent another financial crisis. I recollect the hon. gentleman, on Thursday, commented on that statement, and said it was absurd to make any reference as between the imports of Canada and those of the United States. The hon. gentleman said that diminished imports meant poverty.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I did not say so, I said they might mean poverty, and they often did.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Well, I am glad the hon. gentleman qualified it. Largely diminished consumption would indicate the poverty of a country, but not largely diminished imports. How is it with the United States? Their imports have diminished year by year, until, for the last three years, the exports exceeded the imports by \$250,000,000 a year. That country was not impoverished by that. The people consumed as largely as ever, but she consumed her own manufactures. If she was not consuming as usual, it would be an indication of the poverty of the people. When the hon.

gentlemen opposite are speaking about the terribly destructive character of the National Policy, they point to the haven to which all our people are going. They point to that country that has, so long since, adopted this policy in the interest of their own country—a policy that is leading our people away—a policy that is making that country, at the present moment, more prosperous than it has been for many many years. I would ask hon. gentlemen, when they are referring to this matter, what would have been our position in the Dominion of Canada if we had not adopted a policy that has enabled us to give employment to our industrial classes? They would have had to go abroad for the purpose of seeking employment. It is stated that 23,000 persons have passed over to the United States from Sarnia, but we all know that a large portion of them belong to the United States. But admitting, for argument sake, all that has been said by my hon. friend opposite, we would have had an emigration much larger than we have had, had it not been for the adoption of this policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The hon. member says, hear, hear. My hon. friend opposite said I had made a vituperative speech. I do not know that the speech I made on the 9th March, or the speech I have made to-night, contain any vituperative remarks. Perhaps I would have wounded the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite if I had referred to what I consider the vituperative course of certain parties in the Dominion in decrying the country, in running it down and injuring its credit; but I do say this, that, under existing circumstances, without giving the National Policy credit for it, it would have been much more gratifying if the hon. gentlemen had taken the course taken by some of their papers three or four months ago, and have admitted that the country is more prosperous than it was, but that the National Policy was not the cause of it. Every unprejudiced man must admit that the country is in a more prosperous and hopeful condition, and I think it would have been more patriotic and more in the interest of the country to have admitted that fact. Many hon. gentlemen in this House communicated with me last Ses-

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

sion before we submitted the resolutions in reference to the Tariff, and will probably remember that in the conversation that I had with them, I said that the next Session of Parliament will be the Session upon which this policy will be more especially put upon its trial than any other, because we had had depression before for five years. Everything had been going down for five years. You cannot immediately stop a locomotive after running four or five miles on a down grade; though you put on the brakes, it takes some little time to bring it up; so with this matter. Many manufactories have been closed, and it could not be expected that the full effect of the policy would be felt within eight or nine months, and I urged upon our friends not to be too sanguine as to its immediate results. My expectations have been more than realised. My expectation would have been more than fulfilled even if we had not been able to present half the facts that we have presented during the consideration of the amended Tariff, and, instead of having any want of faith, that faith is stronger to-day than when I submitted the proposition on the 10th of March, because there has not been an argument advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite that has not been fairly met, and not a single statement put forward by them that has not been completely demolished. There were two or three things I referred to in my speech—two especially—one with reference to the loan. The late Finance Minister said it was a pretty good loan. The loan he made in 1876 was nearly as good. He went on to depreciate it, although admitting it to be a good loan. But the hon. gentleman in his statement, and it was done intentionally, no doubt to place me, if it was possible to do so, in a false position before the people of this country, said that, when I visited England to negotiate a loan, Sir A. T. Galt was there at the same time. I may say that, when I was in England negotiating the last loan, he (Sir A. T. Galt) was on this side of the Atlantic. It was said when I was at Washington negotiating any business, Sir A. T. Galt was there also. He was not there with me. But I feel it an honour to have it supposed that any business transacted by me, or any

proposition submitted by me, was so conducted and of such a character as to entitle it to the supposition that it emanated from so able a statesman as Sir Alexander Galt. I will say no more upon the subject at present; but there is another matter that I refer to with great satisfaction. It was said that the policy, when proposed, was less favourable to Great Britain than to the United States, and that, therefore, it was an unwise policy. Oh, what a wonderful change since this time twelve months, when they imagined that it was against England and in favour of the United States. Now, when the result proves it to be favourable to Great Britain as compared with the United States, their tune has changed. But I have produced evidence, which has not been gainsaid, that the duty on the whole of the goods imported from Great Britain was only increased about 1 per cent., and 3 per cent. on the whole imports from the United States. As I am about drawing my remarks to a close, I will just refer to the reference that has been made to the evidence of public sentiment against the National Policy. It has been stated that we had some such evidence in the elections that have taken place. Has there been any given by a single election for a member of this Parliament for any change of opinion, on this point, since the 17th of September, 1878? It has been said, over and over again, that the Ontario election was evidence that the National Policy had lost its hold on the people of that Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: So they are.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Well, Sir, I am not a resident of Ontario. I happened to visit—

AN HON. MEMBER: It was a pleasant visit?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It was a pleasant visit. But no one could go into Ontario, previous to these elections, and come to any any other conclusion, but that the National Policy, of all other policies, was the most popular. What is the fact? Down to within two days of the elections, the leading organ of the party, the supporters of Mr. Mowat's Administration, the leading men of that party deprecated the idea of making the National Policy an issue.

MR. MACKENZIE: Why did you do it, then?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Why did we do it? Because our friends saw that Mr. Mowat's friends were in the majority, unless they were divided by the National Policy. Mr. Mowat's friends said: "We have been beaten on that in Ontario in the Dominion elections. Let us abandon that altogether, and keep to our own party lines, and we will succeed; but if not, we will be beaten."

MR. MACKENZIE: What did you do?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The Liberal Conservatives knew the National Policy was popular, and, as they were in a minority, they naturally tried to make it the issue, because it was popular, and would give our friends the only chance of success.

MR. MACKENZIE: As far as you could, you made it the issue.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: But the Liberals would not have it; and, therefore, the Ontario elections are no evidence whatever of the unpopularity of the National Policy. Let us see. There has been another evidence given of the unpopularity of the National Policy in the Dominion of Canada. The people of England have declared against the foreign policy of the Beaconsfield Administration. That is given as an evidence of the unpopularity of the Tariff, because, as was said by the hon. member for West Durham, it is evidence of a good time coming. Why? Because the Liberal party in England had succeeded in obtaining a majority against the foreign policy of Lord Beaconsfield. But there is a good time coming. It has been said, "the Opposition are greatly elated. "Why?" it was asked. Why, it is understood that there was some arrangement between the present leader of our Government and Lord Beaconsfield in reference to the settlement and development of the North-West. But members of the Opposition say that is all upset now. Now, Sir, you would suppose that any change which would deprive us of the alleged expected assistance would have been the subject of regret and not of rejoicing. A good time coming! I believe, Sir, there is a good time coming. I believe that the policy

of this Government has inaugurated a good time with reference to the encouragement of the industries of this country, giving a home market to our farmers for their produce, giving business for everybody, and filling up the vast territory in the North-West in preparation for the millions that will populate it in the future. This is the good time coming. And I do not hesitate to say, Sir, that, when we meet in Parliament next Session, we will have fully entered upon the good time coming, the success of our policy will be assured, and the prosperity of the country will be so manifest that its strongest opponents will have to admit and appreciate its value. Yes, Sir, there is a good time coming, and in faith of that good time coming, I desire to submit the resolutions I have already placed before you.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I think I would not be doing my duty on this occasion if I did not make some observation on this discussion, particularly as I was a member of the late Government, and as I come, too, from the same Province as the hon. the Minister of Finance. The course that hon. gentleman has taken to-night reminds me of by-gone days. I can remember, about twelve or fifteen years ago, when the hon. gentleman, then a Liberal now a Tory—

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: A Liberal still.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I will not say he is a renegade. He was a Liberal, and I cannot help thinking that his true convictions are still Liberal; but he became a converted Tory. He has played the rôle to-night of prophet, as he has done for many years. He is a prophet, but he is a false prophet; his prophecies have always been and ever will be falsified; he is not a true prophet. He has always addressed this House with that dignity and decorum, which I cannot say characterises the hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper), who in that respect, really excelled himself the other night; the exaggerations he indulged in went beyond whatever he was accustomed to deal out; his speech was replete with vituperation, invective slander, egotism and threat; and I was surprised to hear the hon. the Minister of Finance, who says he does not indulge in vituperation, endorse that speech of the

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

hon. member for Cumberland. I say that such a speech does not become a gentleman of his position or the dignity of this House. He has referred to the Pacific Railway Scandal as being one of the proudest acts of his life to justify and defend. I do not desire to revive recollections which it gives me no pleasure to revive ; but i cannot allow hon. members to be assailed by that hon. gentleman for the position they assumed on the motion by the hon. gentleman who sits next to me. I took an independent stand in the matter. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman opposite wants to revive the matter. He said that every man who disapproved of that transaction was guilty of fraud and corruption ; that the dissolution of 1874 was a midnight attack upon the people. The people understood that transaction well, and I wish, feeling it my duty to do so, to refer to a few facts in regard to that Pacific Railway Scandal. Does he not know that not only the hon. members of this House condemned it, but also that the sentiment and the press of England were unanimous in its condemnation? What do we find occurred in reference to that transaction, which I would rather forget, but that I cannot allow the hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) to attack me and other members on this side because we felt it our duty to censure it? I propose to read a few extracts from the correspondence published in reference to it, in order to exhibit its character :

Extract from letter of Sir Hugh Allan to Mr. G. W. McMullen, dated August 6th, 1872.

"Yesterday we entered into an agreement by which the Government bound itself to form a Company of Canadians, according to my wishes ; this company will make me President, and I and my friends will get a majority of the stock, and that the contract for the building of the road will be given to this company. In terms of the Act of Parliament Americans are to be carefully excluded, through fear that they will sell it to the Northern Pacific. But I fancy we can get over that some way or other. This position has not been obtained without large payment of money. I have already paid over \$200,000, and I will have at least \$100,000 more to pay. I must now soon know what our New York friends are going to do."

"(Private and Confidential.)

"MONTREAL, 30th July, 1871.

"Dear Sir Hugh,—The friends of the Government will expect to be assisted with funds in the pending elections, and any amounts

which you or your Company shall advance for that purpose shall be recouped to you. A memorandum for immediate requirements is given below.

"Very truly yours,

(Signed) "G. E. CARTIER."

Now wanted :

Sir John A. Macdonald.....	\$25,000
Hon. Mr. Langevin.....	15,000
Sir Geo. E. Cartier.....	20,000
Sir John A. (additional).....	10,000
Hon. Mr. Langevin (additional).....	10,000
Sir Geo. E. Cartier (additional).....	30,000

"MONTREAL, Aug. 24, 1872.

"Dear Mr. Abbott,—In the absence of Sir Hugh Allan, I shall be obliged by your supplying the Central Committee with a further sum of twenty thousand dollars upon the same conditions as the amount written by me at the foot of my letter to Sir Hugh Allan, of the 30th ultimo.

"GEO. E. CARTIER."

"P. S.—Please also send Sir John A. Macdonald ten thousand dollars more on the same terms."

"Received from Sir Hugh Allan, by the hands of Mr. Abbott, twenty thousand dollars for general election purposes, to be arranged hereafter according to the terms of the 30th July, and in accordance with the request contained in the letter of the 24th inst."

(Signed,) "J. L. BEAUDRY,
"HENRY STARNES,
"L. BÉTOURNEAY,
"P. S. MURPHY."

"Montreal, 26th August, 1872."

Hon. gentlemen opposite show by their manner that they do not like the re-call of these facts. They would prefer to listen to the hon. member for Cumberland, who condemns every man who disapproves of that transaction. It is well, however, to hear both sides.

"TORONTO, August 26th, 1872.

"To the Hon. J. J. C. Abbott, Ste. Anne's :

"Immediate, private.

"I must have another ten thousand dollars —will be the last time of calling. Do not fail me. Answer to-day.

"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

"MONTREAL, August 20, 1872.

"Sir John A. Macdonald, Toronto.

"Draw on me for ten thousand.

"J. J. C. ABBOTT."

"TORONTO, August 26, 1872.

"At sight pay to my order, at the Merchants' Bank, the sum of ten thousand dollars for value received.

"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

(Endorsed.)

"Pay to the order of the Merchants' Bank of Canada.

"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

Then, five days afterwards, Sir John A. Macdonald telegraphed for another \$10,000.

Mr. BOWELL: Read the letter as to the distribution of the stock.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I do not well understand what the hon. gentleman wants. He can read the passage he refers to himself. I repeat that it gives me no pleasure to read those letters; but I appeal to the sense of propriety of hon. members on both sides to decide whether upon all occasions, after a lapse of seven years, the hon. member for Cumberland, should refer to this particular transaction and denounce those who condemned it. Whenever he attacks me and hon. members on this side in this fashion, I will use this evidence and quote those letters against him. The hon. gentleman has told us that the whole five years of the late Administration presented only one green spot, the Fishery Award. He said that for the Fisheries Commissioner we had to select a gentleman not within our own ranks, but on the opposite side of politics, who was a personal friend of Sir John A. Macdonald. I am not prepared to say whether Sir A. T. Galt was, then, a personal friend of the present Premier. I know that during the last two years he was in Parliament, he opposed Sir John A. Macdonald and his Government. They were many years associated together, and may have been personal friends. Why should we not have appointed Sir A. T. Galt, even if he was a friend of the First Minister. Let me explain the circumstances connected with the Halifax Commission. When the duty fell on the late Government of attending to it, we cast about to see whom we should select, preliminarily. We decided not to appoint one of ourselves—we thought it would be inexpedient to appoint a member of the Government. The name of Sir Alexander Galt was suggested, and no man in this Chamber more cheerfully bears testimony to his high character and fitness for the work than myself. It affords me the greatest pleasure to speak in the highest terms of his great ability, great fidelity and loyalty to his country. We felt that such a man, who had filled the position of Finance Minister for many years, who was well-known in this country and in England, possessed peculiar qualifications for that position. We

did not consider the question of his politics, or ask whether he was a friend of Sir John A. Macdonald or not; this was of no consequence. Sir Alexander Galt was accordingly appointed, and when the Commission met at Halifax, he acted with becoming dignity, great decorum and impartiality. He had associated with him two gentlemen of high character, and considerable ability. The United States were represented by Judge Foster, a man of high character and remarkable ability, and with him an able lawyer on that country, Mr. Dana, well-known if the domains of jurisprudence and literature; and also with Mr. Trescott, from Washington. We attended at Halifax, prepared our case, called our witnesses, and occupied several months in the enquiry. I had much to do in the initial stages of and in the preparation of the case. I gave my whole undivided time and attention to the work, for months, without receiving a cent of compensation therefor. I was assisted by Mr. Whitcher, and two other gentlemen from the Departments, who rendered valuable service. In the professional duties connected with the enquiry, I was assisted by able lawyers. I had also associated with me Mr. Ford, the agent of the British Government. But I had the sole responsibility of attending to this business on behalf of this Government. I was not aided by the advice of my colleagues, as they were so far away from the place of the enquiry. I endeavoured faithfully to discharge my duty throughout, and I think I understood the case. The hon. member for Cumberland, who is not willing to give a political opponent credit for anything, and who was in Halifax at the time of the enquiry, I believe he did not attend it, and knew nothing of the case or how it was conducted. But after his election, he denounced me, though we had been on friendly terms personally, so far as I know, for thirty years. At least I never had any personal altercation with him, and we have been the representatives of adjoining counties for many years, his in Nova Scotia and mine in New Brunswick. I conducted my election honourably, and never indulged in expressions derogatory to him, nor in personalities of any kind. Well, on the day of the declaration in his own county, the hon. the Minister of Railways made a

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

violent attack on me, and abused me fearfully, representing me as false to the country, as one who had no interest in it, but who seemed desirous of destroying its best interests; and not satisfied with that, when the battle had been fought, and he might have been supposed content, he attended a meeting in my county, at Moncton, being accompanied by the hon. the Finance Minister, and the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville), being present at this enthusiastic demonstration; when he thought fit to denounce me, in the heart of my own county. He told my constituents that I was an office-seeker, and always had been; that I had knocked at the door of his Government for office. If that is not true, he can rise and correct me. He added, that his Government had refused me office, which, had they given me, would have placed me on the Government side instead of the Opposition. The hon. member for Cumberland must have known there was no foundation in truth for such a statement, and he had a witness beside him, the hon. the Finance Minister, who also knew it was false and baseless. The hon. the First Minister, to do him justice, I believe would say that I never asked for office; but he was kind enough to offer me the Lieutenant-Governorship of my own Province, as did also the hon. the Minister of Railways himself. The latter also offered me the Governorship of Nova Scotia, and a seat in the then Government. I had two offers of a seat in it, which I declined, and yet the hon. gentleman had the hardihood to declare, in my own constituency, that I had asked and been refused office by himself and colleagues. Have I not reason to complain, also, of the conduct of the hon. the Finance Minister, in letting that statement pass uncontradicted? We had been colleagues in the New Brunswick Government, ten or fifteen years, before Confederation; and I appeal to him, whether I ever asked for an office of any kind, either in the Provincial or Dominion Government? The hon. gentleman does me the justice to say I never did. Then, why did he not contradict the charge or the hon. member for Cumberland, made in his presence? I think that was his duty. The hon. Minister of Railways must have been actuated by magnanimity

or very bad personal feeling towards me. I can imagine no other motive for his conduct; to villify and abuse seems to be an instinct of his nature. All I want is fair play in the matter, from both sides, which I believe most hon. gentlemen will allow me. I now wish to read from the *Moncton Times*, the report of a speech of the hon. gentleman, made on the 27th September, 1878, ten days after our elections, in which he speaks of me in this fashion:

"When Mr. Mitchell was Minister of Marine and Fisheries he proposed to protect our Fisheries by fitting out a fleet. The idea was derided by Mr. Mackenzie and his crew, but Mitchell went on with his fleet and soon seized and condemned the American craft and saved the rights of our fishermen. So other industries should be protected.

"Sir Albert Smith had been spreading himself a good deal over the Fishery Award. He ought to be ashamed to speak of it. The Treaty of Washington, under which that Award was made, was carried at the point of the bayonet against Mackenzie and his army. The late Government had carried the Treaty, and they had selected Mr. Mitchell to represent Canada on the Commission. Mr. Mitchell had prepared the case—a case that with anything like fair management must have secured a handsome Award for Canada. But the present Government—and they deserve credit for it—recognised the fact that they had no man of sufficient ability in their ranks, and they selected Sir A. T. Galt, an old friend of Sir John A. Macdonald, to act for Canada. The Knight deserves his title for entrusting the work to Mr. Galt instead of doing it himself, as he thereby secured five and a-half millions instead of half a million that otherwise he would have got. People must be very ungrateful to object to his empty title, as he really saved us \$5,000,000 by recognising his own incapacity and entrusting to Mr. Galt the work he was unfit to do himself.

"Sir John A. Macdonald—and he could not mention that name without saying that he fully endorsed the remarks of Mr. Tilley in declaring that Sir John was the greatest man in Canada, a man who had rendered signal service to his country, to his own personal loss, a man of commanding talents, who could have enjoyed all the comforts that money could procure had he chosen to avoid public life. Sir John A. Macdonald had asked Mr. Mitchell to act as his position entitled him to, but Mr. Smith, who had the same right, waived his claim, and thus saved at least \$5,000,000, that the country undoubtedly would have lost had the case been handled by Mr. Smith."

So far from my having opposed the Washington Treaty, I supported it. I felt, when Sir John A. Macdonald returned from Washington, that the settlement was unfair to the people of this country,

but that grave consequences might flow from our opposition to it—that the true interests of the Dominion and Empire demanded our support of the Treaty. I do not know whether the hon. the First Minister, whose distinguished ability we all recognise, knew that the hon. member for Cumberland had made this statement. Now, is the House, after these explanations, prepared to approve of his charge, his calumnious attack on me? How could he know that if I had been a Commissioner, instead of Sir A. T. Galt, the Dominion would only have got \$500,000 instead of \$5,500,000 from the Americans? He speaks of it with the greatest confidence, and said he knew we would only have got half a million of dollars if I had been the Commissioner. The hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) knew nothing of my services in connection with the Fishery Commission. Sir A. T. Galt, a credible witness, a gentleman to whom he has referred here in terms so eulogistic, and in which I entirely concur—he had an opportunity of knowing the value of my services, whether they were in reality worth anything or not. Had Mr. Ford, the British agent, an opportunity of knowing whether my services were of any value or not? I think he had. These are the two gentlemen I call as witnesses in contradiction of the statements made by the hon. member for Cumberland. It might be considered egotism on my part, under ordinary circumstances, to make reference to this matter, yet I feel, as a public man, I am justified in refuting these slanders, and in referring to gentlemen who know the falsity of the hon. gentleman's statements. Sir A. T. Galt, on the 24th November, 1877, the day after the Commission closed, in writing to Earl Derby, refers to my services in these terms:—

“In all the proceedings, Mr. Ford has been most ably supported by Mr. Albert J. Smith, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has constantly attended the Commission, as representing the Dominion Government, and of whom it is difficult for me to speak in fitting terms of appreciation.

“As Commissioner, I have had an opportunity of observing the great value of the services of these two gentlemen, and I most respectfully bring them under the notice of Her Majesty's Government.”

This is the testimony of Sir A. T. Galt.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

The hon. gentleman may say that it is of no value, but I do not think that Sir A. T. Galt would make a statement like that unless he believed at all events that there was some foundation for it. Mr. Ford, in making his report to the Government, speaking of me, says:

“But placed, as it has been my good fortune to be during the past six months, in almost daily communication with him I cannot refrain from bringing to your Lordship's notice the great assistance he has rendered me in the discharge of my duties as British agent to the Halifax Commission. To his cordial co-operation in all matters affecting the interest of the two countries, and to his unceasing exertions in the promotion of our cause, I mainly ascribe the success that has attended the enquiry which has just been terminated, and which has been crowned by so gratifying a result.”

Now, there is the testimony of these two gentlemen. One, occupying the position I did, and feeling deeply my responsibility to the country, felt naturally a great anxiety in the success of this case, and I devoted the best talents I possessed to the furtherance of the interests of this country in that connection. I felt it extremely hard, considering that I never had any altercation with the hon. gentleman, that he should have made such a defamatory attack upon me. I felt called upon to advance this testimony here in refutation of the slanderous statements made by the hon. member for Cumberland. I would not be afraid to appeal to the hon. the Minister of Justice also. He was in Halifax during the whole time this enquiry took place. I would not be afraid to appeal to the hon. members from Halifax, who likewise know something of my services, in contradiction of the charge made by the hon. member for Cumberland, if it were necessary to do so. At Moncton, the hon. member for Cumberland told the people that he would look after their interests, and be their friend, and that I had been direlict in my duty to my constituents. It is well-known that Moncton is the great centre of the Intercolonial Railway system, where the machine shops are situated. But how did the hon. gentleman promote the interests of Moncton and the working-man. He dismissed hundreds of employes from the shops at that place. I may also state that the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals seemed to think that it was necessary for him to make

some apparent economy in the expenditure connected with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, because he had accused the late Administration, in its management of that railway, of being extravagant and corrupt, and so he felt it was necessary, apparently at all events, to do something in the direction of economy. He discharged hundreds of men. I do not think there are at this hour one-half the number of men employed at Moncton that there were when the General Elections took place. The hon. gentleman felt it was necessary, in order to exhibit a spirit of economy, to reduce the salaries of the railway employés from one end of the line to the other, even of those employés whose salaries were already too small. At the present time the salaries of the men of that line are much less than they are in almost any other branch of the Civil Service of this Dominion. I would ask why should he strike at the railway employés, why not extend this economy to other officers and employés of the Dominion? Why victimise and sacrifice them alone? I find in the Estimates that in other branches of the Civil Service, the number of employés has, in some cases, been multiplied, and their salaries increased. The hon. gentleman said that since he had charge of that railway it had begun to be profitable to the Government. Well, it is known throughout the whole of that country that the road is running down. From Moncton to Rivière-du-Loup the testimony is universal, showing that the engines are disabled, and that the stock is deteriorating in consequence of this false economy. I may say that some change is absolutely necessary in reference to the management of that railway. But we are told on the other side of the House that we are not to criticise the management of the railway, that to do so is unpatriotic, that we are striking at the best interests of our country, that we are injuring the reputation of the road, and that people will refuse to travel upon it, and therefore that we ought to say nothing about it. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) criticised, yesterday, the land regulations of the North-West, and he was immediately asked from the other side, "What right have you to say anything about this." Your speech will go abroad. It will injure our country, and therefore you

ought to keep silent. Now, coming to the National Policy, I shall be obliged to recall many events that took place years ago in connection with the Confederation—the hon. the Finance Minister's career at the time when he played the part of a false prophet. After the hon. gentleman had attended the Quebec Conference, and agreed on behalf of New Brunswick to accept 80c. a head on the population of 1861, and \$63,000 for ten years, he returned to that Province, and at public meetings he took counsel with the people and advised them to accept these terms. He expressed great amazement that the delegates at that Conference had consented to extend such generous terms to New Brunswick, but I would ask that hon. gentleman now, if the people of New Brunswick at that time had taken his advice where they would have been at this hour? They would have been in a state of hopeless bankruptcy. They have now an income of nearly \$600,000, which is more than twice what it would have been if they had taken his advice. Yet, even now they are in great straits, financially. They are driven to the utmost extremity for money. It may be necessary for me to refer to the fact that the hon. gentleman told us that New Brunswick would become the Birmingham of this whole Dominion, and that the people of that Province would do all the manufacturing for the back country, as he called the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Well, Sir, the people are disappointed. They were led to expect great things, which have not been realised, and, although I trust this Dominion will never be dissolved, yet I believe that if a poll was taken in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the people would pronounce most emphatically against the Union. The hon. gentleman's promises of prosperity have all been falsified. I did not mean to say that the hon. gentleman at that time wilfully deceived the people, but he indulged in that kind of prophetic fancy which he does indulge in when he desires to carry a point. He told us forty times to-night that there was a good time coming, and these are the kind of prophecies and visions he has indulged in throughout his whole political career. The hon. gentleman seems to be, at the present moment, an ardent Protectionist.

I would like to ask when his mind became so intent on this subject. I have said my hon. friend became a Tory from being a Liberal; now I would like him to tell us when he became a Protectionist from being a Free-trader. Until the change of Government, in 1873, we never heard anything about Protection from him. I must refer to a speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, in 1873, which will convict my hon. friend once more of being a false prophet. He says :

"I would like to take you with me in imagination to the time of the expiration of the next ten years, when the Pacific Railway will be built. I believe that there is too much patriotism in this House, and this country, to allow either personal or political considerations to interfere with the prosecution of this national enterprise. I look to the completion of this work with as much confidence as I do upon any profession that has been made by this Parliament during the last five years. We will go to the Pacific. We find that the miners now engaged there are paying 14c. per pound for all goods they consume, and a man must earn \$4 or \$5 a day to make it an object for him to remain. This House can appreciate the effect that will be produced in that far-off Colony when the railway is in full operation, and when the miners can be sustained there at \$1 a day. A very large and rapid influx of population will take place, and the fertile valleys will be settled by industrious agriculturists, who will obtain good and ample compensation for their labour. The produce of their lands will be carried to the seaboard by the Pacific Railway, and a large increase to the revenue of the Dominion will be the result. Let us come a little way east and visit the North-West Territories. With this railway complete through it, a territory than which there is no better on this continent, capable of the highest state of cultivation, three times the size of the State of Illinois, is it not to be expected that such a territory, with the same railway facilities that settlers had twenty-five years ago, will have its population increased so rapidly, that we may soon expect one or two Provinces between Manitoba and the Rocky Mountains, all contributing to the Dominion Treasury. Let us come a little further, with the Canal system completed, and the connections made with the Pacific Railway at the head of Lake Superior, and the settlers of the North-West producing double what they require, the surplus being brought down by the railway, placed on our vessels and sent through our canals. Toronto, the trade of which has doubled within the last five years, will be quadrupled by that trade, and Hamilton and London will be equally favoured; and all this will contribute to the revenue of the Dominion. Let us come further east still, to the Province of Quebec, and look into Montreal. There will be nothing in the world to prevent that city becoming the rival of New York. With reference to the ancient city of

Quebec, with the public spirit shown by her people of late, she would bid fair to come next to Montreal in importance in the Province and double her revenue. Then, coming to my own Province, with, perhaps, limited advantages, compared with Ontario and Quebec, but prepared as we shall be with the aid of the railway, we shall fight hard for our share of the shipping trade. Passing to Nova Scotia, I have no doubt that before the expiration of the ten years, she will have a railway from Cape Breton to the most westerly point of the Province. Halifax will secure her share of trade as the necessary result of the Intercolonial; and this, with the development of her vast mineral resources, may reasonably be expected to enable her also to contribute more largely to the Dominion. With all these influences, may we not expect to derive an income fully able to meet the increased expenditure."

It is a remarkable coincidence that the hon. gentleman should have been Finance Minister in 1873, and now that he is Finance Minister again, and as the hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) said, is the Saviour of his country, that he should have made such a speech. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are dreams of fancy which the hon. the Finance Minister indulged in in 1873. Seven years have passed since then, and what portion of his prophecies have been realised. He would like to tell us, but he cannot tell us. Now, I read this to show his declaration, as clear and distinct as any declaration can be, that in 1873 the hon. member was not a Protectionist, he was a Revenue Tariff man. We have the hon. the Finance Minister speaking there, with all the responsibility of a Finance Minister, telling us that, in view of this increased expenditure, all we have to do is to increase the taxation $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I wonder if the hon. gentleman had then any idea of a Protective policy. I wonder where this idea of Protection first entered his mind; was it at Fred-erickton, while enjoying, as Lieutenant-Governor, *otium cum dignitate*, that he solved the problem? It is a very remarkable coincidence. The hon. gentleman then only advocated a $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase; but, seven years afterwards, he advocates a policy which involves a taxation of 26 per cent. on dutiable goods, and 20 per cent. on free and dutiable importations. It was stated by the hon. member for Cumberland that, during the five years we were in power, we nearly swamped and destroyed the country, by increasing its in-

debtedness. I watched anxiously to see if that statement would be repeated by the hon. the Minister of Finance, but it was not. And I think he is a much better authority than the hon. member for Cumberland. I affirm what the hon. gentleman has practically admitted that the increased expenditure during our Administration, resulted from carrying on public works, the responsibility of which was assumed and undertaken by hon. gentlemen themselves. We find the hon. the Finance Minister himself, in 1873 stating: Here is \$60,000,000 of liability, the hon. gentleman's speeches at that time state, was assumed by their own Government. The Government changed a few months after this. Its obligations were transferred from them to us. It was our duty as far as possible, to carry out these works in good faith, with the resources at our command. In discussing this subject, many important events in the history of the country are recalled. Let us consult the *Debates* of 1871, when the scheme for the entrance of British Columbia into the Confederation was under discussion. What cause did hon. gentlemen, then as now in Opposition, take when this scheme was presented to the House. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and several hon. members then and now in the House, raised their voice against the assumption of this terrible and insane liability of building the Pacific Railway in twelve years. I must, in justification to myself, refer to some observations I made at that time on that subject. It would be interesting for hon. gentlemen, when it is charged that the late Government was responsible for embarrassing this country with an enormous debt in connection with the construction of the Pacific Railway, to read the speeches made at that time. I said, Sir :

"There were two very important considerations—one was that there was a great departure from the principles of the Constitution in the matter of the representation. With regard to the financial aspect, however, he could not but believe that lasting injury would be done to the country by the expenditure to be incurred. The cost of the railway could not be less than \$100,000,000, and it was equivalent to the Imperial Government asking England to embark in an enterprise involving a thousand millions. Was not the matter, therefore, sufficiently grave to merit the most seri-

ous consideration—and he entreated the Government to pause. The faith of the Government was pledged by the resolution to complete the railway within ten years, no matter if the result should be ruin. No verbal reservation could have effect, the written record alone could hold, and the words of the resolution were clear, and if, in two years, the railway was not commenced, British Columbia could appeal to the Imperial Government. They had been told that the expenditure would not burden the people; but could that be believed, and no one would undertake to say that a company would undertake the work as a remunerative scheme, and, therefore, sooner or later, the Government would have to pay every dollar of the expense, and the contractors would want the land as a profit. No one could suppose that even after the road was built, it would pay one-tenth of its working expenses, and how, therefore, could British capitalists be expected to undertake the work. The hon. the Minister of Customs had intimated that if they did not strike quickly they would alienate British Columbia from the enterprise; but was that an element for discussion? No. If such were the case, the matter belonged to the Imperial Government only. Was the House ready to involve the country in so large an increase of debt? That debt was already \$100,000,000, and there were many burdens that would arise from the Intercolonial and other works. The Union Act had provided for the extension of the Court system, and that had only been delayed because of the deficient state of the finances of the Dominion. The cost of the railway could not be named, it might be much greater than the amount named, and yet *coûte que coûte* the country would stand pledged to complete it. He should oppose the measure because it would impose burdens on the people that they were not able to bear, and would involve the country in ruin and disaster."

It is not fair, it is unjust, it is not treating their opponents with fair consideration to charge upon them the responsibility for the indebtedness of this country, as the hon. member for Cumberland has done. This Pacific Railway policy has been an incubus upon the country ever since it was initiated. When we came into power there is no doubt we felt called upon to maintain and support the public faith of the country as far as possible. Hon. gentlemen who composed the late Government opposed this railway scheme at its inception, but, inasmuch as the faith of the country was pledged to its completion within ten or twelve years—though they felt this was absolutely impossible—they considered that to a certain extent it devolved upon them to carry out the Treaty engagements made with British Columbia, as far as they possibly could. But, Sir, what did we do? The

late Premier endeavoured, as far as possible, to get as much information by exploratory and instrumental surveys as would enable us to proceed with the work as far as consistent with the Act of 1874, which declares that we shall not proceed with the work if the result is to increase the burdens of taxation upon the people. The present Government, however, are determined to proceed with this work. The resolution introduced last night, clearly indicated the policy of the Government. There is a general feeling prevalent in the country that the Government should not proceed with the work in the manner proposed. They have let 125 miles in British Columbia, that will cost from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 alone. The Government have a strong power at their back, and can carry any measure they choose; but I warn them that the feeling of the country is hostile to their proceeding with this work to the extent they are doing. There is some excuse for opening up the North-West Territories with railway communication, but to construct a line across the Rocky Mountains is an undertaking the Exchequer of the country cannot bear, and it would deprive other portions of the Dominion of necessary appropriations for public works. Look at the Estimates, and what do we find. New Brunswick is utterly neglected in regard to public works. We are contributing to the expenditure of the Pacific Railway and we get nothing in return. The people of this country ask the Government to pause in their too reckless Railway policy. They ask us to open up the Great North-West coast for the reception of the emigration to the country. But, Sir, is it any benefit to the people of this unsettled portion of the Dominion; is it any benefit to the people of our own Provinces? It is not. I am sorry to say that the exodus of our people from this country is absolutely alarming. What benefit is this Railway policy to the people of the Lower Provinces. It may suit the North-West. It may suit land speculators and lead to an increase of population there, but it will injure the country from which that population migrates. I will undertake to say that one-half of the people who went to Manitoba, last year, were people from the Dominion of Canada. It seems

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

certain, however, that the Government will cross the Rocky Mountains, and they suggest that they have some means of getting \$38,000,000 from emigrants and \$32,000,000 by promissory notes besides, but this is a delusion. I had intended, in connection with the remarks I made, to ask the hon. the Finance Minister when he became a Protectionist? I would like, however, to ask the hon. the first Minister, because I believe he would like to give an answer according to his honest convictions, whether he became a Protectionist until he found that it was absolutely necessary to invoke some agency as a means of defeating the late Government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I can answer that question at once. Sir Alexander Galt announced that the policy of the Government in 1859 was Canada for Canadians; that it was so to adjust the Tariff as to incidentally assist our Canadian industries. That policy, as I said was announced in 1859 and it has been our unvarying policy ever since.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Is it possible that my hon. friend can state to this House and the country that those were his honest convictions in 1859, and that he did not give effect to those convictions until 1878. Why did you not introduce Protection before, if these were your views?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Because the United States by their action relieved us from the necessity of doing so; because we had a market there whether or no.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: The hon. gentleman kept his convictions in abeyance for twenty years. Surely the hon. gentleman must have been recreant to his duty to his country if he felt that the principle of Protection should form the basis of the fiscal policy of the country, to allow those convictions to remain in abeyance for so long a time. The hon. gentleman has changed his policy. We are told by the hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) that Sir Alexander Galt is one of the greatest financiers that ever lived, that he is a heaven-born financier, and he further says that the hon. the Minister of Finance was perfectly justified in consulting Sir Alexander Galt with regard to the fiscal policy of the country.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I cannot permit the hon. gentleman to put a statement in my mouth that has no foundation in fact. I made no such statement as that which the hon. gentleman is now attributing to me.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Did not the hon. gentleman say that the hon. the Finance Minister acted wisely in consulting Sir Alexander Galt?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: In answer to the taunt that the hon. the Minister of Finance had consulted Sir Alexander Galt, I said that it would have been well for the country if the late Finance Minister had done so. I did not say that the present hon. Finance Minister had done so. I give the hon. gentleman's statement a flat denial. I say that what he has just stated on this point is entirely unfounded in fact. There is a record of what takes place here. I will refer to the Reporters' notes and I say he will search in vain to find a single note to substantiate his statement.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Does the hon. gentleman say that the hon. the Minister of Finance did not consult Sir Alexander T. Galt? It is not of much consequence what he said. It does not reflect upon the hon. the Finance Minister; it is no reflection upon him at all; the hon. the Minister of Railways says "the late Finance Minister is a king of deficits, and no man is fit to be Finance Minister who does not avoid deficits." I think he reflects on the hon. the First Minister when he says this.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I did not say so.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: You did say so.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I did not.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: You said he was king of deficits, and that—

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I did not make the assertion that no man was fit to be a Finance Minister who accumulated deficits. What I did was merely to quote the statement, to that effect, made by the late Finance Minister himself.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Did not every member of this House understand the hon. gentleman to say "that any Finance Minister who could not balance

the receipts and expenditures was unfit for his position."

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I quoted the late Finance Minister's assertion to that effect.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Very well, let us go on. Now, we find that for each of the six years from 1858, there was a large deficit; and I do not think the hon. the First Minister, who was at the head of the Government at that time, should be reflected upon by his colleague. I do not think he should be rebuked by the hon. member for Cumberland for these deficits. Deficits may occur in spite of the best financing efforts. The tide of depression had set in; the volume of trade could not be increased. Two and a-half per cent. was added to the taxation of the country, and that gave a higher revenue. Sir Alexander Galt, who was the Finance Minister at that time, declared himself entirely opposed to a fiscal policy such as we have now. Last year we had a deficit; the hon. the Finance Minister was not at fault. Not at all. This year he acknowledges a deficit of \$500,000; but I believe the result will show a deficit of upwards of \$2,000,000. Surely, then, the hon. the Minister of Railways will not allow the present Finance Minister to remain where he is. He had everything in his favour; he put on the duties just as he wanted, and, therefore, there is no excuse for his having a deficit. But he will have a deficit, increasing year after year; because, if he puts duties on manufactures he cannot have them imported, and, therefore, he must lose the revenue. Now, the people are weighed down with \$7,000,000 of additional taxes. I think, however, the hon. the Finance Minister will never receive such money as he expects; the people will have to pay it, but it will not come into the Treasury. We are informed that prosperity reigns everwhere; he informed us that St. John was prosperous. Why, there never was such depression there as exists now. What did the hon. gentleman say last December? It cannot be much changed now. He was received with great *éclat*, surrounded by a great many friends; he went to Fredericton, and had a good time there; he made a great many visits; but he did not visit Mr. Gibson who employs about 3,000 hands, and is one of the largest

manufacturers in our country. Did he visit any of the timber mills? Are not they entitled to Protection and consideration? I should think so. The hon. member behind him will think so, having regard to the various articles affected that are current in that business.

AN HON. GENTLEMAN: Give any of the articles that are raised.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I could not stop to enumerate them; the average duty is 20 per cent.; whereas, before, it was 12½ only.

AN HON. MEMBER: I have asked the hon. gentleman to give the articles used by lumbermen that have been increased.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Cottons, woollens, pork, iron, and everything in fact. I say that the lumbering interest is an important interest, and the labouring population engaged in lumbering should not be ignored. Why did he not take counsel with the lumbering community, and the farmer of the country? Why should we look to any particular interest? Did he go to the rolling mills, at St. John, when he visited that place? The hon. member for King's knew where it was. There is one fact I would like to refer to, that is, that according to the speeches of hon. members opposite, and particularly the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance, we are to come to the conclusion that we had no manufactures in this country before; that they have all sprung up through the agency of the National Policy. Now, I would ask whether, five years ago, we had not more men engaged in manufacturing than we have now? Why, according to his own statement, they were rolling up surpluses in those times; depression and scarcity of labour was unknown; the country was happy and prosperous under their rule. Now, Sir, what kind of a fiscal policy had they then? Just the same as we had during our five years' Administration, except that we increased the duties by 2½ per cent. How then does the hon. gentleman show that we cannot find prosperity except by the adoption of this new fiscal policy of theirs? They say they prospered before, under the old Tariff of 15 per cent., which we raised to 17½ per cent. I could read, Sir, a speech made, in 1874, by the hon. member for Cumberland, in which he said the farmers

of this country were as prosperous as any in the world, and that under a Revenue Tariff. He seemed on the question of the tea interest to think this policy had been doing a great deal for the shipping interest. I say it is doing nothing. It is impossible to foster the direct importation from China and Japan; and the policy operates injuriously. The small tradesmen of the country ought to have a chance as well as the large traders in Montreal and Toronto. The people of New Brunswick have little trade with Ontario. Why not allow them then to buy in Boston or New York? Now, Sir, the sugar business, what about that? The hon. the Minister of Finance said a good deal of sugar is imported by the River St. Lawrence. How many vessel loads come up to Montreal? If he has got information I would be very much pleased to receive it, because I think there is a very small quantity. But suppose it does, what benefit is that to our ship-owners—we have no monopoly. Foreign vessels can enter into the trade as well as our own. The effect of the legislation on the sugar duties is to transfer the trade from one Canadian city to another. We have a return showing the importation of sugar into Canada during the last six months from which I find that the amount received in Ontario, in the last six months of 1879, was 32,617,000lb., and for the corresponding six months of 1880, ending January, 9,685,000lb. Sugar is not imported into Ontario to the same extent. Then coming to Quebec, we see the result of the duties there; the importation for the last six months of 1879 were 19,000,000lb., and for the six months of this year, ending January, 46,000,000lb. In Nova Scotia, it has increased from 5,000,000lb. last year to 14,000,000lb. this year; and in New Brunswick there was a decrease from 3,000,000lb. last year to 2,200,000lb. this year. So the effect has been to change the current of the trade from one Province to the other, and that is all. With regard to our shipping interest, which I think I know something about, I believe it does not derive any benefit from the National Policy on the article of sugar. Whether sugar is refined in this Dominion or the United States is of little consequence I believe it was much better

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

under the previous system so far as the shipping interest of the country is concerned with the United States. Our vessels take sugar from Cuba and the West Indies to the United States; most of them are engaged in that trade. We build vessels thus to do the carrying trade of our own and that country. A large portion of the trade of the United States is done in British bottoms. We are told that as regards St. John, N. B., the effect of the change in the sugar duty has been to increase its shipping business. I suppose the hon. the Finance Minister thought he was supported by authority in that statement, but he was entirely in error. I have learned that in the months of January, February, and March, not one single vessel cleared from St. John to the West Indies, although the hon. gentleman states that that port has never done so much business before. My hon. friend informs me that only one vessel cleared from the West Indies to St. John, while during that time six English vessels engaged in the trade with the West Indies cleared from West Indies to New York. This shows conclusively the change is of no benefit to our shipping. There may be half-a-dozen small vessels in Halifax which take away cargoes of fish and shooks to the West Indies and bring back sugar, but the greatest portion of sugar comes now to Halifax. Merchants then telegraph to Montreal to see if they can send it there, and if no orders are received they despatch it to New York. A great deal of sugar goes from Halifax to New York, much more than to Montreal. It has been stated by the hon. the Finance Minister that the people did not pay any more for their sugar than before, that, in fact, it is cheaper at present. He said that the kind of sugar that can be used by the common people, and the grades above that, were even cheaper than ever. If that be true, why did the refiners want this present Tariff, and why unless it were beneficial to them. It is stated the Red-paths make from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000 a year by it. Has any hon. gentleman been authorised to deny that statement. None so far as I know. The hon. gentleman has referred to the elections in the Dominion since the present Government took office, and claims as a compliment to it a few iso-

lated cases. He seems to ignore entirely the elections in Ontario, and to think that they had no significance whatever. The greater Province, Ontario, has reversed this National Policy. Did not the hon. the Finance Minister go to the Ontario constituencies before the last Provincial Elections and tell the people that if they supported the Mowat Government that there would be a practical reversal of the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government. He told them so in so many words, as did also the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. the First Minister also visited that Province and endeavoured to enforce his policy upon the people, saying that the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government was imperilled if they sustained Mr. Mowat. That was the key-note this Government sounded. I could refer to many other matters in reference to the hon. the Finance Minister so far as New Brunswick is concerned, and the course he has taken since he entered Parliament. He must know that it would be impossible for him to be re-elected for St. John; the people of New Brunswick are adverse to his policy. I will undertake to prophesy that he will never run an election in St. John again. The power will pass from the hands of these Ministers as surely as the sun sets in the west, at the first chance the people have. Ministers think the people are with them, as do some of their followers on the back benches, but I would like to see the question tried, and, as the Finance Minister and other speakers on the other side have said that our manufactures have not increased as rapidly as they would have done, inasmuch as uncertainty exists in the public mind as to whether the present policy would be permanent, and there may be something in that view, would it not be in the interest of the country to try the question before the people; then, if sustained, the present policy would be considered permanent. It seems proper and wise that we should have an election now, but I think the hon. the first Minister has no desire for it. He knows better. He knows that he would be beaten. The hon. the Finance Minister seems to think that my re-election in my county would not be certain. I would like to try the question, practically with him. He says the sugar

refinery, established in Moncton, is going to destroy my popularity.

AN HON. MEMBER: It will employ twenty-three men.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Yes. That small benefit would upset and overturn me in my county, he thinks; but I would not be afraid to try the issue with him or anybody else. I repeat that this is inimical to the best interests of the country and, that the people, particularly of New Brunswick, are against it. There is no emigration from our country every day. I do not mean to say that it is altogether due to the National Policy, for I know that would not be fair; but we will say that if the people would accept this policy they would be able to remain in this country—that anybody and everybody would be employed—that there would be ample work for all. To show the depression it has caused in St. John, I may refer to the reception given to the hon. the Finance Minister in December last, and I do not think any change has taken place since. I think he was a little unfair in his introductory speech, in claiming that the temperance ovation given to him, was of a political character, and in his utilising that compliment for the purpose of showing that the people of St. John approved of his policy. I believe the ovation was given in his honour as a temperance man, and that the gentleman that presided was not a supporter, but an opponent of the National Policy. I think I can show the hon. gentleman his mistake in saying that prosperity exists in St. John in full measure. There was at this dinner a friend of the hon. gentleman who is now, I am glad to say, a Senator (Hon. Mr. Boyd), who made a speech on that occasion, in which he said:

“He knew that Sir Leonard sympathised with the misfortunes of St. John, the city which had been his home, and where his property was. When he came to it this last time; he spoke to him of the dullness of business here, and the necessity of giving us all the help he could; when he replied—almost with tears in his eyes—that he was prepared to do what he could reasonably for the city, and the Government was willing to carry out what could be done for our benefit. (Cheers.) He referred to the stories which had been spread of his having quarrelled with Sir Leonard but affirmed that none of them were true. It was nearly thirty years since he first had the

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

honour of Mr. Tilley's acquaintance, and he had never had an unpleasant word with him. A truer friend or a better man he had never met, and he hoped his right arm would wither, and his tongue be palsied before he uttered the first word against him. He, like all other good citizens, was greatly concerned for the prosperity of St. John. (He trusted that, whatever our political differences might have been in the past, we would forget them until our city is built up, and be neither Liberals nor Tories, but St. John men. If we do this, we may yet see great results; we shall see a line of steamers to Europe, and to the West Indies; docks, wet and dry; warehouses, and many other things. They would find that, if Sir Leonard made promises, he would keep them. They might say of him, as was said of a Mexican dollar, the more you rub him the brighter he gets. (Cheers.)”

Does the hon. the Finance Minister recollect that he exhibited so much emotion that the tears started from his eyes at a description of the great distress prevailing in St. John. Mr. Boyd uttering these sentiments should at least become a Senator, and he has since become a Senator, and I have no doubt whatever that he will make a good one. He said: “There is great distress in St. John, in which the hon. the Finance Minister deeply sympathised.” Mr. Boyd then promised that the people of that city should have docks, wet and dry, and a line of steamers to Europe and the West Indies. I see as yet no provision made for any of these enterprises. Therefore, I presume that Mr. Boyd was mistaken. I feel that I have sufficiently shown that the hon. the Finance Minister is a false prophet—that he is as unreliable in his principles and prophecies now that he is a Tory as he was when he was a Liberal.

MR. TASSÉ: Mr. Speaker, having submitted at some length my views on the merits of the National Policy, when it was considered and carried by Parliament, at its last Session, in obedience to the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the people, I do not intend to go over the same ground on the present occasion, especially after the very eloquent and exhaustive addresses in favour of that policy, in which I am now an humble but as firm a believer as ever I was in former days. I do not pretend to be able to throw much additional light on this important matter, which has been already treated by some of the ablest members on both sides of the House; I wish, however, to devote my

attention to some particular points which have been slightly discussed, and take exception to a few statements made by hon. members of the Opposition. As many references have been made, since the beginning of this Session, to the city which I have the honour to represent—specially by some hon. members of the Opposition, who have manifested a deep but fresh interest in the welfare of my constituents, for which, no doubt, they will feel grateful, I will, at the outset, as in duty bound, take up that point which is the most entitled to my immediate consideration. Sir, in his extreme desire to undervalue the beneficial effects of Protection on the country, the hon. leader of the Left stated, in his speech on the Address, that it was admitted even by Government papers that there was an unusual amount of distress in the city of Ottawa. In the first place, I do not know of a single Conservative paper which has admitted that there was an unusual amount of distress in this city; and, in the second place, I deny that the statement of the hon. gentleman is well founded. Furthermore, I contend that the distress which may now exist to a certain extent is far from being as wide spread as that which prevailed during the last two or three years of the previous Administration. The maintenance of a soup kitchen in our midst has been advanced as an argument against the National Policy, but hon. gentlemen opposite should not forget that that noble institution—the soup kitchen—is but a legacy of their own Government, that it was implanted in Ottawa during the late Government, that it flourished not only here, but in various cities of the Dominion in the same ratio that our most useful and important industries were then decaying and falling down one after the other. But, Sir, my hon. friends need not feel uneasy on this point, for another winter will most probably prove that owing to the revival of trade, the usefulness of the soup kitchen has gone. It is true that an assemblage of unemployed workingmen—which has been so often referred to on the other side of the House—took place a few weeks ago, but it could not be denied that it was far from being as large as the one which paid a visit to my hon. friend in the winter of 1877, and which, I dare say,

he has not yet forgotten. I could not give a better or more authoritative illustration of the distress that prevailed in Ottawa during the Administration of the hon. gentleman than by quoting a short extract from a speech delivered by the Liberal candidate, Mr. C. W. Bangs, one of my opponents during the last elections:—

“Last winter he (the Mayor) had gone to Mr. Mackenzie and laid before him the condition of the poor people of the city. Mr. Mackenzie replied that he would do all he could to assist the city, and had it not been for this he did not know what they would have done. Every morning, when he came down to the City Hall, he found from twenty to one hundred men seeking assistance—men who were willing to work, but who had families starving at home. Some of the men were not able to earn 25c. per day, but still he sent them up to Mr. Henderson, the superintendent of works. Mr. Henderson would come down and say: ‘Don’t send another crowd that can’t do anything.’ He replied: ‘These men are starving and may as well be supported by the Government as by the city.’”

Such was the glowing, the brilliant condition of things in Ottawa during the Mackenzie Government. Well, Sir, after such a statement uttered by a Liberal candidate—and which gives but a very imperfect idea, a very imperfect picture of the misery then desolating the capital, the House will easily perceive how little foundation there is in the assertion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition that there is an unusual amount of distress in the city of Ottawa. I will come now to another point which concerns to a very great extent my constituents, which concerns also to a great extent the inhabitants of the Ottawa Valley, nay, of the whole country. One of the main objections raised against the National Policy when it was at first propounded in this House; one of the main objections raised against the National Policy in the press and on the hustings, in the last political campaign; and one of the main objections raised against that policy in the last Session was, that a Protective Tariff would destroy, would ruin our lumber trade. That industry being one of the largest, if not the largest industry of the Dominion; that industry being the foremost industry of the Ottawa Valley, that industry employing every year 50,000 people, and involving as it does many millions of capital, such an objection, if sound, would have been calculated to impress unfavour-

ably the public mind against the National Policy; but the people, thanks to their good sense, and not owing to their ignorance, as it was contended by the hon. member for Centre Huron, did not believe that such an objection was well grounded; they had no confidence in the men by whom it was urged; they thought that the lumber trade could not be more prostrated, as every other industry, than it was during the Reform Administration, and they gave their warm adhesion to the National Policy, almost every constituency of the Ottawa region returning Conservative members, by large majorities—the vast county of Ottawa alone giving a well-deserved majority of 1624 votes to its worthy member. In this connection, it will not be without interest to read the following declaration, made last Session by the hon. member for Centre Huron—who is supposed to be the financial light of the Opposition—in his second speech on the Tariff:—

“We are to have all the trade and business of the country revolutionised; we are to have, to take but one illustration alone, the lumber interest of this country, employing from 45,000 to 50,000 men, with their families depending on them; we are to have this interest put in the greatest peril, because it is impossible to conceal from the House that the imposition of a further burden of 30c., or 40c., or 50c. per thousand on the manufacture of lumber will go very far to give that great industry its death blow for the time being. They can understand, from that illustration alone, how exceedingly trifling all the benefits which are proposed to be secured under this Tariff are, compared with the enormous mischief which will result from its operation. Which is true of the fishing interest and of the transportation interests, and as the agriculturists will find true of their own interests also.”

In fact, every interest in the land, including the lumber interest, was going to suffer most severely—was to receive its death blow. Well, Sir, what has been the result of the mournful prediction of that hon. gentleman, who seems determined to emulate that famous Trojan prophetic Cassandra, who had nothing but the most gloomy things to predict for her country? Let me hasten to say that it is yet as unfulfilled as many other lugubrious predictions emanating from the same source. This fact is not surprising, for that hon. gentleman has not been a success so far in the prophetic vocation—indeed he has reaped more laurels as a maker of deficits, as a

mixer and muddler of figures, to employ the language of the *Globe*. No one has forgotten that the hon. member for Centre Huron puzzled, once, every member of this House when he stated, in one part of his speech, that Protection would enrich a few manufacturers at the expense of the working class, whilst, in another part of the same speech, he asserted that Protection would produce such a home competition that it would ruin the manufacturers themselves. To come back to the lumber trade, I am happy to say that, far from being ruined, far from being annihilated, far from receiving its “death blow for the time being”—to use the very word of that hon. gentleman, the lumber trade has received, within the last year, an immense impulse—an impetus unparalleled for many years. Far from receiving their death blow, lumbermen have considerably enlarged their operations, have increased the number of their woodmen, have employed them at higher wages, and have vastly increased their consumption of agricultural products, for which they offer an immediate and most advantageous market. Far from receiving its death blow, the demand for lumber has been such that for the first time it had to be shipped on rails from Ottawa, and that not only are the immense piles accumulated for years around the Chaudiere already sold, but that an enormous quantity of lumber, which still lies in the forest, has been contracted for at the highest prices ever offered in Canada. Far from receiving its death blow, the transportation traffic connected with the lumber trade will be greatly revived, and we shall see, as soon as navigation opens, a large fleet of steamers and boats carrying the products of that industry to a foreign destination, whilst many of our railways will be fully occupied, as they are now, for the same purpose, at profitable rates. Far from receiving its death blow, there will be an unusual activity in a few weeks around our magnificent falls; the “hum” will resound once more agreeably to our ears, and my hon. friends opposite shall hear it, if our legislative duties are not concluded at the beginning of May; mills which had been silent for years will be reopened, and others which had worked during the day only will be then in full blast day and

night—a state of things which we had not the gratification to witness during the five long years of the late Administration. In fact the only death-blow that will be inflicted anywhere, will not be inflicted on the lumber trade, but on the unpatriotic operations of the party which to-day dare to rise their powerless voice against the almost unanimous wish of the nation. In reviewing some speeches delivered last year by hon. gentlemen opposite, I noticed that the hon. member for South Brant laid then great stress on the fact that bank stocks had greatly fallen from the 17th September, 1878—a date inscribed in black letters in the Reform day-book—up to last Session. Of course the National Policy was made responsible for that falling off, although it then existed but on paper, in the resolutions submitted to the House by the Government. It is obvious that a comparison made at such a time, when the previous Tariff was in existence, was most unfair, and that it was necessary to wait a few months at least to ascertain its probable effect on the monetary institutions of the country. This Session, it seems, would have been a more fitting opportunity—although a longer experience is undoubtedly required to judge such effects with some accuracy—to institute a comparison between the actual quotations of stock banks, and the quotations existing at the very time when the National Policy became the law of the land. Our opponents having failed to compare those figures on that basis—the only fair basis that could be adopted to ascertain the influence of the National Policy in that respect, I will supply the comparison which will establish the healthier condition of the banks, and the greater confidence enjoyed on them by the public since the present Tariff has been in operation. I will give the quotations of the previous week compared to those of the corresponding week for 1879—such as they appear in a late issue of the *Shareholder*:

	25th March. 1879.	25th March. 1880.
Bank of Montreal..	139½	141½
Merchant's Bank...	81	95½
Canadian Bank of Commerce.....	103	119
Bank of Toronto....	115	130
Ontario Bank.....	62	78
Banque du Peuple..	49½	69

	25th March. 1879.	25th March. 1880.
Bank British North America.....		
Molson's Bank.....	74½	80½
Deminion Bank....		118
Federal Bank.....	100	105
Hamilton Bank....		102
Banque Jacques Car- tier.....	33½	70½
Quebec Bank.....		
Banque Nationale..		
Eastern Townships' Bank.....	68½	99½
Union Bank.....	54	68½
Consolidated Bank..	46½	
Exchange Bank....	53	45

I may add that not only have most of the bank securities advanced notably, but also that many of the stocks of other public institutions or companies have risen in the same proportion: a result which fully indicates that the tide of prosperity has fully set in. In fact, every stock is going up, is advancing, except the political stock of the hon. gentlemen opposite, which seems to be more depressed than ever. In this connection I may observe that the hon. member for West Durham almost said the other night that the success of the Liberals in England was an indication of the triumph of his party in a near future. But I will take the liberty to advise the hon. gentleman not to be over-exultant on that account, for by a strange coincidence Liberals have only succeeded in securing power since Confederation—and this event has not been too often repeated for our common sake—when a Conservative Government was presiding over the destinies of Great Britain. We have learned from the speeches of the Opposition that there was a great reaction in the country against the National Policy, that the people generally were already disgusted with it, and that the “passing craze”—to use the language of the *Globe*—“which led the Provinces to vote directly against their interest, is already over.” And when we have called for a substantial evidence of that so-called reaction, we have received the uniform reply: “How can you entertain any doubt about it, when the last local elections of Ontario—a Province which gave at first such a warm support to the National Policy—have been so favourable to the Liberal party.” To make good such an argument, our opponents should prove that the National Policy, and not pro-

vincial matters, was truly the main point at issue. But they have failed, utterly failed to establish that fact. Some of our Conservative leaders, some of the Conservative papers offered them, I am aware, to fight the electoral battle on that score, but they refused to take up the gauntlet thus thrown to them. The speeches of the Ontario First Minister, the Hon. Mr. Mowat, and the articles of the *Globe*, the *Hamilton Times*, and other leading Liberal papers which were quoted the other day by the hon. member for Hamilton, fully demonstrate that they refused to engage in the contest on that ground; and they were for once wise men in their generation, for they knew perfectly well that the verdict rendered a few months previous would remain unchanged; that an intelligent people like the people of Ontario would not stultify themselves by condemning, after a short interval, a policy which was then but in embryo, which has just been voted by Parliament, which had not even a month's trial, and which they had approved by an overwhelming majority, after the most mature deliberation ever given to any public question at the polls. If the National Policy has influenced, to a small extent, the last elections of Ontario, there is one question which, I am sorry to state, had much to do with them on the Liberal side, a question which the leaders of that party would not dare to introduce in this House. I had been led to believe, Mr. Speaker, by the public utterances of the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the days had passed when my fellow-countrymen would be traduced, and sneered at by his party. In fact, not very long ago, I had the pleasure to read some very graceful compliments paid to my race by that hon. gentleman, in a speech delivered in Scotland the land of his birth, where he received such a gratifying welcome—and I was under the impression that his party would cease to stir up the national prejudices of one portion of the people against the other; that the bugbear of French domination, for instance, of which we heard so much in the past, which had been worked up so unfairly, and so unscrupulously, to the prejudice of our Conservative allies in Ontario, was used up, and would never be invoked again, even for electoral purposes. But, Sir, that was but a delusion, which recent events

have entirely dispelled. In the absence of better argument, in their desperation, in their thirst for power, the Liberal party resuscitated that very bugbear of French domination, to speculate on the worst prejudices of the people; and, I regret to say, it met with an ill-deserved success in some quarters. To remove any doubt on this point, I will quote a few extracts from different issues of the *Globe*, which will simply suffice to illustrate the unfair measures resorted to by the Liberal party, to delude the electoral body of Ontario. The *Globe* said, on the 24th May, 1879:

“When Ontario joined the Confederation, her supposition was, by doing so, she had escaped from Lower Canadian domination. The present subservience of the Government to Quebec Conservatives throws a doubt on this and on our future position, and brings up the whole subject again.”

In another article, on the same day:

“The Tories follow the lead of their precious chieftain and would put Ontario, which Province they know they cannot either cheat or control, back again under the rule of the Frenchmen, whom Sir John can humbug and swindle if he cannot control.”

On the 26th May:

“The people will show by their votes, on the 5th of June, that this Province is not to be tamely cheated of its due, either because Sir John A. Macdonald is again under the thumb of his Quebec followers, or because he longs for fat things to present to the hungry office-seekers who have yet to be rewarded from the plunder acquired by the late elections.”

In another article, published on the following day, and written in that same liberal-minded spirit, the French supporters of the Government are styled, in that felicitous, in that delicate language peculiar to the *Globe*, “the French tail of Sir John A. Macdonald.” Well, Sir, if we are but a tail, we have at least the consolation of being the tail of an illustrious statesman, who but recently enjoyed the unprecedented honour, for a colonist, to be admitted into the Privy Council of Her Majesty the Queen. We have at least the consolation of knowing that our tail is longer than the whole—I will not say tail,—but the whole following of Mr. George Brown in this House, which has been rather shortened by the last elections. And we have this further consolation of knowing that the so-called French tail of this Government would never have sub-

mitted themselves to the humiliating treatment which our predecessors had to experience under the iron rule of the hon. member for Lambton. Sir, that spirit of antipathy to our race is so manifest in the *Globe*—that great power behind the Throne—that this Government can hardly decide upon a single French appointment without it should be criticised and objected to on that single ground—without it should exclaim: “Another Frenchman appointed!” I believe that even the number of charwomen, who happen to be of French origin, is instanced as a strong evidence of that terrible, that threatening French domination. Of course, those attacks of the *Globe* appear during the recess, when they are supposed not to attract the attention of the members of this House, but as I presume that the hon. member for Quebec East—the gallant leader of the gallant little French band opposite—is a constant reader of the *Globe*, it would be interesting to hear what he thinks of the course thus followed by the leading organ of his party. This crusade against French appointments is as unjust as unwarranted, when it is well-known that this Government is only treating us with that spirit of fairness which they strive to display towards every class, every creed, every nationality in this country; when it is well-known to those, at any rate, who are aware of the facts, that the French people, far from receiving the lion’s share, as it is sometimes falsely contended, do not even obtain in the whole distribution of patronage the share to which they are strictly entitled by their numbers; when it is well-known that in the French speaking Province of Quebec, our people, with that spirit of generosity so characteristic of them, and which should be imitated in other Provinces—give to their fellow-citizens of other origins a larger share of patronage than the latter could justly claim. Sir, it is sometimes a matter of wonder to many Liberals that their party is not more popular, is not better appreciated by the French speaking element of this country, that they are losing election after election in the Province of Quebec—whenever the people have an opportunity to record their votes against them; but in the face of such insults, in face of the hostile attitude of the *Globe*—it only surprises me that

French Canadians in this House—few as they are—or outside of this House, should be found so forgetful of their sense of dignity, so forgetful of their duty towards their race, that they could devote their talent, their energy, to the advancement of a party which strives to inflame, to our injury, the worst prejudices of the people, which strives to array Province against Province—Ontario against Quebec—one class of the community against the other—Englishmen against Frenchmen—and which strives to disunite instead of binding by the strongest possible ties, as it should be the strong aim, the strong desire of every true lover of our country, the heterogeneous, but most valuable element which constitute our Canadian population. As I stated, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal members of the House have exhibited a peculiar delight—and it may be a legitimate one—for they have very few causes of comfort at the present juncture—in extolling the last elections of Ontario as a proof of a wonderful reaction against the National Policy. This proof, however, cannot be held as very conclusive when we know that, in all the partial federal elections held since 1878, and they have been many—they have not been able to redeem a single constituency—nay, they have lost three seats: East Hastings, Argenteuil and Charlevoix. In endeavouring to make that point, they only forget that they give another striking evidence of their inconsistency. Have they forgotten, have the hon. members of the House forgotten, that when the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries mentioned last year, during the debate on the Tariff, the result of the local election of Prince Edward Island as a further indication of the popularity of the National Policy—which had been greatly discussed during the campaign—the hon. member for Lambton rose indignantly from his seat and rebuked, in the severest terms, that hon. gentleman for having introduced provincial matters, which, in his opinion, were entirely irrelevant to the debate. As my hon. friends opposite seem to have lost sight of that incident, I will read from the *Hansard* what occurred on that interesting occasion.

“Mr. Pope, (Queen’s, P.E.I.), said he did not wish to make a speech, but he had a little

intelligence to announce to the leader of the Opposition and his friends, who had endeavoured to convince the House and the country that the people of the Maritime Provinces would be injured, and the Province of Prince Edward Island destroyed, by the Tariff. The local elections had just been held, the National Policy being of course the greatest question discussed. It was said the country was to be ruined on account of the heavy taxes imposed by the Conservative Government, at Ottawa; however, he was happy to say that the Local Conservative Government, who supported the National Policy, was returned by twenty-five against five.

"Mr. Mackenzie said it was the first time he ever heard a Cabinet Minister make such an announcement. If the hon. gentleman had no more sense of the dignity of his own position he might, at least, have some respect for the Cabinet of which he was a member."

It can easily be surmised that such an announcement was far from being agreeable, far from being cheering to the hon. member for Lambton, and that on the spur of the moment he uttered harsh words, which he probably regrets now. Nevertheless, if it be true that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—to use the very same language of that hon. gentleman—exhibited by this announcement, an utter lack of respect for the dignity of his position, what shall we say of the hon. leader of the Opposition, what shall we say of his hon. followers, who have been sinning in the same manner, and on a much enlarged scale, since the commencement of the debate, in connection with the local elections of Ontario, contradicting themselves in a manner that should amaze every member of this House. We have heard it stated by some hon. gentlemen opposite that even the manufacturers were dissatisfied with the National Policy—that very policy which, according to them, had been concocted in their sole interest, to the detriment of the mass of the people—as if the interest of the manufacturers could be diametrically opposed to the interest of the nation of which they form a most important element. The hon. member for West Elgin has specially devoted himself to that task, employing for that purpose a process of fabrication which, I regret to say, is not altogether unfamiliar to the opponents of the present Tariff. But, Sir, if ever a statement made by a member of this House has been demolished by an avalanche of the most crushing evidence that could be brought against it, it was the statement which the hon. mem-

ber for West Elgin made, it is reported, under the responsibility of a certain Reform club. The visits which the hon. the Minister of Finance has taken the trouble to pay to many of the most important manufactories of Canada, and for which he deserves the warmest praises of the country, has fully established to every unprejudiced mind that the condition of the manufacturers has been greatly improved to their own benefit and to the benefit of the working classes. And the public returns which have been submitted to the House fully demonstrate also that the productive powers of the Dominion have been vastly developed—a fact fully corroborated by a considerable reduction of our imports of foreign fabrics—a reduction which has operated specially to the prejudice of the American producer, who, but for that wise policy, would have secured an almost absolute control of the Canadian market. Sir, a meeting of the manufacturers of Ontario took place not very long ago at Toronto, and not a dissentient voice was heard against the National Policy. Far from it, every one present—and amongst them were life-long Reformers—manifested his warm approval of the present Tariff. In a long speech on the effects of the National Policy, the President, Mr. E. Guerne, jun., uttered the following words, which I will read from a report published in the *Globe*:

"The Tilley tariff is the boldest piece of commercial legislation that was ever instituted in Canada. He had confidence to predict for all classes of industry a course of prosperity equal to the hopes of the most sanguine supporters of that measure. Already a most decided improvement had taken place, and the results of the next twelve months will be of such a pronounced benefit as to make it extremely hazardous for a leader to bring forward a measure proposing its repeal."

Let me now draw the attention of the House to the very important declaration made by Mr. W. H. Howland—a gentleman well-known as a Liberal and as a man thoroughly versed in commercial affairs. I am again quoting from the report of the *Globe*:

"Mr. Howland said that in the face of the great change in the financial affairs of the country since the last meeting of the association, he desired to move a resolution. In looking back over the past they could all see how black a time they had passed through, and how many were upon the verge of ruin. He did

not think that they realised at the time the blackness of the commercial interests of the country. If times had continued in the condition they were in at one time, all the industries of the country would have been closed. (Hear, hear.) He thought they had every reason to be thankful for the great change that came about. The National Policy had been tried. The country sympathised with the policy, which had been, to a great extent, the cause of the return to prosperity. The advance had been gradual, and he felt confident to say that within twelve months the advance would be such that they would be on a sounder basis than before. He could say with confidence that all the people wanted was reasonable Protection, and that they never intended to make unreasonable demands. Hereafter if the demands were moderate, and expansion was not attempted too rapidly, on on too great a scale, he thought those present would see, before many years had passed, the Dominion of Canada one of the leading productive countries of the world. (Hear hear.) He was a Liberal, and, as an old Liberal, he was looking forward hopefully to the time when the leaders of his old party would become convinced that the present National Policy was beneficial to the Dominion, and would change their views, whereby it would enable their old friends to join again under the old banner. It was his firm belief in the good that had resulted from Protection that inspired him to move the following Resolution: 'Resolved, that this association desires to express its general approval of the Tariff legislation of the last Session of the Dominion Parliament, which, it is evident, has in a large measure helped to bring about the marked commercial improvement and financial confidence now existing in this country.'—The Resolution was carried unanimously."

Hon. gentlemen opposite may now proclaim, if they dare to do it, that even the manufacturers are dissatisfied with the National Policy. In the speech which I have just quoted, Mr. Howland expresses a strong confidence that the National Policy will work so well that all parties will ultimately give their assent to its principle, and that old Liberals like him will thus have an opportunity to join their old friends under the same banner—an act which, at best, I may observe, would not be very grateful towards the promoters of that policy. Well, Sir, such also is my confidence in the National Policy that I do expect to see a similar result; that I do expect to see the day when Liberals as well as Conservatives—when the whole country will be so much satisfied with the effects of the National Policy—that that question, having been solved for many years to come on the basis which we now advocate, will cease to be the main dividing

line between our two great parties, to be replaced, perhaps, by such nice political problems as the representation of minorities—I quite understand that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite should be anxious to increase the minority at the present moment,—such as the compulsory vote in order that the Liberals should give to the country a fair idea of their views on the freedom of the subject—and other political problems—not including the photographing of criminals, which was recently unveiled to our admiration;—problems delineated for our future consideration in that celebrated oration at Aurora, which the hon. member for West Durham called himself a "disturbing speech," perhaps an imprudent speech"—a speech, at any rate, full of discussions, which, according to the *Globe*, "must be classed rather with the recreations of leisure hours than with the graver efforts and more earnest work of high and practical statesmanship." Supposing that such a change should occur in the mind of the leader of the Opposition in connection with the present Tariff, it would be an easy one, and would be less amazing than his contemplated change on the Pacific Railway enterprise—for the day is not very far distant when that hon. gentleman, notwithstanding his Free-trade proclivities, opposed a reduction of a Tariff of 20 per cent. to 15—this was in 1866—and when he asserted in a later speech, at Hamilton, that the duties could not fail to be increased, on account of our increased obligations, and that they should be levied in such a manner as to favour the home industries—the very principle which we have successfully carried out in the adoption of the present policy. Lest I should be suspected of misrepresenting the hon. leader of the Opposition, I will quote a very few words which he uttered on both occasions. In 1866, the hon. member for Lambton opposed a reduction of a Tariff of 20 per centum—and this Tariff is not higher in many respects—on the following grounds, to which no Protectionist could take exception:

"He admitted that the policy of the Government had not been in harmony with the tendency of public men towards Free-trade. But large interests had grown up under our system of incidental Protection, which, he considered, should not be destroyed. In reply to a question, he said he was in favour of the Pro-

protective system which had been the policy of the country for some years, and under which interests had been created which the House should respect."

Let us see now what he stated at Hamilton on the 16th of January, 1874, on the eve of the general elections:—

"Sir Francis Hincks stated last year, on his election tour and in the House of Commons, that he was in favour of incidental Protection. I said I was also in favour of it. It is a stupid phrase at best, but it means simply this, that as long as duties are levied upon articles imported, they should be levied upon the articles produced by our own people."

Such a result, I repeat, would not be a surprising one, for it has been witnessed in more than one country, Protection gaining ground steadily everywhere, whilst the theory of Free-trade—which has never been truly practised—has, to-day, perhaps, less advocates than it had in the days of Adam Smith and Richard Cobden. When Protection was established in the neighbouring Republic, under the auspices of the celebrated Henry Clay—a man whom history will class among the greatest statesmen of the age, and the greatest benefactors of his country—one of its foremost opponents was another political man, almost as highly considered, almost as celebrated, as his great rival, Daniel Webster. Well, Sir, the Tariff—the American system as it was called—worked with such advantageous results, it revived agriculture, commerce, and industry so rapidly, it developed the national resources to such an extent that, after a few years of experience, Daniel Webster became a convert to that same policy which had been the main lever of the prosperity of the Republic. Let me quote a short extract from a speech he delivered after an experience of nine years of a Protective Policy:—

"Candour obliges me to remind you that when the Act of 1824 was passed, neither he who addresses you nor those with whom he usually acted on such subjects, were ready or willing to take the step which that Act proposed—they doubted its expediency. It passed, however, by the great and overwhelming influence of the Central States. New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio. New England acquiesced in it. She conformed to it as the settled policy of the country, and gave to her capital and labour a corresponding direction. She has now become vitally interested in the preservation of the system. Her prosperity is identified, not perhaps with any particular degree of protection, but with the preservation of the principle; and she is not

likely to consent to yield the principle, under any circumstances whatever. And who would dare to yield it? Who, standing here and looking round on this community and its interests, would be bold enough to touch the spring which moves so much industry and produces so much happiness? Who would shut up the mouth of these vast coal pits? Who stay the cargoes of manufactured goods now floating down a river, one of the noblest in the world, and stretching through territories almost boundless in extent and unequalled in fertility? Who would quench the fires of so many steam engines, or stay the operation of so much well-employed labour? Gentlemen, I cannot conceive how any sub-version of that policy which has hitherto been pursued can take place without great public embarrassment and great private distress. I have said that I am in favour of protecting American manual labor; and, after the best reflection I can give the subject, and from the lights which I can derive from the experience of ourselves and others, I have come to the conclusion that such Protection is just and proper, and that to leave American labour to sustain a competition with that of the over-peopled countries of Europe would lead to a state of things to which the people could never submit."

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we shall find more than one Daniel Webster in the ranks of the Opposition, if our National Policy continues to revive the commerce and the industry of the country as it has done since its establishment. But even if the National Policy had not been so advantageous to Canada within the last months, I claim that it would be premature to judge of its usefulness, and that it would be detrimental to the best interests of the country to change it after such a short experience. There should be but one opinion, Sir, on the desirability of remodelling our Tariff as seldom as possible in order not to create uncertainty and uneasiness in our commercial and industrial operations, and I contend that my hon. friends opposite are doing an unwise, an unpatriotic work in clamouring at the present juncture for a complete change in our fiscal system. Nay, I will prove that the present course they are following in opposing the present Tariff has been condemned by no less an authority than the hon. member for West Durham, who stated in the last Provincial campaign of Ontario—in which he took a very prominent part—that the National Policy should have nothing to do with the local elections, and that it would not be wise to reverse our present fiscal system until a sufficient experience had proved that it was

not suited to our best interests. That hon. gentleman made that two-fold declaration in a great speech, which he delivered at Toronto, on the 21st of May, 1879—and which has been reproduced by the *Globe*, from which I will quote:—

“ Well, Sir, I wish to say one word upon the National Policy, not upon its own merits, but just this that my own opinion is that the attempt to bring it into the contest is doubly disingenuous, because it is plain that the question is disposed of for a certain period—whether rightly or wrongly, for weal or woe—by the majority; although by no means a decided majority, as the returns seem to indicate, still a majority of the people of Canada, determined for a change in their fiscal management. That change has taken place, and I do not hesitate to say that until the lesson of our experience shall be added to the lessons derived from the experience of other countries, and to those arguments derived from reason and research, it will not be best to reverse the fiscal policy which has so long been laid down ”

A more stronger condemnation of the course followed by the Opposition, in so far as this Tariff is concerned could not be adduced, coming as it does not only from one of its prominent members, but from one who, in the estimation of many Reformers, is their coming leader. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing more than another that has pleased me since the adoption of the National Policy—besides the most material proof that it is working well, that it is fulfilling our expectations—it is the fact that this Government seem disposed to give the example to the nation, that is to say, to encourage the homeproduction—to purchase everything that we can successfully produce, but which we used to import from foreign countries in former years. I think the thanks of this House and of the country are due, for one, to the late Minister of Militia, the hon. member for Terrebonne, for having taken the proper steps to expend in this country a large sum of money which we had to send every year beyond the sea. Henceforth the clothing required for our gallant militia will be manufactured here, and at reduced prices, if I am correctly informed; henceforth, we shall also manufacture our powder, our cartridges, and even the guns that we might be called upon to fire in defence of our country, if the sad day ever comes that it is necessary to furnish more deadly weapons than those which are employed in our party warfare. However important may be the manufac-

ture of those articles, the annual expenditure caused thereby is trifling, compared to the large sums of money which we have disbursed for years, to the benefit of foreigners, in connection with the building of our railways; sums of money which should have been spent long ago in the country had a proper system of Protection been adopted to foster the home production—to foster the production of iron. Indeed, Sir, we possess an immense and inexhaustible supply of that most valuable mineral throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, in every Province, except Prince Edward Island, but nowhere in a larger quantity and in a better quality, than at a very few miles from our legislative halls, in the magnificent county of Ottawa. Sir, there are few persons, I dare say, who are aware of the extent of our market for the consumption of iron; few persons are aware of the immense quantity of iron which has been brought into this country in various forms; few persons are aware of the enormous amount of money which Canada has exported to England and to the United States on that account since Confederation—although many are fully aware of the cost of buying steel rails in a foreign market. The magnitude of the importation of iron in Canada may be judged, when it is established that for twelve years the Dominion has imported iron alone to the value of more than \$96,000,000, according to the following statement, drawn from official sources, and which I will submit to the House. In 1872 we imported iron to the amount of \$12,291,908; in 1873, \$20,202,753; in 1874, \$18,878,411; in 1875, \$15,783,960; in 1876, \$11,600,897; in 1877, \$9,330,982; in 1878, \$8,298,517, making a value in the aggregate of \$96,387,428, or, if we include the last year's, more than \$100,000,000—a sum sufficient to construct the whole Pacific Railway. Well, Sir, is it not to be regretted that Parliament has waited so long to encourage the manufacture of an article which exists here in such abundance, and for the production of which we possess all the necessary facilities? We possess, for instance, in the immediate vicinity of our iron ores, all the coal, all the peat, and all the lumber required to work them profitably—for so far as the iron ores of the Ottawa county are con-

cerned, there is a depth of more than 150 miles of forests to fall back on—an advantage which is not to be found almost anywhere, the lumber of nearly every country which is adjacent to iron mines being exhausted. In this connection, Sir, I may be allowed to express the wish to see the duty on pig iron increased from \$2 a ton to \$3—the American duty is \$7—an increase which is demanded by those who are engaged in that valuable industry, and those who feel inclined to embark in it. This industry was fearfully neglected under the late Administration, like almost every other industry for their sole ambition appeared to buy in the cheapest market, as in the case of steel rails, for instance. But now that we have statesmen—instead of flies-on-the-wheel—at the helm of affairs, we may fairly expect to see that most important industry assume a development yet unknown in this country. We may fairly expect to see the day when the iron industry will do for Canada what [it] has done for Great Britain, and in later years for the United States, and become one of the mainstays of our industrial prosperity. In 1873, the neighbouring Republic imported iron to the value of \$7,477,556, its export reaching the sum of \$12,129,939; but four years later, in 1877, the iron industry had taken such a wonderful development that the import of that article was but \$1,632,815, the export being not less than \$16,659,675. Truly, Mr. Speaker, I have felt a very deep gratification when I read, lately, the following advertisement, signed by the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals—one of the staunchest champions of the National Policy, and who seems so well determined to practise what he knows to preach so eloquently and so forcibly:—

CANADA PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Tenders for Rolling Stock.

Tenders are invited for furnishing the Rolling Stock required to be delivered on the Canadian Pacific Railway within the next four years, comprising the delivery in each year of about the following, viz :

Twenty Locomotive Engines; 16 First-class Cars, (a proportion being sleepers); 20 Second-class Cars (a proportion being sleepers); 3 Express and Baggage Cars; 3 Postal and Smoking Cars; 240 Box Freight Cars; 100 Flat Cars; 2 Wing Ploughs; 2 Snow Ploughs; 2 Flangers; 40 Hand-cars.

The whole to be manufactured in the Dominion of Canada, and delivered on the

MR. TASSÉ.

Canadian Pacific Railway, at Fort William, or in the Province of Manitoba.

By order,

F. BRAUN, Secretary.

Dept. of Railways & Canals,)
Ottawa, 7th February, 1880. }

I do not hesitate to say, Sir, that the Government, that the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, deserve our warmest congratulations for having made such a patriotic move in the right direction. I trust it will produce the good results which are to be expected from this true and sensible application of the National Policy. Sir, the country is committed to a gigantic scheme, the building of 2,500 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway; the country has already made, and is prepared to make, the greatest sacrifice to ensure the success of our national undertaking; the country will not accept the policy of repudiation, which will be offered to it, after having condemned a policy of negation; the country believes that this railway will consolidate our political union, and vastly assist to attract immigration and develop the boundless but still unemployed resources of the Dominion; but the country has every reason to expect that these great sacrifices will be incurred in such a way as to give our people—to those who shall bear the greatest share of the burden—the largest immediate returns possible. I have not the slightest hesitation to state that if we were going to continue to expend elsewhere a large portion of the enormous sums required for the construction and for the equipment of our trans-continental railway, I would, perhaps, hesitate before giving further assent to such an expenditure, which cannot but greatly increase the Public Debt of Canada. But let the Government persevere and, preserve energetically in their policy, and they will find this House and the country at their back, fully determined to assist them in their patriotic and statesmanlike course. In 1877, the Government of Victoria, one of the Australian colonies, advertised for tenders for the supply of 5,000 tons of iron water pipes, and, with the view of encouraging home enterprise, accepted the tender of a colonial factory at £17,000 more than they could have been imported for. Let us follow that policy which is

the true National Policy; let us follow that policy on all occasions and in all its legitimate directions; let us follow that policy which has been endorsed, not only by the Conservative party, but by thousands and thousands of Reformers, who have ceased to believe in a Reform party that had nothing to reform—and let us not forget that the glorious motto inscribed on the banner which we carried triumphantly at the last elections was that of Canada for the Canadians.

MR. GILLMOR: Members on this side of the House propose to fight the question out upon this line: We are not influenced by expediency, but are influenced by nothing but principle. We are opposed to the whole principle of Protection. I do not propose, in the few remarks I may make to-night, to refer to the speeches of any hon. members who have preceded me, other than to say, with reference to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tassé), who has now closed his remarks, that he has manifested considerable sharpness, and which reminded me of a circumstance occurring down in our country. A young man, ambitious in theology, went off to attend a theological training school, and when he came back he was called upon to officiate. An old man, who had listened to him, was asked what he thought of the progress the young man had made. "Well," he said, "my young friend, you can whet a case-knife, but you cannot make a razor out of it." Now, my young friend over there, who has endeavoured to demolish the hon. member for West Durham and the hon. leader of the Opposition, is very sharp when he has been whetted up, but the material with which to make a razor is not in him. I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to speak on this question, as I do not see that any very great good can come out of this discussion. The few remarks I shall make will be those which have suggested themselves to me in listening to this discussion since it commenced. I am an attentive listener, and I would not speak on this question except that I think my constituents expect me to enter my protest against the fiscal policy adopted by the present Government, on all suitable occasions. In speaking at this time it will be my duty to go back a little, and I promise not to go back more than fifty years. Some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken

went back more than a century. I will take occasion to go back in this discussion to the time of Confederation. I will read the remarks made by the hon. Finance Minister last year, when introducing this Tariff. He said:

"The time has arrived when it will become our duty to decide whether the thousands of men throughout the length and breadth of the country, who are unemployed, shall seek employment in another country or shall find it in this Dominion."

He goes on:

"Whether we will confine ourselves to the Fisheries and certain small industries, and cease to be what we have been, and not rise to be what I believe we are destined to be under wise and judicious legislation."

The hon. the Finance Minister in the opening remarks of his Budget Speech, did not appear to be much elated with the success of the National Policy so far. He wanted a little more time, and said, that if he had it, the results would be more satisfactory. Like the barren fig tree, he wanted another year, when he would dig about it, and dung it, and then it would bring forth fruit. Mr. Speaker, I have been a long time acquainted with my hon. friend the Finance Minister, and in any remarks I may make to-night, I want it understood that I do not love Cæsar less, but love Rome more. I discover that he still retains his old characteristics. I will say, at the outset, that I never knew my hon. friend to make a prediction that was fulfilled, and I never knew him to admit that he had been mistaken in any prediction. Give him time and all his predictions will come true; and this reminds me of another story: Some young men in Portland, in the State of Maine, were amusing themselves on the bank of a river, trying if they could throw stones across it. A strapping fellow from the country happened along, picked up a brick, and threw it further than they threw the stones. They said to him: "You are a powerful man." "Yes," said he, "pretty strong. I think I can throw one of you across, and I will bet \$10 on it." They planked down the money, and he took hold of one fellow, who came forward, by the breeches and the scruff of the neck, and pitched him some ten or fifteen feet. He swam back and said "I want the money." "No," he said, "I can do it," and threw the man in again. He again swam back, and de-

manded the money. "No," rejoined the country chap, "I can throw you across, and I will throw at you from now until this time next year, but I will throw you;" and so my hon. friend (Sir Samuel L. Tilley) says, if you will only give him time all will come true. With regard to the effects of the National Policy, of course, I am more acquainted with its influences upon the county I represent, and upon the Province of New Brunswick, than with its influence throughout the Dominion. I can speak with regard to the Fisheries, which is one of the small industries to which the Finance Minister referred. In the county which I have the honour to represent, there are between 25,000 and 30,000 persons, and of that number 5,000 souls receive support from that industry. It is an important industry, because it is a school of training for our seamen, and for those persons needed for commerce. Without commerce no country can become great. It is an industry accompanied by a great deal of toil and hardships, and ought to be encouraged. Does the National Policy encourage the Fisheries of the Dominion? What is it calculated to do to help the thousands and tens of thousands who are engaged in this industry? It is calculated to oppress them, to crush them with enormous taxation, and by placing a tax upon everything they use in that calling. There is a tax placed upon the food that they consume, on the rigging and sails, and on everything required in that industry. That industry is one of the largest that we have. Our Government placed the value of a partial use of them to the United States for twelve years at the enormous sum of \$12,000,000. And this was the industry which the hon. the Finance Minister has chosen to term a small industry—an industry of small importance. It is very much more important, I suppose, to encourage the manufacturer of clocks, of very much more importance to encourage the manufacture of agricultural implements, and of very much more importance to encourage the manufacture of buttons. The hon. the Finance Minister has spoken of the visits he had made; but he does not appear to have conversed with more than twenty men engaged in the manufactories of the country. Altogether he has not named more than twenty persons with whom he

conversed with regard to the manufactories of the country, and with regard to the fiscal policy which is to build up the industries of the Dominion; only these twenty men, every man of whom is interested in this system of spoliation, to control the interests of a Dominion composed of four millions of people. The exports of fish last year, taken from the deep sea, amounted to \$6,000,000, and the products to \$12,000,000. When will the manufacturers export to foreign countries an amount like that? Mr. Speaker, I think that too much attention has been given to the manufactures of this country. This fiscal policy is the illegitimate offspring of the political necessities of the Tory party. What has brought about this Protection? It was never dreamt of by the late Finance Minister. It has not been dreamt of by the leaders of the Conservative party for years. The only necessity which existed for that policy was, that they were out of power and wanted to get back again. They talked about the distressed condition of the country, and presented to the people this nostrum, this quack remedy, which is destined to come to naught. I feel that I am on the right side on this question; I feel that we have right on our side, and I propose to fight it out on this line. I care very little with regard to the majority in this House; majorities do not affect men of honesty or principle; therefore, I did not intend to say anything on this question. But how far have the Finance Minister's predictions been realised, with regard to the keeping of the workingmen in this country? For the last forty years I remember none that has seen so many able-bodied men—men the most valuable to New Brunswick and the most needed—leave the Province. I would not be unfair enough to charge this exodus to the National Policy. I believe it has sprung from the general depression; but the National Policy has failed to keep them in the country, as was promised it would, or to give them increased employment. It has proved a most signal failure in this respect. I have received a letter from a friend in the county of Carleton, one of the best agricultural districts in New Brunswick, stating that no less than 1,000 good, strong young men have gone to the United States. I never knew so many

in my own county go away; and they have left St. John, not by hundreds, but thousands, since the National Policy came into operation. These men have gone where they expected to better their condition. Of course, many would come and go under any circumstances, but the friends of this policy predicted it would find food and work and comfort for all. They knew better at the time—that it would not produce that effect; or they ought to have known it. I remember the Finance Minister, in replying to an address at St. Andrews, N.B., said:—“Six months from the time the Conservative party succeeds, there will be work found for every man, woman and child in that town.” Was that a figure of speech? Did it mean anything? I should expect to see any promise of mine fulfilled. That speech, to a certain extent, perhaps, influenced the people, who thought that the new policy would furnish them with labour, food and clothing. Not only has it not furnished a day's work to those people, but it has heaped upon them a load of taxation; everything they eat, drink and wear being more expensive than before. So far as the county of Charlotte, and the whole of New Brunswick is concerned, I believe this policy has proved injurious to every interest. The Fisheries have suffered as well as other industries, and the Government may thank their stars that prices have improved in England and the United States. That is the only bright spot of comfort they have. I have heard it attributed to the National Policy—a statement no more absurd, however, than many others from hon. gentlemen on the Government side. The National Policy has established warehouses in Calais, that very important lumbering concerns may be able to carry on their business successfully there. I do not know of a lumbering concern of any magnitude that has not established a warehouse on the American side since the adoption of that policy. I have been told by one of the cleverest merchants of St. Stephen, a large lumber operator, that it has fixed a tax of \$100 additional on each team of two horses that the lumbermen send into the woods. It must have crushed that industry in New Brunswick but for the improvement in the foreign market. That has given some satis-

faction and encouragement to our business men, however. But, excepting the improvement in the lumbering interest, I never knew so much depression and darkness in regard to the business prospects of New Brunswick. The National Policy has injured our shipping and coasting trade, by depriving it of return freights, and reducing earnings. We have no shipping trade with Western Canada; our vessels carry our lumber and farm products to the United States, and it is of great importance they should have return freights. Our trade and business is with the United States and Great Britain. We have nothing to send to Canada west; and it is in the interest of our people to buy, with the proceeds of their exports, what they most conveniently can in those countries, and bring it back in our vessels. We are now compelled to pay a duty of 50c. a barrel on flour, bought from Canadians, of the same grade as we used to get without that duty in the United States. I am assured by merchants that we now pay that much more for the flour. That is one of the fruits of the National Policy. I do not think I exaggerate in saying that, within the last year, 20,000 people, mostly men, have left the Lower Provinces. The emigration is as large, proportionately, from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island as from New Brunswick. That policy, so far as New Brunswick is concerned, has resulted in nothing but oppression, heavy taxation and ruin. If there are any hon. gentlemen in the country responsible for this sad condition of things, it must be the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the Minister of Railways, none of whose predictions of prosperity have been fulfilled. They were like the golden pictures sketched to induce us to enter Confederation. The stream of prosperity was to flow quick and violent. I was willing to make the best of Confederation, after we were in it, but there was no necessity for making Confederation a failure by this policy. I am glad it has fallen to the lot of the hon. the Finance Minister and colleagues to introduce it—to inflict it upon the country. I am glad the Reform party has not been guilty of this craze, if I may so style the National Policy. My thoughts are carried back some

twenty-five years, to the time I first entered Parliament in New Brunswick, when I had the honour of being associated with the hon. the Finance Minister. The Conservative party had then ruled the Province, perhaps fifty years. The family compact had controlled affairs a long time. The hon. the Finance Minister was then a Liberal, and on the defeat of the Conservative Government, when it was necessary to form a new Administration, he was selected as the most eligible man for Provincial Secretary. He had some reputation for financial skill, having acquired it largely by his addresses on Temperance. He was very clever in toting up totals, and used to indulge in many figures to show the enormous evils of intemperance, and the cost of the drinking habits of society. He would represent to his audience how many horses and waggons in a straight line it would take to draw the money, in silver, that the drinking habits of society cost; and, occasionally, to vary the entertainment, he would tell us how long a canal, and how broad and deep would be that which the rum and water would represent, that was drunk in the country. Having had a large experience in public speaking and in this kind of arithmetic, we concluded he was about the best man for that office. He took charge of the Provincial Finances in 1854, and controlled them ten or twelve years, till the question of Confederation came up. During all those years I supported him in the main, and found him very amiable—full of the milk of human kindness. But I found he became very much changed when defeated and out of office, after his office had, for the time being, been filled by another man. He was remarkably kind and gentle, as pleasant as he is now when he is in a majority. But he has certainly assumed a very different character. He became very uneasy out of office; he was certainly a different man out of office from what he was in office. I had occasion to fill that office, and I say he and his supporters acted more like a set of political hyenas than anything else. Instead of being a docile person, as he was when he became so lamb-like, he was more like a roaring lion going about seeking whom he might devour. He devoured me; financially, I was used up when I went in. There was nothing in the Treasury, and

there never will be where my hon. friend has been. When I went into office, there was a very considerable sum in the Treasury. I think there was \$6,000, with which to meet Parliament and commence my financial operations. The first thing I had to do was to go off and try to borrow some money. Parliament was to meet, and I had to provide for the indemnity of the members and other financial engagements. I had never had much to do with finances; I did not know how to meet the banks at that time. I had no acquaintance with them; but I mustered up courage, and went up to St. John and went into the Bank of British North America. I told them I wanted to raise a little money to carry us through the Session, and they said that as they were an institution of the country and wanted to render all the help they could, as they were doing business there and making money, it was but right for them to write to Montreal and see what they could do. I went to another bank and could not get anything. I went to another bank and managed to borrow some \$20,000. I borrowed some \$15,000 or \$20,000 from another bank. I went back to Fredericton and began to attend to my duties. In a short time I got an answer from the Bank of British North America that they would loan us \$5,000. I thought I would not be under an obligation to an institution of that magnitude for a sum like that. Well, the hon. gentleman, as I said before, very soon devoured us. We went to the country and were defeated. But when my hon. friend went into the office of Provincial Secretary there was no Public Debt in New Brunswick. I think the debt at that time could not have exceeded \$100,000. The Tariff was not over 10 per cent. My hon. friend was in office until Confederation, at which time there was a debt of \$5,000,000, and we had obligations to the extent of \$2,000,000, so we came into Confederation with a debt of \$7,000,000. Such were my hon. friend's financial operations in New Brunswick. Little as I regarded the Tories when we turned them out, financially speaking, I thought we might have been as well off if we had kept them in. My hon. friend went into the agitation for Confederation. He told us that would be a panacea for all our ills; that we were going to manufacture for the

back Provinces, as he called Ontario and Quebec; that New Brunswick was to become the Birmingham of the Dominion of Canada. I do not think that prediction has been fulfilled. I do not see any Intercolonial cars being loaded with our manufactures to go up west; but that was the whole strain of the arguments and speeches about the benefits we were to derive from Confederation, according to my hon. friend. The result has been the opposite of what he predicted. The manufactures of the Lower Provinces have been going down since Confederation. Instead of having our commercial agents up here in the west, looking out a market for our agricultural implements, we find quite the opposite. We find our Lower Provinces traversed by commercial agents from Montreal; every hole and corner of the Lower Provinces is flooded with them. Our proportion of the net National Debt, allowing for our assets, is estimated at \$11,500,000, while our share of the gross debt amounts to \$13,000,000. We have a Tariff of over 20 per cent., and are taxed beyond endurance. Our industries are burdened. What encouragement has the agricultural industry received from the National Policy? What has this policy done for the farmer? It taxes enormously everything which he has to eat, drink and wear, and far from increasing the prices of his farm produce. I have never known a period when the products of the farm were so low as they were last year. What has the policy done for the mercantile classes of New Brunswick? It has driven trade from the merchants and the middlemen all along the frontier. It has driven trade from St. Andrew's and St. Stephen's into Eastport and Calais on the Maine sides. I have talked with two of the largest importers in the county of Charlotte, in reference to this policy, and though they are warm supporters of the party in power they admit frankly, notwithstanding their political preferences, that the Tariff was very injurious to them. The Fishery Award was \$5,500,000. Of that one million went to Newfoundland, leaving \$4,500,000 for the four Maritime Provinces in Confederation. Set apart \$900,000 for Quebec, and we have then \$3,600,000 for New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, which divided over a period of twelve years

would give to those Provinces \$300,000 a year. As it is in the Treasury of the Dominion it should bear interest. Interest on \$300,000 at 6 per cent., one year—\$18,000; so that in the year 1880, the three lesser Provinces would have from this fund, to divide amongst them \$318,000. Allowing their population to be 750,000 it would give us 42½ cents per head. In 1881 we would have two years interest on the next \$300,000, making \$336,000 to be divided in 1882, which would give us 45 cents per head. It would increase 2½ cents per head annum for the twelve years, making an average *per capita* during those years of 56 cents per head, and would pay more than two-thirds of the 80 cents subsidy we now receive from the Dominion. I am inclined to think, however, we will not receive any portion of that Award. I have seen no evidence yet that we may expect it. I trust the hon. gentlemen now managing affairs will feel it to be their duty to do something for the fishing industry, that has contributed so much to the Treasury. New Brunswick is to-day in the most humiliating position, and is suffering the greatest commercial depression which has prevailed in that Province since the hon. the Finance Minister took charge of its finances twenty-five years ago. Although the electors were warned of the consequences of this policy, and sent here twelve men out of the sixteen to oppose it, we find ourselves powerless to do anything for our Province. Indeed our political humiliation is even greater than our commercial humiliation. The predictions of my hon. friend, with regard to the balance of power that we would exercise in the Confederation, have not been verified. He told us in his speeches on this question, that in all moral questions we would have Ontario with us, and on all matters of fiscal policy, matters of trade, we would have Quebec and the Lower Provinces with us, and, therefore, we would always have the controlling power. But how do we find ourselves now? We find ourselves in a hopeless minority, with very little support from the other Maritime Provinces. We did not dream, when we entered Confederation, that our tax per head would, in so short a time, be raised from \$2.75 to \$6 a head. In a speech made in 1864, my hon. friend said:

“It has been said that figures never lie; but

if you start on an erroneous basis, you make figures do as much lying as anything else."

Again :

"Mr. Lawrence says we cannot compete with Canada in manufactures. Mr. Lawrence tried to lead the manufacturers of New Brunswick to believe that they could not compete with Canada. I gave you the impression that you would manufacture a great deal for Canada, and be, as it were, to it what Birmingham is to the west of England. In short, I feel that Mr. Lawrence's calculations, from end to end, are the emanations of a mind which is impressed with the insignificance of our people. Mr. Parks, the owner of our cotton factory, has, through a friend, authorised me to say that, if he had the extended market that would be made by this Federation, he could sell at 10 per cent less than he can at present."

The hon. the Minister of Finance told them then they had every facility for manufacturing. Mr. Lawrence told them that such would not be the case ; in Canada they had the population, the capital, and manufactories already in operation, and that New Brunswick could not compete. Since Confederation, has the Intercolonial been seen freighted with manufactured goods coming up to Canada? Have commercial agents been seen looking for a market for New Brunswick manufactures? Quite the opposite. Canadian goods have been going to New Brunswick, both to the injury of our importers and manufacturers; and runners from Canada have infested every hole and corner of the Lower Provinces. Mr. Lawrence was the fool before Confederation ; who is the fool now? The cotton manufactory was established twenty years ago, and has been enlarged since. Mr. Parks has been manufacturing goods ever since, and that establishment is not due to the National Policy. I am satisfied Mr. Parks will not send any cotton into Canada. I fancy I can see one distressed manufacturer, the hon. member for Centre Toronto. I fancy I can see him going over to the hon. the Finance Minister and begging for some protection in order that he might continue his manufacturing. He got that protection, and that is the reason for his leaving the Liberal party. In order to help that hon. gentleman, worth \$500,000, every poor man who wants a table or a chair has to pay more for his furniture. Have the masses of the people no claims upon the Government? We are told that notwithstanding this in-

creased taxation that goods are cheaper than they were before the National Policy was adopted. The idea is a new one that taxation makes goods cheaper. Hon. gentlemen must think the people are very stupid to believe any such assertion. The predictions of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance are never realized. When he was told that the Federal Government would be expensive he said, \$13,000,000 annually would be all that would be required to carry on the affairs of the country for a quarter of a century. I would not intimate that the hon. gentleman would for a moment state what was not correct, he would not lie I am sure, but he has told us that figures will, and, Mr. Speaker, so far as the figures are concerned, I pronounce this a "whopper." He told us that \$2.75 would be all that would be required for a quarter of a century to come. That statement, in view of the actual facts, I am tempted to describe as a "whopper." He stated that so great would be the increase of population, as the result of building the railroad that, in 1880, the population of New Brunswick would be 400,000. The hon. gentleman never states what is correct, and, so far as figures are concerned, that is another "whopper." He stated that the Intercolonial would go through the centre of the Province and cost \$15,000,000. It has not gone through the centre of the Province, and it has cost about \$30,000,000; that is another "whopper." I could produce hundreds of calculations made by the hon. the Finance Minister to induce us to enter Confederation, which calculations he could prove to a demonstration, yet none of which have come true. Now, I am sure, no one can imagine that that hon. gentleman would deviate from the path of rectitude and truth; but if the Scriptures are true, where it says that the liars have their place in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, I pity that hon. gentleman's figures; and if the liars are to be cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, salt cannot save these figures. David and Jonathan were not more closely allied than were the hon. gentleman and these figures, yet the best of friends must part. I listened attentively to the hon. the Minister of Railways, while delivering his speech, power-

ful it certainly was, and well calculated to rally his supporters. I thought, while he was speaking, of Vesuvius, and expected, with the rest of my friends, to be buried with the lava. I thought of a flaming fire, a rushing, mighty wind, and an earthquake, and I thought of a very essential element which was not in the speech at all. As the interests of trade are identical in the three Maritime Provinces, I am sure the National Policy has been as injurious to Nova Scotia as to New Brunswick. I see that the Government have sent \$1,000 worth of food to the starving fishermen of Guysboro. The National Policy has not done much for them. I am anxious to hear the representative of that county (Mr. Ogden) expatiate on the beauties of the National Policy. The contrast between the beaming face of that hon. member, whose eyes stand out with fatness, who has more than heart can wish, and the hungry, gaunt forms of his emaciated constituents is great indeed. The National Policy has helped them with a vengeance. I understand the Government propose this as a loan. I trust it will be considered as a gift. They have helped the poor of Ireland, why not the poor of Guysboro', who, to some extent, have been made so by their National Policy? I was amused at the changes which came over the countenance of the hon. the Minister of Railways during the speech of the hon. member for Annapolis on the British Columbia Judges' Bill. When he found his hon. colleague was disposed to rat on that vote, he fairly trembled—

“For Satan trembles when he sees
The weakest saint upon his knees.”

I hope the hon. member will not prove a weak saint—but that the seed has fallen in good and honest soil and will bring forth much fruit. My heart warmed towards him, and I felt like giving him the hand of fellowship and welcome him to our sorrows just now and our joys three years hence.

MR. KILLAM moved the adjournment of the debate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No. It is necessary to go into Committee on the resolutions submitted.

MR. KILLAM: It would be unfair to proceed at this late hour. There are several hon. members of the Opposition who desire to speak upon the subject.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not necessary to go into Committee now.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: With our usual good nature we will consent to adjourn the debate.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes after

One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 7th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY—QUEBEC CELEBRATION.

QUESTION.

MR. DOMVILLE enquired, Whether the Montreal Volunteers will be permitted to go to the city of Quebec to take part in the next celebration of the Queen's Birthday, and what assistance they are to receive from the Government to enable them to do so; whether the 54th Battalion of Infantry and the Richmond Field Battery of Artillery, nearly one hundred miles nearer to the city of Quebec than the Montreal Volunteers are, and in every way equal to the Montreal Volunteers, will be permitted to go upon the same terms as to Government assistance; and if not, whether the Government will assist the Eastern Townships' Volunteers to meet at Richmond to celebrate the Queen's Birthday.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Montreal Volunteers are to go to Quebec to attend the review; two battalions and a battery of artillery. One battalion will be taken from the Eastern Townships, number of battalion not yet fixed; one from the Province of New Brunswick, not yet fixed; also one from Ontario, not yet fixed. An allowance towards covering the expenses of each battalion attending the review will be made.

MAIL CONTRACT IN LÉVIS:

QUESTION.

MR. LARUE enquired, For what reason the Government cancelled the contract for the carriage of Her Majesty's Mail between Lévis and St. Joseph de Beauce, and intermediate stations, awarded to Laurent Roy, of Lévis, on the

1st August, 1878, and which was to expire only on the 1st August, 1882.

MR. LANGEVIN: This contract was cancelled because it had been granted without having been advertised, as required by law. Nevertheless, it appears that the only person who has received money for the service mentioned in this contract is Mr. Roy himself.

EMIGRATION OF BRITISH TENANT FARMERS.

QUESTION.

MR. STEPHENSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint special agents for the purpose of promoting the emigration of tenant farmers, or others, resident in Great Britain or Ireland, to the Dominion of Canada, during the present year; and if not, why?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government have their ordinary and regular staff of emigrant agents in the Old Country, and they do not propose to appoint any special agents.

NEW BRUNSWICK—INTERNATIONAL BRIDGES OVER RIVER ST. JOHN.

QUESTION.

MR. COSTIGAN asked, If the Congress of the United States appropriate one-half of the estimated cost of certain proposed International bridges over the river Saint John, N. B., will the Government of Canada provide the remaining half of said estimated cost?

MR. LANGEVIN: If the United States Congress will offer to pay one-half of the cost of certain proposed bridges over the St. John River, the Government of Canada will be prepared to consider the matter.

ST. MAURICE RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. MONTPLAISIR enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates any sum whatever for the improvement of the river St. Maurice, more particularly between the Piles Falls and La Tuque.

MR. LANGEVIN: The engineer who has been sent to make an inspection has not yet reported; and the Department is unable, therefore, to say whether a sum of money will be required for improvements. Under these circumstances I am unable to submit to my colleagues,

MR. LANGEVIN.

and they are unable to submit to Parliament, any proposal in reference to any such improvements, at all events during this Session.

OTTAWA RIVER FISHING PRIVILEGES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland), in moving for an Order of the House for the production of copies of all grants, leases, and agreements made between the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any of its officers, and any persons owning or possessing lands, bays and marshes, or portions thereof, lying on the north side of the Ottawa river, between the city of Ottawa and Grenville; also, full and complete statements of all moneys paid by the Department, during the last three years, for or in respect of fish-breeding or game protection, on those grounds, bays and marshes, or any of them, and the names of persons to whom paid; also, copies of all instructions given to members of the Dominion Police, or officers of the Department, touching game and game protection; also, copies of all correspondence touching game protection on said grounds, bays, or marshes, and copies of all complaints in respect of the same; and, also, a copy of a circular dated on or about the 15th December last, issued by the said Department to fishery overseers, in reference to game protection, together with copies of all objections or complaints made concerning the enforcement of the Provincial Game Laws by Dominion officials, acting under instructions from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, said: I desire to state briefly the grounds upon which this motion is made. A number of persons in this city, and in the neighbouring counties, have felt that a very grave abuse has existed for the last two years or more. It is well known that this Parliament and Government have no concern in the matter of game protection. That is a subject which, under the British North America Act rests entirely with the Local Parliaments and Governments. During the last two years, however, persons engaged in legitimate sport on this river, and in the neighbouring marshes, have found that the Dominion Police have been employed to warn them off. A great many persons in the city, as well as those living in the neighbourhood—arti-

sans of the little villages, and farmers and farmers' sons—felt that they were being deprived harshly, unjustly and illegally of a pastime they had hitherto enjoyed without let or hindrance. It was found, upon making enquiry, that those policemen, who sometimes acted in an arbitrary, high-handed way, going so far as to threaten arrests, and in one or two instances actually making arrests, were employed under the authority of the Fishery Department, and under the express orders of the Commissioner of Fisheries, Mr. Whitcher. The case of two gentlemen being thus interfered with, came prominently up last September, and they requested me, as a public man, to interest myself in the question. I told them there must be a great mistake—that it was impossible to conceive that the Department of Marine and Fisheries should meddle with the question of game protection in this or any other neighbourhood; but I was assured that such was the fact. I wrote a letter to the Department, couched in courteous terms, and asked if it were possible that those police officers had authority from the Department to warn off and prevent persons from enjoying their lawful sport on the marshes and bays of this river; but I could not get any satisfaction. I received several long letters from the Commissioner on the subject of game protection, couched in vague generalities and avoiding the question, which I put as pertinently as I could, *i.e.*, whether those officers were employed for the purpose of preserving game on this river? At last I got one letter, from which I will read an extract. The correspondence was so very voluminous that I will not trespass upon the time of the House by reading the whole of it. Mr. Whitcher says, under date of the 9th September last:

“Allow me to state that I shall always cheerfully afford you, or any other gentleman, whatever information on this subject it may be thought proper to ask. At the same time, permit me to mention, that the class of persons from whom damage is always to be apprehended in a locality within easy reach of a populous city, like Ottawa, must necessarily be excluded by rigid means from all opportunities to do injury, although it may happen that the general and absolute terms of exclusion bear with some degree of hardship on others whose presence is not only innocent, but desirable on account of the moral and intelli-

gent support, which every enterprise for the protection and propagation of game, fishes (and incidentally birds), it is most essential to secure, as a countervailing influence to that aggressive spirit evinced by parties who complain that the restraints of Game and Fishery Laws infringe the public liberty to kill and destroy game at all seasons.”

Now, here we have a position taken by this Department, not merely to protect game generally, because I do not think sportsmen would object to that, even if it had been done by an illegal extension of authority. There is no question raised as to the protection of game during the close season, but there was an attempt made to prevent certain classes of persons from shooting at all seasons of the year on this river. This action of the Department is certainly the assumption of an authority of a very obnoxious kind; it is a game law of a most offensive character. But it turned out that there was a great deal more in the thing than this. It was not merely the protection of game, in making the river a place of refuge for all the birds of the air, it was the protection of game for the private use of a gentleman and his particular friends. That is what this protection of game resulted in. It was not a general protection of game, but the protection of a selfish and isolated interest, at the expense of the whole community; and that was being done, not at the expense of those gentlemen, but it was being done at the expense of the public, and by the employment of the Dominion Police, who, in their uniforms and bright buttons, were ranged along the edge of the river, to warn away all the young men from this city, and all the artisans, *habitants* and farmers on the river side. It grew to be a very great abuse, and was felt to be such. I addressed, then, when I found I could not get anything more satisfactory than those general statements, one of which I have just read, a letter to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in which I formulated a charge. The letter is dated 29th Sept., 1879, and reads thus:—

“DEAR SIR,—I beg to call your attention to a correspondence which has just taken place between Mr. Whitcher of your Department and myself.

“I have a right to complain that this gentleman has (although he has generously given me at considerable length his personal views on the

protection of birds, game and fish—a subject on which I did not desire any information) entirely evaded answering the simple question which I proposed. I will put the case as clearly and concisely as possible.

“It appears that Mr. Whitcher, while acting for the Department in certain fish-breeding arrangements on the Ottawa river, acquired a personal interest in certain bays and marshes for the purpose of shooting game (I assume this to be the fact, partly from his own words and partly from other information), and that under his orders the policemen, or officers employed for the protection of the fish-breeding operations, have acted as his special game-keepers and personal servants; and that they recently ordered from off certain of the marshes (not even within the limits of the lands held by the Department, as I am informed) certain gentlemen of this city who were merely engaged in the lawful sport of snipe shooting, and who were not in any way interfering with fish-breeding, a process which, I believe, cannot be prosecuted where men can walk and where fish cannot swim.

“The impropriety of this proceeding must be obvious, as though the Dominion Government may, I shall assume, lease lands to the water’s edge, and also the bays and water courses thereto belonging, for fish-breeding purposes it can have nothing to do with the question of game protection, which is a matter of Provincial concern only. The fact, besides, of Dominion officers being employed under a color of public duty of a totally different kind, in protecting the game preserves of individuals, whether under a joint or separate arrangement as to the relative share of compensation which is apparently the defence put forward by Mr. Whitcher is, to say the least, a highly objectionable and novel feature in Departmental administration.

“I simply call your attention to this correspondence with the desire of clearly understanding if the practice is sanctioned by you as the head of the Department.

“I am, dear Sir,

“Yours truly,

“JAMES COCKBURN.”

I received no reply to this letter for a considerable time, but I acquit the Minister, personally, of any complaint in that respect: there were reasons of a private character for the delay, and I certainly do not, nor did I ever intend to attach any importance to that. It was the delay in sending me the report, or, rather, the mistake in permitting any such report which I have reason to complain of. Mr. Whitcher shortly afterwards issued a circular, a part of which I will also read, as showing, clearly the pretence put forward by the Department. He says, addressing the Fishery Officers, under date of the 15th of December, 1879:

MR. COCKBURN.

“It is known that many of the Fishery Officers have regarded it as somewhat onerous for them thus incidentally to enforce the Game Laws, without receiving any extra allowance for either salary or expenses; but this Department has felt justified in doing so, from an official point of view, because of the practical assistance which it afforded to their regular duties. We have been, nevertheless, grateful to those Fishery Officers who have so spiritedly and efficiently exercised their powers without any remuneration therefor, actuated solely by a desire to preserve the valuable game of the country, which, without some such active interest and authorised supervision, would have been now very much decreased, if not in many parts almost exterminated.”

We have this circular issuing from the Department, and the full, complete control of the game not only justified, but asserted in the most formal terms, and the employment of those officers in the protection of the game justified. I received a letter from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, shortly after this circular was issued, which certainly surprised me very much. It contained, to some extent, an excuse for the action of the officers, and was also, to some extent, a hauling down of the colours that had been flaunted by the officers of the Department; and it contained, besides, a report by Mr. Whitcher, to which I take special exception. The *gravamen* of this offence is, that the case we submitted to the Minister, which I have just read in the letter of 29th September, having been by him referred to Mr. Whitcher for his report, that officer does not confine himself to a justification of his illegal act as he should have done; but he proceeds to inquire into the motives of the member who had brought this subject before his Department—a course which, I take it, no hon. member of the House will for a moment approve of. I will read my letter to the Minister, dated January 20th, 1880, which contains an extract from the objectionable report and my remarks thereon:—

“OTTAWA, January 20th, 1880.

“SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge your letter (received only to-day) under date of 17th inst., being a reply to a letter addressed by me to you of 29th September last, and also a copy of an official report by Mr. Whitcher of 1st October, this being the first intimation I have had of any such report.

“The correspondence which took place prior to the 29th September with Mr. Whitcher, speaks for itself, and I prefer to refer you

to that, rather than to Mr. Whitcher's erroneous comments upon it. The letter of 29th September, however, formulated certain charges against this gentleman which remains unanswered to this hour. His long arguments about the propriety of game protection and the desire which he states is entertained (notwithstanding the British North America Act to the contrary) by some persons—names unknown—that the Dominion Government should assume this charge in connection with fish-breeding, are all quite beside the questions raised in that letter.

“ ‘Game Protection’ is properly limited to the close or breeding season, but all this correspondence points to something very different—to the preservation of game, for private use, during the open season, by the employment of Dominion Police officers, and that for the benefit of a certain person who claims that he has a perfect right to do this, either at his own expense, or at the expense of the public, or at the joint expense of himself and the Department (the question of cost being of course unimportant in his view), and all this is to be done under the false pretence of fish-breeding.

“ Every word of my letter of the 29th September I maintain; and every charge therein contained will be amply supported.

“ But Mr. Whitcher to whom, I am now informed, my letter was referred for report, instead of confining himself to the charges preferred against himself, and answering them if it was in his power to do so, has attempted to avoid the issues by invoking other, and totally foreign subjects for consideration. I will quote his own words: ‘Knowing of the threatened law-suit by Mr. Cockburn’s clients, I was the more cautious in answering his enquiries; and it now seems to me that it is not because, as he pretends, the proper information was withheld, but because he did not elicit such replies as would commit either the Department, a policeman, or myself, and afford some foundation for the intended suit. The spiteful attack on myself, made in his present letter (No. 5) is probably as much in revenge for failing to commit me in the interest of his client as for a previous act connected with the dismissal of his brother-in-law by your predecessor, for which Mr. Cockburn has unjustly blamed me and openly avowed his intention to annoy or injure me. I am justified in supposing this, as Mr. Cockburn mixes the trivial subject of his former letters, which he says consisted of a simple question with new matter of a malicious kind, and thereby discloses his motive and the plausible tenor of his correspondence.’

“ Let me say, Sir, that there is not one word of truth in these idle and absurd imaginings. I wrote your Department in my public capacity as a member of Parliament, in the public interest, and to protect the sportsmen of this city and neighbourhood against the continuation of an abuse. I was never asked professionally or otherwise to prosecute Mr. Whitcher nor any one else, nor had I any such intention; and I have further to say that I never had the distinguished honour of having a brother-in-law in Mr. Whitcher’s Department, nor indeed any other relation by blood or kindred in any of the

Departments of the Civil Service. The whole story is either a wicked invention or a singular hallucination.

“ I observe, with satisfaction, by the concluding words of your letter to me, that the practice of employing Dominion officers, in connection with game protection, is hereafter to be discontinued; so far good, it would have been better, however, had this been conceded at first, as it might possibly have saved the reputation of an official whose pen has been proved to be prolific of blunders and absurdities.

* * *

“ I am, Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

(Signed,) “ JAMES COCKBURN.

“ The Hon. J. C. Pope,

“ Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

“ Ottawa.”

I have again to say that, when a public officer, in any Department, ventures to go outside of his duty, and to enquire into and criticise the motives of a member of Parliament in bringing a charge against his Department, he is doing that which, I trust, this House will never sanction. The mischief of such a pretension must be evident. Perhaps there is a moral lesson in it, for it comes home to all in this Chamber. The gentleman says he has a perfect right to employ these policemen in any one part of his domain, because, he says, he has private interests, and he has a right to supplement the services of the policeman by giving them some pay for the performance of those services, although they are connected with the protection of fish. In one paper (the circular) he ignores that view of the case, and says these officers have the duty to perform, and no remuneration at all. Poor fellows! They have been working for the public, in the interest of game protection, and they have the reward of knowing that they have been doing their duty free of any kind of remuneration. But now he says, in this report of the 1st of October:

“ If I choose, or any other person chooses, to employ a policeman, or fishery officer, to work for me, at my own expense, there is nothing objectionable about it. * * * * There is certainly no novelty about the practice. Even clerks in the House of Commons, the Senate, and other public officers sometimes assist members and Ministers, who have professional or domestic affairs to conduct. Nobody thinks of seriously questioning the use of time, fuel, light, office accommodation, stationery, etc., etc.—incidents to this custom. There is an honourable understanding of the distinction between using and abusing such common privileges.”

So we have Mr. Whitcher catching at what takes place in this Chamber and also in the Departments, putting himself on a level with Ministers and members, and saying that, because these things are tolerated there, he is, therefore, to be at liberty to employ the Dominion Police in the protection of his private interests, as the possessor of certain sporting privileges on this river. In conclusion, I have to say that this matter has been made the subject of a good deal of newspaper criticism and correspondence. There has been some party feeling about it, and I have no doubt an effort has been made in this House to canvass the question with members and to raise, if possible, a prejudice against this motion, which, however, is made entirely for the reasons I have given. I have nothing, whatever, to say, for or against Mr. Whitcher personally. I know very little about him, and I do in this case as I would in every other, where I see a man stepping forward and assuming to take upon himself a power and privilege which will give him a special advantage and exclude everybody else from the same. Where such is done and is not backed up by the authority of law, I will be always one to protest against it. I beg now, Mr. Speaker, to submit this motion for the papers.

MR. WRIGHT: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. member for West Northumberland. During the past autumn, my attention had been called, through the public press, to the condition of things which existed in the county of Ottawa, in connection with this matter. On the 19th of November, 1879, an article appeared in the *Aylmer Times*, a paper published in the county of Ottawa, in which the following statement was made:

"Some three or four of our people left, some days ago, to pass a few days fishing and shooting in the township of Lochaber, some thirty miles north-west of this village. After spending a few days tranquilly, they were visited, on Thursday last, by a fishing detective from Ottawa; but, fortunately for them, he found nothing in their possession to incriminate them. They confiscated two or three old nets, the property of a settler on the lake. How is this? Any number of gentlemen from Ottawa, many of them connected with the Fishery Department, can go where they please, and no attention is paid to them; but let a resident of the county go out into the northern wilds and he is dogged by a Govern-

ment detective. Along the front of this township (Buckingham), is also a Government reserve, both for fish and fowl. About a month ago, some of our sportsmen went down to the bays that extend along the whole breadth of this township, when they were met by a Dominion policeman, and informed that they would not be allowed to shoot, as the whole of the bay was under the Government. Nevertheless, week after week, parties in Ottawa come down and shoot without let or hindrance, under the eyes of one of the heads of the Department of Fishery and Fowls. This thing has gone far enough. It is the duty of our member, Mr. Alonzo Wright, to see that equal justice will be meted out to us, and that his own constituents, at least, have an equal right with others; and that when a license is applied for to fish in our lakes, and the law complied with, that the same may be granted, on the payment of the legal fee, and no favour shown."

It must be evident that such an appeal from my constituents could not be made in vain. Accordingly, I made the most careful enquiry into the truth of the statements made in the letter, and I am satisfied of its substantial correctness. Representations have been also made to me by many of my constituents, which convinced me that they have been illegally, unjustly and unfairly dealt with. Capt. Archibald McNaughton, an old friend of my own, and a gentleman whose respectability and veracity cannot be questioned, corroborates all these statements. I have in my possession a letter written by Mr. Joseph Riopelle, in which he states that he thought he had some rights as a Canadian, but is now satisfied that a Canadian has no rights which a fishery officer is bound to respect. He states that he was driven from these grounds by a Dominion policeman, in a most insolent and offensive manner. Now, Sir, I agree with the gentleman who wrote to the *Aylmer Times*, that this has gone far enough, and that such illegal interference with the rights and privileges of my constituents can no longer be tolerated, and that the insolence of these officials shall be promptly rebuked by their superiors. We all thought that the functions of the Department were accurately defined by the name Marine and Fisheries, but it appears that they claim dominion, not only over the waters and the fish therein, but likewise the fowls of the air, and the *ferce nature*, the animals of the forest. Their motto should be: "*Per mare per terram.*" This is not the first time I have had to complain of the insolence and arrogance

of Dominion officials. During the late *regime* my constituents were most wantonly outraged by the Inspector of Weights and Measures, who treated them as though they were the inhabitants of a conquered country, confiscating their weights and measures in a most tyrannical and offensive manner. Representations to that effect were made to me by the late lamented Col. Pritchard, of Wakefield, Messrs. C. Devlin and Prentiss, of Aylmer, and most of the leading merchants of the county. I did all in my power to obtain redress for them but unhappily without effect. I hope that, in the future, nothing of this kind will occur. It may be said, that this is a small matter, and unworthy of the attention of this House and the country. But I maintain, that any matter that affects the rights, privileges, and liberties of my constituents, or any portion of the Canadian people, is not too small to engage the attention of the members of a free Parliament. The thirty shillings, which Hampden was called on to pay as his share of the ship money, was a small matter; but it was the principle which troubled him. To use his own words, he could lend his money as well as another, but he feared the curse invoked in Magna Charta, on anyone who should palter with the rights and privileges and liberties of the English people; and so, for this thirty shillings, for the principle involved in this payment, he threw himself across the pathway of a despotic monarch, of a haughty aristocracy, of the minions of a court, and cheerfully gave his life for the rights and liberties of the land he loved so well. And so I, too, fear the curse invoked on all hon. members of Parliament who shall palter with the rights, privileges, and liberties of their constituents. A curious custom prevails in the English Channel Islands, called the *clameur de haro*. It was ordained by Duke Rollo of Normandy, that if any of his subjects were wronged they might appeal to him and his successors for all time to come, until the final judgment day. Mr. Freeman tells us, in his history of the Norman Conquest of England, that when William the Conqueror was carried to his rest in the great Abbey of Caen, a Norman Knight, Ascelin by name, barred the pathway of the procession, and claimed

that he had been unjustly deprived of the land on which the Abbey had been built, and at the grave in which the Conqueror was to be laid he made his appeal to Rollo. And these fierce Normans, who had stormed the heights of Hastings, and slaughtered King Harold and his fighting men, and conquered broad England, halted before the open grave, and the appeal to Rollo was heard, and the wrong was righted, before the stark King could be laid to his rest. And to-day, in the English Channel Islands, if a subject of Duke Rollo is wronged, he calls on his Prince for aid and succour, and his cry goes up through the dim centuries, and the Prince hears his cry, and comes to his rescue, and though his followers were down in the press of battle, and his successor the Queen of England, rights the wrong done to the subject of Duke Rollo, and so we trust it will be in every English land until the final judgment day. And so my constituents being wronged, appeal to this Parliament, which represents all the traditions and privileges of the English Parliament from the beginning to the present day. It is this principle of justice, of liberty, and regard for law which forms the basis of the English system. It is this principle of liberty and justice, and equality of all before the law, which makes us to differ, as Lord MacAuley tells us, from the serfs who crouch beneath the sceptre of Brandenburg or Braganza. I was told only the other day, in a sneering manner, that this was a small matter and unworthy of the attention of the House, because only a few poor miserable hunters and fishermen who were concerned. This was not strictly true, although I believe that many poor hunters and fishermen have been wronged, for my constituents are as substantial and well to do a body of people as are in the Dominion; but if this statement had been correct, if these people had been poor and miserable, so much the stronger the reason why their member should defend them. If they were rich and powerful they might defend themselves. But, Sir, I would say as Touchstone did of Audrey: She may be a poor thing, but she is all mine own. It would be a base and infamous thing in me to desert those, who have stood to me in storm and sunshine because they were poor and unable to defend themselves, to allow their rights and

privileges to be interfered with by officials whose stipends come from the earnings of the masses of the people. I recollect well the first canvass I made in the forest county which I have the honour to represent, very often we had no town hall in which to assemble, no roof to shelter our heads, but in the heart of the primeval forest, with the tall pines waving over our heads, we held our sylvan gatherings. The impression made on my mind will never be erased, as I saw the hardy settlers, the pioneers of civilization, come trooping to the place of rendezvous. They were exiles from many a land, all the divers elements—English, Irish, Scotch, French—which make up our people, and every man had his tale of wrong, oppression and outrage to relate. At last the meeting would be organised and the chairman would announce to me its decision. He would say, and the statement of one was that of all: We care not for abstract questions of politics; with regard to the great questions of the day, do as you will; with us the great struggle is for existence. All we ask of you is to guide and assist us, and to stand between us and our oppressors. Well, I have done so to the best of my ability. In season, and out of season, I have been at their service. If they came to my door at midnight, I was ready to do their bidding. And my reward has been the faithful and loyal support of as many and independent body of constituents as the sun ever shone upon. But it is not a pleasant life to lead to make, day after day, the everlasting round of the Departments without any result—to climb those awful stairs which Dante describes as the punishment of politicians, to wait patiently in the ante-chambers of the great, to witness the perpetual exaltation of the creature above the Creator, and to bear the insolence of office, such is the everlasting round to which politicians are, doubtless, for their sins condemned. It is not a pleasant task, and no gentleman could perform it, were it not for the pleading eyes and wan cheeks which force us to it. I did not wish to take any part in the discussion of this matter, but was forced to do so by my constituents, and sense of public duty. I have the greatest respect for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and for many of the able officers who compose its staff. I have

also a feeling of great respect for its author and creator, the Hon. Peter Mitchell, who may be said to have evolved it from his inner consciousness. And if we have reaped the rich harvest of the sea—if we have swept five millions of American dollars into the Treasury of the Dominion. The meshes of the nets were woven and the lines and buoys, by which that operation was performed laid down, by the patient perseverance, practical ability, and statesmanlike sagacity of the Hon. Peter Mitchell. But my regret is, that the services which he rendered to the Dominion have not received a better reward. But in the political field the fruition never equals the expectation. The labourer who sows rarely reaps the harvest, and we are told the race is not to the swift, the battle to the strong, or riches to men of understanding. I say this without wishing to derogate in the slightest degree, from the services rendered by the late Minister of Marine, in carrying out the most difficult and delicate negotiations which resulted so satisfactorily in the Halifax Award. We have been frequently told that the Dominion of Canada ranks fifth among the maritime powers of the world, and certainly of the Department of Marine functions are of a most important character. The duty is to look after all our marine affairs, to do for the toilers of the sea what the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is supposed to do for those on the land, guard, aid, and assist them; to stud our ironbound coasts and inland waters with lighthouses and beacon-lights; to make the shrill music of the fog-whistle warn the mariner of his danger; to ponder to the passions of the piscatorial tribes; to increase the food supply of the nation; these are a few of the duties which devolve on this Department. Among the ideas which preside over the development of the human intellect, that of industry occupies a most important position, but there are also the ideas of the good, the true, the beautiful and the just. If I am permitted, I think I can show that, in addition to obtaining for us material advantages, the Department has conferred on us a genuine intellectual pleasure. We all recollect the debates which took place between the two knightly Chancellors of the Exchequer on the question of finance. We

MR. WRIGHT.

know that the finances of a nation are most important factors and elements of prosperity, and under the *ancien regime*, a good old rule, a simple plea obtained that they might take who have the power, and they might keep who can. King John was in the habit of replenishing his exchequer by extracting the teeth from the Jewish money-lenders, one by one, until the requisite number of shekels were handed over. But the whirligig of time brings its revenges, and now when the Hebrew star, financially at least, is lord of the ascendant, one fears that the descendants of Isaac of York will make us pay compound interest for all the dental operations performed on their ancestor. Lord Macaulay tells us that the rule which applies to individuals does not apply to nations; that the course which in the individual produces calamity, in the nation produces prosperity. With regard to the individual, the system of that eminent economist—the late Wilkins Micawber undoubtedly obtains, income £20; expenditure £19.19s.6s., result, happiness; income, £20, expenditure, £20.0s.6d.—result misery. With regard to nations there is a grander system and more glittering generalisation. Lord Macaulay assures us that the more a nation gets into debt, the richer it becomes, and the Englishman of to-day is better able to pay the interest of 800,000.000, than the Englishman of the time of William the Third was able to pay the interest of 1,000,000. If this statement of his lordship be correct, it is a most comforting economical evangel. If the ratio of prosperity is that of our debt, we may ask: "Oh, what shall the harvest be." The English debt was incurred for foreign wars and subsidies to foreign nations; the Canadian debt is incurred in developing our material resources—constructing a great railway across the Continent, and let us trust solving the great problem of the Empire by transferring the surplus population of England, Ireland and Scotland to the fertile lands of the North-West, and the older Provinces, let us trust that Lord Macaulay's theory is correct, and that a Greater Britain will be founded on this side of the Atlantic. I have alluded to the debates which took place between the two knightly Chancellors of the Exchequer, they reminded us of the picture painted

by Sir Walter Scott of the combat between Saladin and Cœur de Leon near the little well of the desert. The little well representing the Dominion Treasury, in which we hope the water will never get low. The fierce Sir Richard swooped down like an eagle from his eyrie on the Conservative Cœur de Leon, who for forty years had fasted from everything except sin, who for forty had never tasted what the hon. member from Vancouver would call a truly British beverage—horse and man went down before the infidel knight, and the National Policy shrieked when good Sir Leonard fell. But the race is not to the swift—the battle to the strong, nor the best loans to Liberal financiers. Many a victory has been lost through over confidence, and here I will address myself to the military members of this House, and not to lawyers and laymen who cannot be expected to understand such matters. If stout King Harold had kept his bold brothers and his Kentish axemen within entrenchments at Simlac, not been lured to the fatal pursuit of Eustace of Boulogne, the Norman's would have been driven to their ships, and English history written in a different manner, and the descendants of Harold be seated directly, as they are seated indirectly on the English Throne. If the Emperor Napoleon had known of the sunken ditch of Otrain, the last desperate charge of the Imperial Guard at Waterloo might not have been made in vain, fierce Sir Richard desiring to obtain possession of the talisman the mystical National Policy which had brought victory to the Conservatives and defeat to the Liberals, dismounted from his steed of darkness, and lost the advantage he had obtained. The stout Sir Leonard who had gained strength Antea-like from his mother earth, and partaken of a draught from that crystal fountain, which for forty years had been his only beverage, retired within the leafy coverts of finance, where the little foxes play, and soon emerged therefrom with the largest loan at the smallest rate of interest—the fatest pullett from his opponents hen-roost. We all remember the excitement of these contests, how the fierce light of the London Stock Exchange dazzled our eyes, and the mystical mirage of lapsed balances led to optical and mental delusions. And so it was with a feeling

of great pleasure I saw the past and present Ministers of Marine, like two tall admirals, nail their colours to the mast, and hoist the signal for action.

“As they drifted on their path,
There was silence deep as death
And the boldest held his breath
For a time.”

Like the soldiers of Xenophon we cried, Thelatta, as we heard the murmur of the sad sea waves and felt the fresh sea breeze fanning our heated brows. It was a contest of leviathans, a combat of marine monsters, which a great painter would have liked to depict. Mr. Green tells us in his history of the English people how the great Armada sailed in slow and stately and Spanish fashion to the conquest of our English land, and so the late Minister sailed in stately manner to the conquest of the present occupant of the Treasury Benches, but the hardy Islander, only waited for the word to spring upon his foe. We all know the result of that contest, which need not be repeated. We of the rank and file on both sides of the House, smelt the battle from afar, and like the Norman and Breton fishermen, waited quietly for the waifs and strays which might come to the shore, without caring for any nice questions of flatsam or jetsam which might arise. I think I have proved that the late Minister of Marine has deserved well of his country—has brought five millions of American dollars into the Treasury of the Dominion. He has founded a piscatorial aristocracy. He has conferred on us a genuine intellectual pleasure, and I now proceed to show how he secured for us a social recognition. A few years ago Canada was a *terra incognita*, a land of outside barbarians in which, socially speaking, there was much weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. To the average Englishman it was like that heath on which the weird sisters haled the Thaul of Cawdor, it was a “blawsted country.” It was a country in which many Englishmen had made investments in a great railway likely to be of a permanent character. It was a land of magnificent distances, of great forests, rushing rivers, great inland seas, and inhabited by a people that never calculated odds, and fancied they could hold their own against all-comers, as their fathers did in 1812. It was a land inhabited by people of

diverse nationalities, by many Frenchmen, who preserved the ancient faith, gentle courtesy, and chivalrous gallantry of their Norman and Breton ancestors; by many Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, who had made for themselves fair homes in the wilderness, and were animated by devoted love to their Queen and undying love for the old lands beyond the sea. It was a land on which the people looked on toadies and flunkies much as the free Northmen looked on the creeping and crouching and crawling things which abased themselves before the Byzantine Emperors. It was a land without a literature of its own, but where the people were satisfied with the Bible, the Shakespeare, the Milton, the Bunyan, of their fathers. It was, with some drawbacks, a beautiful land waiting, like the statue made by Pygmalion, to be warmed into life by the caresses of its Creator. It was in this benighted land a new day was about to dawn, in which a new social evangel was about to be preached. The late hon. Minister of Marine had secured for us a great store of treasure, and founded a piscatorial aristocracy. He determined to procure for us social recognition. Accordingly, he despatched an eminent official, who combined the graces of a Chesterfield with the diplomatic talents of a Tallyrand, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the older civilizations. At first the Canadian Chesterfield was not as successful as we had a right to anticipate. An eminent statesman, who occupies a high place in the estimation of his countrymen, was at that time in England. Any compliment paid to him would have been regarded as a compliment paid to the Canadian people. It is true that we may mourn his peculiar proclivities, and regret that we are not able to fathom the mystery of his mystical minorities. We might regret his roaring speech at Aurora, and his unhappy allusion to the inhospitality of British Columbia; but for all that, he is a statesman of which any country might be proud. In the plenitude of his power, the Envoy Extraordinary determined to launch the bark of the statesman on the social sea; but man proposes and the Department disposes. In this country—in Canada—it is the man we consider, and

not the clothes he wears; the head, and not the hat which covers it. In the older countries a different rule obtains, the clothes take precedence of the man, the hat of the head which covers it. For the first time we realise the full significance of the clothes philosophy, which is propounded by Mr Carlyle in Sartor Resartus. But one swallow does not make summer, and one defeat does not deter a great general. The Envoy Extraordinary, literally came, saw and conquered. His success were duly recorded in the journals of this arctic lumber village, to borrow the language of Mr. Goldwin Smith. As account after account reached us, those accounts which quickened the slow pulse of Canadian society, those accounts told us of breakfasts with barons, lunches with lords, and delicious dinners with dukes and duchesses, we felt that many cubits had been added to our Canadian stature, that at last we had been admitted to what Mr. Stanley calls the brotherhood of nations. It might have been thought, that after all these achievements, the Department would have been satisfied. It had created a navy, replenished the Treasury, founded a piscatorial aristocracy, and secured for us social recognition, but the French proverb says "l'appetit viendrai a mangeant." Mr. Buckle tells us, that there is no instance on record of a nation or individual having power without abusing it. The Department had the northern part of this continent on which to work its will, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with three marine miles of our coasts in which to cast its nets. All our magnificent inland seas, in which to promote the passions of the piscatorial tribes, every river and brook and rivulet within the Dominion was at its disposal. It had all the fishes in the sea, but it must have the fowls of the air as well. It was like Ahab, who although he cast his glance over the great expanse of moorland and mountain which composed his domain, could not keep the gleam of the grapes in poor Naboth's vineyard out of his covetous eyes. One would have thought that having almost a continent at their disposal, they might have left the county of Ottawa alone.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex): After having listened to the eloquent address of the hon. member for Ottawa County, who

has treated us to his classical quotations and poetical allusions, it must be felt that it would be a dangerous matter to infringe upon the dignity which doth hedge about the "King of the Gatineau," who has evidently ridden into town on his Pegasus this morning. With a view, not of controverting anything that has been said, but rather of bringing out all the papers necessary to understand this matter of the enforcement of the Game Laws by the Marine and Fisheries Department, I desire to move, that additional information be furnished by adding certain words to the motion. The hon. member for Ottawa has wandered very far afield from the solitary Dominion policeman on the little bay on the north shore of Ottawa county, who was the cause of all the trouble. The hon. gentleman's speech reminds one of the lecture of Artemus Ward on "Africa," the great feature of which was, that in a lecture occupying more than an hour in delivery, no reference was made to the dark continent. In order to put the question more fairly before the House, I purpose, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, reading a letter addressed by the Commissioner of Fisheries to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is as follows:—

"DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES,
"OTTAWA, 1st Oct., 1789.
"MEMORANDUM.

"THE HON. J. C. POPE,

"*Minister of Marine and Fisheries.*

"In re further letter of Hon. Jas. Cockburn referred to the undersigned for particulars:—

"Copies of the previous correspondence to which the Hon. James Cockburn's present letter refers are herewith.

"Mr. Cockburn complains that my replies are impertinent, officious and evasive. I respectfully submit them to the hon. Minister's judgment, believing them and having intended them to be courteous, regular and satisfactory, as is proved by the following summary of the questions put and answers given:—

"Letter No. 1 asks if any and what 'bays, lands and marshes' on the north shore of the Ottawa River are reserved from the public. Also mentions an occurrence in connection with which it is asked if the same took place by my order or that of the Department; and by what authority or law two gentlemen were prevented from shooting near Buckingham wharf.

"Answered, by specifying the limits of reserves; and promising enquiry into the circumstances of the case mentioned. It was added the places referred to could only be visited for sport by consent of owners.

"Letter No. 2 states that this answer does not convey the information desired, and puts an entirely different question relative to a place which is assumed to be, but is *not* within the limits, and is known to be private property; and also asks if any person 'shooting snipe' thereon will be turned off by a policeman or other official of the Department.

"Answered, apologising if the reply failed to convey the information desired, and adding that the places to which his notes referred are not within the limits described. Also explaining at length the necessity for excluding the general public from places used in connection with fish-breeding.

"Letter No. 3 puts the same questions in a different shape, applying the enquiry as to persons shooting snipe 'on any of the marshes or bays on the Ottawa river,' being subject to interference by a Government policeman or other official under orders of the Department.

"Answered, that the rule adopted at all the fish-breeding places in the Dominion prevented strangers from using the premises without authority. Manifestly no answer was needed as affects any other of the places named, as it had been already stated in my first letter that they were private property, and could be used only by consent of the owners, with whom public officers (as such) had no connection. Besides, the shooting was not anywhere controlled by this Department.

"Letter No. 4 pronounces this civil and sufficient answer impertinent, and styles my previous replies officious evasions. They were written during your absence and in your name; this being the ordinary mode of conducting the office correspondence under official sanction. No answer was necessary. Meanwhile the two gentlemen whose 'case' Mr. Cockburn had in view made their statement and received explanations. One of them was satisfied; the other said he had consulted Mr. Cockburn and threatened a law-suit. The instance referred to proved to have been an entirely private affair, which occurred some four miles away from where the Government guardian is located, and outside of any reservation, as Mr. Cockburn admits. Knowing of the threatened law-suit by Mr. Cockburn's client, I was the more cautious in answering his enquiries; and it now seems to me that it is not because, as he pretends, the proper information was withheld, but because he did not elicit such replies as would commit either the Department, a policeman or myself, and afford some foundation for the intended suit."

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): What is the hon. gentleman reading?

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) stated that he desired to justify the conduct of the official whose conduct had been under discussion. He read extracts from the official correspondence between Mr. Whitcher and the head of the Department and others upon the subject.

MR. COCKBURN asked if the hon.

MR. PATTERSON.

gentleman was reading from a printed paper.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): Does the hon. gentleman, to whom the letter which is now being read was addressed, know that this official correspondence has been printed by Mr. Whitcher for the use of his friends outside of the Department? I think this is a very irregular course, and one which should at once be condemned by this House. The hon. gentleman is reading from a printed paper, which is a copy of the one addressed to the Minister. That paper has been printed by Mr. Whitcher for private use in this House, before the motion has been granted and before the papers have been ordered by this House to be made public.

MR. MACKENZIE: This cannot go any further. If the hon. gentleman is reading from papers belonging to the Fishery Department, and which have not been laid before this House, it is quite irregular. We are all as much entitled to these papers as he is. I ask the right hon. the First Minister to interfere.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The interruption of the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) is quite irregular. The hon. gentleman who has the floor was reading some papers; when he is through we can judge. We can judge whether the Department of Marine and Fisheries has given documents out improperly, or for improper publication. The hon. gentleman can read any paper he likes. We can judge what it is when he gets through.

MR. COCKBURN: He has stated what he is reading.

MR. MACKENZIE: I understood him to say so.

MR. PATTERSON: I did not obtain it from the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. COCKBURN: I have asked the hon. gentleman if he was reading a paper containing the remarks addressed by Mr. Whitcher to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and he has admitted that he was reading a copy of an official document, which is one of the papers I have asked this House to order to be laid on the Table. It has been printed, as I am informed, for the use of the members without the knowledge of his

chief; and if that is so it ought not to be read.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That has to come out by-and-bye. The hon. gentleman is as much a member of this House as the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn); they stand in exactly the same positions; the hon. member for West Northumberland read from papers; he had a right to read them, and so has the hon. member for Essex the same right. The question as to whether the documents have been properly or improperly put in print is another matter.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): I read from a paper which was addressed to me by the Department and became my private property the moment it was mailed to my address; but the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) is reading from the official records of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and he has admitted that he is so reading.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not see why he should not read any document, if it is legitimately in his possession. Let us hear the whole case, and then we can judge. There is nothing irregular or improper in what the hon. gentleman has been doing.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex): Well, Sir, the letter which I was reading runs on as follows:—

“The spiteful attack on myself, made by his present letter No. 5, is probably as much in revenge, for failing to commit me in the interest of his client, as for a previous act connected with the dismissal of the late Fishery overseer, J. K. Cameron, by your predecessor, for which Mr. Cockburn has unjustly blamed me and openly avowed his intention to annoy or injure me. I am justified in supposing this as Mr. Cockburn mixes the trivial subject of his former letters, which, he says, consisted of a simple question; with new matter of a malicious kind, and thereby discloses his motive and the plausible tenor of his correspondence.

“The statements now made, and gratuitous assumptions advanced, relate chiefly to personal matters; and although I might properly decline to gratify Mr. Cockburn's desire by giving any explanation of private affairs, I will gladly do so in deference to the hon. Minister if so desired. Such of his remarks, however, as can be separated from the rest and replied to as public matter, are noticed as follows:—

“Mr. Cockburn asserts—‘It appears that Mr. Whiteher, while acting for the Department in certain fish-breeding arrangements, on the Ottawa River, acquired a personal interest in certain bays and marshes for the purpose of

shooting game (I assume this to be the fact partly from his own words and partly from other information) and that under his orders the policemen or officers employed for the protection of the fish-breeding operations have acted as his special game-keepers and personal servants, and that they recently ordered from off certain of the marshes (not even within the limits of the lands held by the Department, as I am informed) certain gentlemen of this city who were merely engaged in the lawful sport of snipe-shooting, and who were not in any way interfering with fish-breeding, a process which, I believe, cannot be prosecuted where men can walk and where fish can swim.’

“I emphatically deny that ‘policemen’ or ‘officers’ employed by the Department are used by me as special game-keepers and personal servants—presumably at the public expense, for that is the only objection there could be against doing so; or that any such persons acted in a public capacity as Mr. Cockburn alleges towards certain gentlemen of this city. This latter fact has been already explained to the gentlemen in question. If I choose, or any other person chooses, to employ a policeman or fishery officer to work for me at my own expense, there is nothing ‘objectionable’ about it; and there is nothing ‘novel,’ for the Department allows salaried fishery officers to act as private guardians on the salmon rivers, and they are paid therefor by the lessees. It is an advantage to the public service, by enabling this Department to hire efficient men at salaries, their pay being supplemented by private contribution. Dominion policemen are also allowed to act apart from their regular duties at public places, or in business for private persons. Parliamentary and Departmental messengers notoriously perform many public services for public men and government officials, as well as for private citizens, that would hardly appear deserving of formal protest by any public man of many years' experience. There is certainly no novelty about the practice. Even clerks in the House of Commons, the Senate and other public offices, sometimes assist members and Ministers who may have professional or domestic affairs to conduct. Nobody thinks of seriously questioning the use of time, fuel, light, office accommodations, stationery, etc., etc., incident to this custom. There is an honourable understanding of the distinction between using and abusing such common privileges. But I claim that by paying for any personal service rendered to me by fishery constables or policemen (on or off duty) there is no room for reasonable objection, provided there is no interference with regular duties for which they are paid by the public.

“Respecting the practice of which Mr. Cockburn complains of allowing fishery officers to enforce the Game Laws, which are under control of the Provincial Governments, the same objections would apply to the Insectivorous Birds Act, and to that part of the Sabbath Observance Statute which relates to fishing on Sundays; also to the municipal law relating to the obstruction and pollution of streams. Occasion is taken to mention that formerly the game laws were enforced by fishery officers under occa.

sional instructions, and endeavours have been made to have these laws placed under jurisdiction of the Dominion Government. There was no additional cost, although some extra trouble, attending this arrangement, and it proved advantageous to both the fishery and public interests, as the persons who usually frequent the shooting places for water-fowl are the very persons who fish illegally, and also shoot fish in the bays and marshes; and when they have no 'lawful excuse' for being about these bays and other localities where fish and game abound, the expense and trouble of keeping them away is very much lessened. The Provincial authorities have always materially assisted Dominion officers in enforcing the Fishery Laws, so that we are every way gainers by the exchange. In fact the two services are so peculiarly related that the public interest in both of them would be greatly promoted by their combination under uniform authority. However, if the Minister, in view of the Hon. Mr. Cockburn's exception to the system, thinks it advisable to instruct the fishery officers in future to abstain from enforcing the game laws and other Provincial Acts, it will spare me considerable personal trouble and expense, and relieve all and singular of us from unremunerative and apparently thankless duty.

"Respectfully,

"W. F. WHITCHER,

"Commissioner of Fisheries."

The result of the correspondence was that a circular was issued to the Fishery Overseers of the Dominion, and this having been sent to me led me to enquire into the causes which induced the Department to issue this circular; and I find in the course of my enquiries that the Fishery Overseers have been the only parties acting in the preservation of game. Their services in that respect have been very great. I came into possession of the correspondence read to this House, in the course of my enquiries. It is to be regretted that there is a divided authority and that the game laws are not under the control of one Department, instead of being under dissimilar Provincial regulations, so that there could be a due enforcement of the game laws. In moving my amendment, I desire to establish some facts, but before they can be established the circular will need to be read; however, as the motion will call for the production of the circular I will not now trouble the House by reading it. It will be among the papers to be brought down under this motion, and it will be satisfactory evidence of the manner in which the Fishery Overseers have performed their duties. I therefore move the following amendment:—

MR. PATTERSON.

That the following words be added at the end of the said motion:—"including also reports and accounts of Dominion Policemen, or other officers, employed by the said Department in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec during the same period, explaining what proportion, if any, of the expenses incurred by them in the service of protecting the Fisheries relates to the enforcement of any of the Provincial Statutes affecting hunting and fishing; together with a statement showing in what manner the Provincial authorities may have co-operated with Dominion officers in enforcing the Fishery Laws."

MR. MACKENZIE: I wish to call attention to the point I raised just now. The ground I took was that the hon. member for Essex could not read from official papers unless they were laid upon the Table of the House. The hon. gentleman disputed that. I am certain I was correct in my contention. I find it laid down in *May*, page 320, as follows:—

"A Minister is not permitted to read or quote from any despatch or other state paper unless he is prepared to lay it on the Table * * * The principle is so reasonable that it has not been contested, and, when the objection is made in time, it has been generally acquiesced in."

Then cases were cited in the British Parliament in 1865, in which this principle was maintained. A public document obtained from one of the Departments has been cited, and it must, therefore, according to the rule of Parliament, be laid on the Table of the House. Early in the Session, I complained that the hon. member who moved the Address was supplied with documents which he used in the debate and which were not laid upon the Table as I demanded. This practice ought to be put a stop to. It places every member at a disadvantage, except the hon. Minister or the hon. member to whom he gives documents of this kind. I, therefore, claim that this document should be at once laid on the Table, and ask your ruling.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is quite right in claiming that the document should be laid on the Table for the use of hon. members. The rule is very properly laid down in *May*, when he says that no second-hand evidence can be given, but that the documents should be produced at once. But what I object to is that my hon. friend (Mr. Patterson) should be interrupted in the course of the discussion, on the ground that he was quoting an official document

which could not be used until it was first laid upon the Table of the House. That objection is quite unsupported by the authority the hon. member (Mr. Mackenzie) read. Of course, the papers ought to be produced. In the remarks I made when I first spoke on the question, I vindicated the right of the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) to quote these documents. I thought he had quite as much right to use them as the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn) had to use those he quoted. At the same time, I am bound to say that a very strong case has been made out by my hon. friend from West Northumberland, and I think also, while the hon. member for Essex had full right to answer him in such remarks as he thought proper to make, that, as far as the officer himself is concerned, if he placed the papers in the hands of the hon. member for Essex, he was guilty of an act of insubordination, and guilty of gross disrespect to the hon. Minister in charge of the Department. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Pope) will find it his duty to enquire how a subordinate officer, even though he may be mixed up directly or personally in the matter, dare take papers from his chief's hands, and place them in the hands of a member of Parliament. I think this matter should be fully enquired into, and, unless the fault is satisfactorily explained, the officer is worthy of censure. There is no doubt we have nothing to do with the preservation of game. We have full charge of all legislation respecting Navigation and Fisheries, and the duty of protecting the Fisheries is imposed upon the Dominion Government; but the game laws, from the conflict of jurisdiction between the Provinces and the Dominion, do not belong to the Federal Government, but are altogether in the hands of the Provincial authorities. Therefore, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or its officials have nothing to do with the *ferre nature* in the various Provinces. I will also say that it was an ill-advised and improper act, and one which ought not to be countenanced, for anyone to take away the Dominion Police from their legitimate duties for the purpose of protecting the rights of any individual either as to fish or flesh. Those officers have specific duties to perform, and their be-

coming game keepers or fish inspectors does not form part of the duties assigned to them. The Dominion Police are here to guard the Government's property and they are to attend to such duties as are imposed upon them by the Government and the heads of the Departments with which they are connected. I feel bound to make these remarks, while at the same time vindicating the right of the hon. member for Essex to proceed with his speech without interruption; but, having made use of those papers, the hon. gentleman is bound, at the request of an hon. member, to lay them upon the Table. I will say further that, if the suspicion of the hon. member for West Northumberland is well-founded that the officer has taken official documents and got them printed and circulated, without the knowledge of the hon. Minister of the Department, he is guilty of an act of insubordination.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no doubt that the practice is that, when a member reads a document, he must be ready to lay it upon the Table of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: I want to see those documents before the debate proceeds.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I will not ask that it be done, but really the hon. member for West Northumberland is bound to lay his papers before the House as well.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex): The document I read was part of the document read by the hon. member for West Northumberland, and I ask that he put his papers before the House.

MR. COCKBURN: I shall put in all mine with the greatest pleasure. But I think the hon. member had better put his in, because I will be able to show that there is a misprint or change in the paper.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.): I have not the slightest objection to lay before the House every paper asked for, and all the information it is possible to give. It appears that there is a pond down the Ottawa river, which was purchased in March, 1878, while the late Government was in power, for the purpose of breeding fish. A large quantity of fish has been put into that pond, and some of the adjoining streams, which have been leased or purchased, I

do not know which, but not with my authority. Officers have been kept down there to protect those fish. As soon as it was represented to me that some of the sportsmen visiting that neighbourhood had been interfered with, I enquired whether any instructions had been issued from the Department to the Fishery officers authorising them to interfere in any way in the protection of game. I was informed that no such instructions had been given. I saw, however, that there was something in the charge, and I caused instructions to be issued to the Fishery officers, informing them that the protection of game formed no part of their duty, and forbidding any interference in that direction for the future. On the 29th September, I received the hon. member's letter complaining that some correspondence had taken place during my absence between the Commissioner of Fisheries and himself, and that not receiving satisfactory explanations from Mr. Whitcher, he had decided to apply to me. I at once sent this letter to Mr. Whitcher and asked him for a report. Two or three days afterwards I was called away to the deathbed of my brother. When I returned, I found an accumulation of business awaiting me, and some delay occurred before the hon. gentleman received an answer. I apologised for the delay, giving the reasons for it, and stated that positive instructions had been given to Fishery officers not to interfere in the future. I do not see why the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) should complain about any interference with the fishermen. No complaint or charge has been made to that effect, and so far as I know there has been no interference. If the hon. gentleman has any complaints to make to the effect that those people have been improperly treated and deprived of their rights by officers of the Department, not a moment will be lost in correcting the offence, and putting his constituents on as good a footing as any others in the Dominion. There are certain regulations which must be carried out, and I know the hon. member's constituents feel it a hardship to conform to those regulations at all times, and to abstain from fishing in the close season. The hon. member for West Northumberland seems to complain of my sending him Mr. Whitcher's report. I did it with the

best feeling in the world; I wanted to show him what the report was, and, although some of the language reflected upon him, I thought it was right he should see the report. With reference to the printed correspondence, I know nothing at all about it. The papers were not issued from the office with my knowledge, and I therefore repudiate all connection with them. There is no law authorising Fishery officers to interfere with the protection of game, and any such interference was without my knowledge or consent.

Mr. WHITE (North Renfrew) : I believe that, if Mr. Whitcher has overstepped the duties appertaining to his office, he has done so with a desire to preserve the game in this particular district. From my knowledge of the destruction of game throughout the Ottawa district, I think it would be desirable if some arrangement could be made between the Dominion and Local Governments of Ontario and Quebec, to protect the game, under the supervision of the Fishery Department. In this district, during 1878 and 1879, a large number of moose and red-deer were recklessly destroyed out of season. I merely rose to throw out the suggestion that, if it were possible to bring about some arrangement between the Local and Dominion Governments for the preservation of game, under the supervision of the Fishery Overseers, a very desirable object would be attained.

Mr. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) : There seems to be an entire misapprehension on the part of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down as to the object of the motion. These proceedings which called it forth have not been taken in the interest of game protection. We are all agreed, I think, that anything that can be legally done for the purpose of saving and protecting the game of the country ought to be done. There is here certainly a pretence of that kind which has been very sedulously put forth with a view of excusing and justifying this high-handed action; but the sole object of Mr. Whitcher was to get the whole of this shooting for his own gun; it was not to protect the game for the general good, but for his own individual good at the expense of everybody else. The right hon. gentleman has put the case very

clearly, as he always does, and I am satisfied and think my hon. friend the member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright) is also, that the object we had in view has been gained by the very clear statement of the law as regards this subject, and the duties of public officers, which has thus been laid down. I just wish to remind the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson) of one thing: I rose to complain that I, as a member of Parliament, in making a charge against a public officer—which anyone will admit I made in proper language—was doing nothing out of the way, but was performing a public duty; and I insisted that, in doing so, my motives were not to be enquired into by any official in any of the Departments; that the hon. gentleman who ventured to do that was going altogether beyond the line of his duty. I stated to the House that that report of the Commissioner of Fisheries was moreover untrue as regards the motives assigned to myself. I used, deliberately, the word "untrue." The hon. gentleman should have allowed my statement to go unchallenged. Every hon. member who rises in his place, and makes a statement, with his hand on his heart, of his own knowledge, must be accepted as speaking the truth. I think, therefore, it was not for the hon. gentleman, after hearing my statement, to allow himself to be made the medium of conveying to this House what I assure him is a slander. The printed statement which he read is not even a correct copy of the one that was officially sent to me. It has been altered. Mr. Witcher himself, having found that the most momentous part of the charge against me which he made to the hon. Minister was untenable, altered it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Essex should not for a moment have lent himself to give currency to a false statement.

Mr. CURRIER: It appears to me that the complaint made against the Commissioner of Fisheries has arisen altogether in consequence of the custom that has prevailed, not only here, but elsewhere, of the guardians of the Fisheries Department looking after the game as well, which they have had no authority to do. Yet that custom has prevailed for years, though not altogether regular. Still those officers have performed a good

work, not in protecting the game for any individual, but for its increase in the interest of the public.

Mr. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): That is not the matter I was dealing with.

Mr. CURRIER: Notwithstanding the complaints against the Fishery officers, they have done a good work on the Ottawa in setting up the fish-breeding establishment, which has, to a very large extent, replenished this river with fish. I hope the Government will encourage that establishment with such appropriations as the case requires. I think that the officer complained of has been greatly instrumental in overcoming the difficulties that existed in connection with the throwing of mill-rubbish into the river. The fish-breeding establishment has settled to a large extent the question as to the effect of this rubbish upon the fish, by proving that sawdust is not detrimental to them, since, in spite of the sawdust, the river could be restocked with fish in so short a time.

Mr. COCKBURN (West Northumberland): Have they done so?

Mr. CURRIER: Everybody along the river says so. Mr. Witcher may have exceeded his duty in using the Government Police, but I believe him to be an efficient officer, and that he acted without selfish motive throughout.

Mr. WRIGHT: I remember hearing of a very distinguished gentleman who made a fortune by minding his own business. I think that perhaps the Department of Marine might take that lesson to heart. Its business is to look after the fish and not the fowl. The hon. member for Ottawa City (Mr. Currier) appears a little confused on the subject. He speaks of the great sawdust question having been settled, and of the benefits of the fish-breeding establishment. I do not think that the cultivation of a few mud-pouts and suckers in the waters of my county has secured a satisfactory solution of this fish question. I should have hoped it had; but my object has been to complain that my constituents have been most unfairly and illegally dealt with, so far as their rights and liberties are concerned, by the officers of the Department, who had no right, as admitted by everyone, to take charge of the fowl. I have my desk full of letters complaining of this interference.

My constituents, many of them French Canadians, have complained of being turned off the sporting grounds by policemen. The people say they think they have a right to shoot so long as there is no law against it. The defence of this action should not be rested upon the fact of the accused being an efficient or desirable officer; he should not be allowed to act simply for his own benefit and that of his friends. That conduct cannot and should not be tolerated.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex): I had no desire to impugn the veracity of the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn). He had read certain passages of a document and denied their truth, when I thought it would be only just to Mr. Whitcher that the whole document should be read. It was in that spirit I read it. But I had no desire in reading it to express the least doubt as to the accuracy of anything the hon. gentlemen said.

MR. MACKENZIE: The attention of the Government ought to be directed to the very extraordinary passage in that letter justifying the employment of the Dominion Police. Explanations were sought for by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), a few evenings ago, with regard to the increase of the vote for Dominion Police, and were given. Now, if a Dominion Policeman may be employed, when off duty, for an hour or two, in doing something about the city, that is one thing allowable; but, if he is taken to guard game, he may be away whilst he should be discharging his proper duties. It is quite clear those policemen have been employed for this purpose; therefore, they must have had nothing to do here. There must have been too many of them, or they could not have been spared for this service. I was glad to hear the hon. the First Minister condemn the whole practice.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I believe the number of Dominion Policemen is the same as under the late Government. It is quite improper that these men should be taken away from their legitimate duties to perform others, however good.

MR. MACKENZIE: With regard to the number of those Policemen, we discovered during the last year of our incumbency of office that two of them had served during the whole of our term,

guarding the ducts of this House from incursions by Fenians. So there were ducts to protect.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is another kind of game.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes; but none of this game was to be found, after all, in the neighbourhood. Those two men might be taken to supplement the Force, or for other purposes.

MR. MACDOUGALL: I think the House ought not to assent too readily to the suggestion that these Dominion Policemen should be confined to their duties in the neighbourhood of these buildings, or in Ottawa, if they can be used for those public purposes clearly within the jurisdiction of this Government, without impropriety. It has long been the practice to use the force in this way—one continued under both political parties. It seems, from the statement of the hon. the First Minister, which has met with the approval of the hon. leader of the Opposition, that that practice of occasionally employing the force on outside service, in cases of exigency, is now to be abandoned. I fear that will involve the appointment of other officers. If economy is to be the result, I do not object, but I doubt if the Dominion Police Force can be much retrenched. Occasions may arise when it will be convenient to have a confidential force near these Ottawa buildings. We have seen the necessity for such a force, and may see it again. I think we cannot safely dispense with an organisation which can be used in the absence of any regular military force; and, therefore, if the Fisheries Department, in the protection of the inland fisheries, a duty clearly within its jurisdiction—though I have doubts as to rivers and brooks—can utilise the force for that purpose—and we have the testimony of the member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier) that they have done so with good results.—I do not see why they should not continue the practice. I, too, can bear my testimony to the great efficiency of Mr. Whitcher, and to the important services he has rendered, not only to this particular interest, the Inland Fishery Service, but on the larger theatre at Washington and Halifax, in matters of international importance. I am very sorry to hear complaints against him, as he was one of my own officers, when as

Commissioner of Crown Lands, I directed this service many years ago; very sorry to find that, his temper being, perhaps, a little irritable, he has found himself at cross purposes with the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn)—a very amiable gentleman, as we all know. I think it would have been better if he had pursued a different course; but I understand the hon. gentleman to be now satisfied with the assurance given that, hereafter, the Fisheries Department will not interfere with the fowls of the air, or with the sporting constituents of the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright). Perhaps it may not be necessary to bring down these papers, after the explanations we have received from the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. While regretting this difficulty, I trust that, notwithstanding the tone of censure of the hon. the First Minister, no measures of severity will be taken against Mr. Whiteher. So far as he has laid down the law in respect to the proper functions of this Government, and the duties of Dominion officers, I entirely agree with him. If the Fisheries Department is to perform, efficiently, its delicate, difficult and important duties in the protection of our Inland Fisheries, it must receive on all proper occasions the support, confidence and generous cooperation of this House.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) mistakes my meaning if he thinks I object to the employment of the Dominion Police upon any other than objects connected with these Buildings. The late Government had occasionally to employ members of the force in connection with charges of coining spurious money in several districts, and that was, though they were remote from this city, a perfectly legitimate employment for those officers. No doubt, the force is somewhat larger than it otherwise would be, on account of having to be employed sometimes in other services than these Buildings would require.

Motion agreed to.

CARLETON (ONT.) ELECTION.—INTER-FERENCE OF HON. R. W. SCOTT.

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY.

MR. ROCHESTER moved:

That Mr. Rochester, Member for Carleton,

having stated in his place in the House, that at the last election of a member of this House for the County of Carleton, the Hon. R. W. Scott, a member of the Senate, and then occupying the position of Secretary of State, did interfere and intimidate in the said election by furnishing money to the Rev. John May, to induce him to become a candidate at the said election, and that the said Hon. R. W. Scott did offer to bribe one John A. Grant, also at said election, to withdraw from the contest in favour of the said May, a Committee be appointed to examine and investigate into the said charges, and that such Committee be composed of Messrs. McCarthy, Thompson (Haldimand), Colby, Trow and Richey, with power to send for persons and papers.

MR. MACKENZIE: I presume the hon. gentleman, at the head of the Government, has not looked after this motion, else he would have made some statement of his views upon it. In the first place it charges the Hon. Mr. Scott with having furnished money to the Rev. John May to induce him to become a candidate at the said election. I would have no hesitation in inducing any friend of mine to become a candidate, if I could help him to pay his legitimate expenses at the election. There is nothing in that charge that should even be mentioned in this House, or anywhere else. The second charge is of a somewhat similar character. Why we should appoint a Committee to investigate charges of this kind does not appear to me very clear. I may say that I have had no communication with the Hon. Mr. Scott on the subject, nor had I looked at the Order Paper in advance to-day, nor even thought of doing so; but if there is anything whatever that comes properly in the nature of a charge, that charge should be brought where the hon. gentleman is a member himself. If there is anything that requires enquiring into, it is questionable if this is the mode of making the enquiry. I do not think there is any precedent for such a course upon our Journals, nor am I aware that there are any anywhere else. There was a charge, two or three years ago, brought against the present Governor of Manitoba, for having in some way intimidated the electors in the county of Montmorency, and that it was framed upon a statement made by a member of the House, when it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and enquired into. That Committee in their report, exonerated the hon. gentleman from all blame in the matter. Ex-

cept that case I cannot recall to mind anything of a similar kind. But the charge made against the Hon. Mr. Cauchon was clearly an offence under the Election Law; he was a member of the House where the charge was made, and the House undoubtedly acted with propriety in sending them to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. This is wholly of a different character. The party against whom the charge is made is not one over whom this House has any control. The offences are not alleged to be contrary to any Statute in existence. The first part of the motion, it is perfectly clear, cannot possibly be a charge of any kind. No power is vested in us to make any enquiry of the kind suggested. I am sure the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has not observed the phraseology of this motion, or considered the propriety of making this motion at all, or he would have drawn the attention of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Rochester) to it.

MR. ROCHESTER: The hon. member for Lambton has, perhaps, forgotten that the Hon. Mr. Scott was then Secretary of State in his Government. I do not for a moment pretend that every hon. Minister has not as much right as any other person to use his due influence in securing the success of an election. But what I complain of is the undue method taken by the hon. gentleman to gain this election. At the last Session I explained to the House the reasons I had for putting this motion on the Notice Paper. I do not think it necessary to go over that again, unless the hon. gentleman opposite desires me to do so. What I complain of is that this hon. member of the late Government sent the employés of the Government into the two counties adjoining the city of Ottawa as canvassers and as returning officers, carrying their confrères to and from this city to the polls, and hiring buggies and paying for them. Now, Sir, what I want to know is who paid all the expenses. If a member of the late Government did so, although he may not be a member of this House, I think he is amenable to this House. Perhaps I am wrong in this—there are better authorities than myself on that point. My object is to show just what course the Hon. Mr. Scott pursued during the late election. The gentleman, whose name is mentioned

in this resolution, styled himself on the hustings at the nomination, "A Tory of the deepest water." I quote his own words. Now, the late Secretary of State took hold of the Rev. Mr. May, who, unfortunate man that he was, like somebody else of old, sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. He sold himself for filthy lucre to run his election with, and to get the influence of the Government of the day, and to secure his return to Parliament. The hon. gentleman in his communications with some of the electors of the county, stated his object in supporting my opponent. His object was to buy over a Conservative in the interests of the Reform Government. He found that he could not run a Reformer in the county of Carleton. The hon. gentleman, in some of those letters, stated that the county of Carleton was not sufficiently well educated to accept a Reformer. I am glad to say it was not, and I hope it never will be. The hon. gentleman thought that the best course for him to pursue was to purchase a Tory, and run him as a Tory with the understanding that if he got in he was to support the Administration of the day. This I will have no trouble to prove if the Government will give us this Committee, and I have no doubt the hon. member for Lambton will be able to throw some light on the subject; for, if I am correctly informed, he was approached but did not give those who approached him any encouragement. The hon. gentleman's answer was to the effect that if a man would sell himself one way he would as readily sell himself another.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: What did he get for himself.

MR. ROCHESTER: I am informed he wanted a certain amount of money with which to pay off certain liabilities and also to pay his election expenses. From all the information we can get, he got the amount he required. Where he got it from, I think it will be interesting for us to know. An hon. gentleman, a Reformer, came out to run for the county of Carleton; the Hon. Mr. Scott was approached on the subject, but he replied that he must run Mr. May. I want, also, to prove before the Committee what every member of the House must admit is a great wrong. It is not right that Civil servants should be used for the purpose of canvassing for

votes for the support of the Government. This, however, was extensively done. I think it only just that the matters I have referred to should come to light; especially as the present stringent Election Law was adopted by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and they were found to be the first to break it. I have received the following letter from Mr. May :

“ To John Rochester, Esq., M.P.

“ SIR,—According to the published report of a speech delivered by you in the House of Commons, I am charged by you with certain nefarious dealings respecting the late contest in the county of Carleton, with the Hon. R. W. Scott, late Secretary of State. If the report of that part of this speech which refers to me be this, that I was bought by the late Government. You further stated that it was your intention to ask for a committee to investigate the charge. I have waited patiently for the fulfilment of this announcement, I have waited in vain. No committee has been granted as yet. No committee has been asked for. Might I presume most respectfully to enquire, ‘Why this delay?’ Is it not cruel to keep Mr. Scott and myself so long in suspense? I can speak for myself—I am ready to meet such committee, I am more than ready, I am anxious to meet such committee. I feel that my character has been traduced—traduced in the most public manner, and in a place where reply was impossible. And I now take the liberty of endeavouring to impress on your mind the fact that, having made the statement above mentioned, and having intimated from your place in the House that you intended to ask for a committee, it is your bounden duty to do so. I would further remark that if you fail to make good your promise, I shall ascribe such failure to the supposition that you are not nearly so willing to meet a committee that will admit evidence on both sides of the electoral contest in Carleton, as I am myself.

“I have sent a copy of this letter to the local press and to the *Globe* and *Mail* of Toronto.

“I have the honor to be, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“J. MAY.

“Ottawa, 18th April, 1879.”

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

FISHERY AWARD—CLAIMS OF THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion, (*Mr. MacDonnell, Inverness*). —[*vide* page 787.]

MR. KILLAM: I desire to ask if the papers in relation to this subject, which the hon. the Minister of Finance stated, were necessary to its proper con-

sideration, and which he also stated would be laid upon the Table this afternoon, will be brought down this evening.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: What I stated was that papers were being prepared which it was necessary the Government should have, before proceeding with this discussion. From this statement the inference was drawn by some hon. gentlemen that these papers would be laid upon the Table of the House. I am willing, however, to lay the papers upon the Table. I have made enquiries concerning them, and I expect they will be laid on the Table of the House before the conclusion of this debate.

MR. RICHEY: I do not require any further papers than are already before the House for the line of argument which I propose to adopt. Before proceeding to the main portion of it, I may be permitted to offer a few observations regarding the course pursued by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House when this question was last under discussion, and followed up in some quarters by their supporters in the press. I think it very objectionable that, in a matter of this kind, hon. gentlemen should resort to the fierce party denunciations in which they have indulged. I submit, that in regard to a question, the solution of which must very largely depend, if it do not entirely depend, upon the impression to be made on the minds of the members of the Administration, fiery declamation cannot be expected to produce any very beneficial effect. When, on behalf of the Government, the request was addressed to this House that an adjournment of the motion should be granted. I felt it to be due, in courtesy, that the adjournment should take place. The motion I then made did not stifle discussion. And what is the position in which we now find the question? Instead of having it at the end of Public Bills and Orders it has, at the request of the right hon. the leader of the Government himself, been placed in the most prominent position. And when it was found inconvenient to proceed with it on Wednesday evening last, the hon. leader of the Government, in the frankest possible manner, offered to give us the following day, a Government day, for the discussion of this matter. We should have

had it before us then had it not been for the technical objection taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition. And now, Sir, I find that I am represented in the *Halifax Chronicle*, by some one having facilities afforded him for hearing debates in this House, and acting as correspondent to that journal, in the following light:—

“After recess, on the adjourned debate concerning the Fisheries Award being called,

“Mr. Richey said the motion should be allowed to stand, and it stood accordingly. This gave profound offence to the Maritime members, who were all ready and expectant of a debate on this much-canvassed subject. Mr. Richey's action was, therefore, received with marks of discontent. It was evident that he was merely acting as a catpaw for the Government, who appear determined to stifle the discussion till such a late period in the Session that it can be of no practical purpose.”

There are just eleven lines in that paragraph and a misstatement for every line. Mr. Richey after the original adjournment did not once ask that the motion should be allowed to stand. It was, as I understand, a matter arranged between the hon. the First Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition. There was no desire manifested on the part of the Government to stifle discussion.

MR. MACKENZIE: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that I had made an arrangement with the hon. leader of the Government to adjourn the discussion.

MR. RICHEY: No; but there was an understanding between the hon. leader of the Government and the hon. leader of the Opposition that it should be proceeded with as early as possible. He then objected to its being taken up on a Government day.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is mistaken. What I said was that I had no objection to their giving up their day, but they must do it in the regular way, by taking up the Orders in their natural sequence and moving either to take each Order separately and pass them over, or move to pass on immediately to that particular Order. That is what I proposed, and the Government declined to do that.

MR. RICHEY: Whatever it was it had the effect of stopping the discussion until the present moment; and I think the position given to this question was the best justification of our confidence that

the Government had no desire to stifle debate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think this is a matter that ought to be settled at once, and with my hon. friend's permission, I will state, to the best of my recollection, how it stands. I stated to the House that it was inconvenient, for the reasons mentioned by my hon. friend, to go on with it at that time, that I would secure him an early opportunity of bringing it on. I said it would be done as the first Order of the Day. My hon. friend objected to this and stated we must call the Orders in turn. I felt the objection taken by the hon. gentleman was a Parliamentary one, and a correct one, therefore, I could only submit.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman consented to give up Thursday, Government day, and as Government Notices have precedence next after Routine Business, the Order for Thursday was Government Measures, and this Order was naturally succeeded Government Orders. It was perfectly competent to move that the First Order of the Day be not taken up, but that the House pass on to the First Order of Public Business. It is one not frequently made with us but it is one that is frequently made in the French Chamber. The Order was that it should be the First Order of the Day, and it was either the First Order or it was nothing.

MR. RICHEY: It is not because I attach any importance, personally, to this matter, that I have thought it necessary to mention it at the commencement of my remarks, but because I deem it a great impropriety for writers, who are here for the purpose of communicating with the press in different sections of the country, to draw upon their inventive powers for the items they supply. I shall now, Mr. Speaker, proceed with the argument which I desire to address to this House. When, in 1872, the question was put in this place, “Whether the Government was prepared to give a pledge that the money compensation which might be obtained by virtue of the Fishery Clause of the Washington Treaty, should be expended for the direct benefit and improvement of our sea Fisheries?” The right hon. gentleman who was then, as he is now the leader of the Government, replied that such money would be

subject to the vote and pleasure of Parliament; and when asked the further question: "Whether any arrangement had been made between Her Majesty's Britannic Government and that of the Dominion?" He said no arrangement had been made; the money would belong to Canada and be subject to the vote of Parliament. The cause is, therefore, before the proper tribunal this evening, and I may here remark that it was due to the astuteness and prevision of that right hon. gentleman that no question could arise as to the claim of the Dominion to the Award. I wish to quote, at some length, in proof of this, and for other impartial reasons connected with my argument, from a speech delivered when the right hon. gentleman introduced the Bill to give effect to the Treaty. In referring to the fact that this amount had been secured for Canada, he said:

"I did not for a moment forget that I was there to represent the interests of Canada. I must ask you to look at the despatch of 16th February, 1871, which reached me at Washington, a few days after I arrived there. It will be seen that Lord Kimberly used this expression: "As at present advised Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the right of Canada to exclude Americans from fishing in the waters within the limits of three marine miles of the coast, is beyond dispute, and can only be ceded for an adequate consideration. Should this consideration take the form of a money payment, it appears to Her Majesty's Government, that such an arrangement would be more likely to work well than if any conditions were annexed to the exercise of the privilege of fishing within the Canadian waters." Having read that despatch, and the suggestion that any arrangement might be made on the basis of a money payment, and there being an absence of any statement that such an arrangement would only be made with the consent of Canada, I thought it well to communicate with my colleagues at Ottawa; and although we had received, again and again, assurances from Her Majesty's Government that those rights would not be affected, given away, or ceded, without our consent, it was thought advisable, in consequence of the omission of all reference to the necessity of Canada's assent being obtained to any monetary arrangement, to communicate by cable that Canada considered the Canadian Fisheries to be her property, and they could not be sold without her consent. That communication was made by the Canadian Government on the 10th March, and of that Government I was a member; and not only did that communication proceed from the Canadian Government to England, giving them fair notice that the Canadian Government, of which I was so a member, would insist upon the right of dealing with her own Fisheries, but I took occasion to

press upon the Head of the British Commission at Washington, that my own individual opinion, as representing Canada, should be laid before Her Majesty's Government. The answer that came back at once by cable was extended in full in the despatch of the 17th March, 1871, and it was most satisfactory; as it stated that Her Majesty's Government had never any intention of advising Her Majesty to part with those Fisheries without the consent of Canada. Armed with this, I felt that I was relieved of a considerable amount of my embarrassment. I felt that no matter what arrangements might be made, no matter whether I was out-voted by my colleagues on the Commission, or what instructions might be given by Her Majesty's Government, the interests of Canada were safe, because they were in her own hands, and reserved for her own decision. Now, Mr. Speaker, it must not be supposed that this was not a substantial concession on the part of Her Majesty's Government. It is true that Lord Kimberly stated in his despatch of 17th March, that "When the Reciprocity Treaty was concluded, the Acts of the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Legislatures relating to the Fisheries were suspended by Acts of those Legislatures, and the Fishery rights of Canada are now under the protection of a Canadian Act of Parliament, the repeal of which would be necessary in case of the cession of those rights to any foreign powers." It is true, in one sense of the word, but it is also true that if Her Majesty, in the exercise of Her power, had chosen to make a Treaty with the United States, ceding not only those rights, but ceding the very land over which those waters flow, that Treaty between England and the United States would have been binding, and the United States would have held England to it. No matter how unjust to Canada, after all her previous promises, still that Treaty would be a valid and obligatory Treaty between England and the United States, and the latter would have had the right to enforce its provisions, override any Provincial Laws and Ordinances, and take possession of our waters and rights. It would have been a great wrong, but the consequences would have been the loss, practically, of our rights for ever; and so it was satisfactory that it should be settled as it has been settled, without a doubt appearing upon the records of the Conference at Washington. Now, the recognition of the proprietary right of Canada in her Fisheries forms a portion of the State Papers of both countries. Now the rights of Canada to those Fisheries are beyond dispute; and it is finally established that England cannot, and will not, under any circumstances whatever, cede those Fisheries without the consent of Canada. So that in any future arrangement between Canada and England, or England and the United States, the rights of Canada will be respected, as it is conceded beyond dispute that England has not the power to deprive Canada of them. We may now rest certain that for all time to come England will not, without our consent, make any cession of these interests. Now, Mr. Speaker, to come to the various subjects which interest Canada more particularly. I will address myself to them in detail; and first, I will consider the ques-

tion of most importance to us, the one on which we are now specially asked to legislate, that which interests Canada as a whole most particularly, and which interests the Maritime Provinces especially. I mean the Articles of the Treaty with respect to our Fishery rights. I would, in the first place, say that the protocols which accompany the Treaty, and which are in the hands of every member, do not give chronologically an every day account of the transactions of the Conference, although, as a general rule, I believe the protocols of such Conferences are kept from day to day; but it was thought better to depart from the rule on this occasion, and only to record the conclusions arrived at. Therefore, while the protocols substantially contain the result of the negotiations ended in the Treaty, they must not be looked upon as chronological details of facts and incidents as they occurred. I say so because the protocol which relates more especially to the Fisheries would lead one to suppose that at the first meeting, and without previous discussion, the British Commissioners stated 'That they were prepared to discuss the question of the Fisheries, either in detail or generally so as either to enter into an examination of the respective rights of the two countries under the Treaty of 1818, and the general law of nations, or to approach at once the settlement of the question on a comprehensive basis.' Now the fact is that it was found by the British Commissioners, when they arrived at Washington, and had an opportunity of ascertaining the feeling that prevailed at that time, not only among the United States Commissioners, but among the public men of the United States whom they met there, and from their communications with other sources of information, that the feeling was universal, that all questions should be settled beyond the possibility of dispute in the future, and more especially that if by any possibility a solution of the difficulty respecting the Fisheries could be arrived at, or a satisfactory arrangement made by which the Fishery question could be placed in abeyance as in 1854, it would be to the advantage of both nations."

I desire to congratulate the right hon. gentleman upon having so completely settled that question as to the right of Canada to the Fishery Award. But I am led to ask, if these Fisheries belong to the Dominion of Canada, by what right did they become hers? They are hers through the several Provinces on whose coasts they lie. One main point, then, which I think it concerns us to consider is, that these several Provinces entered this Confederation with certain defined limits, and we have to ask what were those limits? and what, within these limits, did the Provinces surrender and what did they reserve? I need not refer to the British North America Act to settle that point. Its language is doubtless familiar to every hon. gentleman

within the range of my voice. It provides that "The Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall have the same limits as at the passing of this Act." Before seeking to define those limits, I may premise that grants made of those Provinces to private subjects of old time, both by the Kings of France and the Kings of England, included the Fisheries connected with them, for the fisheries and the fur trade at that time were regarded as the greatest value attaching to these colonies and in the grants from the King of France they were specifically included, as also in the grants from the Kings of England. I may refer especially to that from Cromwell to Sir Charles Latour, the language of which is, after describing a large tract of country, "and including all the islands and fisheries upon the coasts." But to come to the period when, after varying fortunes, the Province of Nova Scotia was, by the Treaty of Utrecht, ceded to the Crown of England, I would draw your attention to the words of that Treaty in connection with the question as to the limits of Nova Scotia, and whether they embraced the Fisheries:

"The Most Christian King shall take care on the same day, that the ratifications of the present peace shall be exchanged, to have delivered, to the Queen of Great Britain, solemn and authentic letters or instruments, by virtue whereof the Island of St. Christopher is to be possessed alone, hereafter, by British subjects; likewise Nova Scotia or all Acadia, with its ancient limits, as also the city of Port-Royal, now called Annapolis-Royal, and all other things in those regions, which depend on the said lands and islands, together with the dominions, property and possessions, and all right whatsoever, whether by Treaties or any other way acquired, which the Most Christian King, the Crown of France, or any of its subjects have hitherto had to the said islands, lands, and places, and inhabitants thereof to be yielded and transferred to the Queen of Great Britain and to Her Crown for ever as the Most Christian King now yields and transfers all the said particulars; and that in such ample manner and form that the subjects of the Most Christian King shall, hereafter, be excluded from all kind of fishing in the said seas, bays and other places on the coasts of Nova Scotia, that is to say, on those which lie towards the south-east, within thirty leagues, beginning from the Island commonly called Sable, inclusively and thence going towards the south-west."

Upon a question subsequently arising between England and France respecting

the boundaries, Commissioners were appointed for the adjustment of the dispute. Hon. gentlemen by glancing at a map will see what was the extent of the boundaries claimed by the Commissioners on the part of England as set forth in the following statement:—

“On the west, towards New England, by the River Penobscot, otherwise called Pentagoet: that is to say, beginning at its mouth, and from thence drawing a straight line towards the north to the river of St. Lawrence, or the Great River of Canada; on the north by that river all along as far as Cape Roziers, situated at its entrance; on the east by the great Gulf of St. Lawrence, from Cape Roziers to the south-east, by the Islands of Cape Breton, leaving these and the Gulf on the right, and Newfoundland and the Islands belonging to it on the left, unto the cape or promontory called Cape Breton; on the south by the great Atlantic Ocean, going south-west from Cape Breton by Cape Sable, taking in the Island of that name round to the Bay of Fundy, as far as the mouth of the River Penobscot or Pentagoet.”

Although the negotiations between these Commissioners were fruitless, it was ultimately settled by the Treaty of Versailles, in 1763, what should be the limit of Nova Scotia. I shall now quote from Haliburton's “History of Nova Scotia,” vol. 2, pp. 1 and 2, which says:

“To the northward, our said Province shall be bounded by the southern boundary of our Province of Quebec, as far as the western extremity of the Bay des Chaleurs; to the eastward by the said bay and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, to the cape or promontory called Cape Breton, in the Island of that name, including that Island, the Island of St. John's, and all other Islands within six leagues of the coast; to the southward by the Atlantic Ocean from the said cape to Cape Sable, including the Island of that name, and all other islands within forty leagues of the coast, with all the rights, appurtenances whatsoever there-to belonging; and to the westward, although our said Province hath anciently extended and doth of right extend, as far as the River Pentagoet or Penobscot, it shall be bounded by a line drawn from Cape Sable across the entrance of the Bay of Fundy to the mouth of the River St. Croix, by the said river to its source, and by a line drawn due north, from thence to the southern boundary of our Colony of Quebec.”

Subsequently this large Province of Nova Scotia was divided into the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton, and one boundary between Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is drawn through the centre of the Bay of Fundy. Having thus estab-

lished the ancient and existing limits of the Province of Nova Scotia, and, I think, having shown to the satisfaction of those who may have carefully followed me, that they include the Fisheries on the coasts, I am led to enquire what, by the Act of Confederation, was surrendered by this Province of Nova Scotia, what was surrendered as to its revenues, what as to public property? The revenues which were not reserved by the respective Provinces or should be raised by them in accordance with special powers conferred upon them, were, it is true, to form one Consolidated Fund for the Dominion of Canada; and I have no doubt that, looking at the British North America Act as it now stands, and noting the fact that the exclusive powers of legislation given to the Dominion, comprehend inland and Coast Fisheries, the argument will be founded on that fact, that the power of legislation carries with it all power over these inland and coast Fisheries. But on perusal of the first draft of the Act of Confederation, I find that inland and coast Fisheries were assigned to the Local Legislatures, and this after the financial arrangements were complete. It is true that concurrent power was given to the Dominion; but what if the draft had not been amended as it was, I presume, simply from the fear of inconvenience to arise from these concurrent powers of legislation? There was an additional compensation for their being withdrawn from the purview of the Local Legislature, and confined to the Federal Parliament; and it is a fair argument from which to infer that all rights of property were not intended to be transferred together with the rights of legislation. Let us then examine what property was given under the Act to the Dominion. The public works and public property of the several Provinces vested in the Dominion are enumerated in the third schedule to the Act, and comprise all canals, with land and water power, public harbours, rivers—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Rivers is a misprint.

MR. RICHEY : If it is a misprint, this affects, I confess, my argument to a certain extent. I should have enquired whether the express mention of rivers did not operate to exclude coast Fisheries from being considered property of the

Dominion ; but that source of argument under the explanation of the right hon. gentleman is, of course, removed. What, then, were reserved to the respective Provinces? All lands, mines, minerals and royalties belonging to the several Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are, by Section 109, reserved to those Provinces; and by Section 117 it is declared that they shall retain all their respective public property not otherwise disposed of to the Dominion of Canada. I now ask, are Fisheries property, so as to come under the designation of "public property?" If the boundaries of Nova Scotia include these Fisheries; if, at the time of Confederation, Nova Scotia had proprietary rights in these Fisheries, my question is: Are Fisheries public property of the State with which they stand connected? If they are public property, then, being public property, are they, as royalties, such property as fall to the Crown, and may be aliened either absolutely or under certain limitations? Now, I shall not simply assert that these Fisheries may be designated as public property; I shall refer to the language of one who has been properly described as the most popular and the most elegant writer on the law of nations, whose work is cited more frequently than that of any other public jurist, and is still the statesman's manual and oracle. What does Vattel say?

"Everything susceptible of property is considered as belonging to the nation that possesses the country, and as forming the aggregate mass of its wealth."

He then distinguishes between what becomes public property, common property and private property:

"When a nation, in a body, takes possession of a country, everything that is not divided among its members, remains common to the whole nation, and is called public property."

"The various use of the sea near the coasts," in another place he says, "render it very susceptible of property. It furnishes fish, shells, pearls, amber, etc. Now, in all these respects, its use is not inexhaustible; wherefore, the nation, to whom the coasts belong, may appropriate to themselves and convert to their own profit, an advantage which nature has so placed within their reach as to enable them conveniently to take possession of it in the same manner as they possessed themselves of the dominion of the land they inhabit."

I have mislaid my reference to another quotation; but, he goes on to amplify

MR. RICHEY.

upon that statement with special reference to Fisheries and coasts, to show that they may be the subject of property. Speaking of that portion of the sea adjacent to a country, within a marine league from the shore, Puffendorf calls it "an accessory to the land as much as the ditch of a town is accessory to a town." "What," asks Dr. Lushington, in the course of a judgment pronounced by him, "are the limits of the United Kingdom? The land of the United Kingdom and three miles from the shore, is the only answer I can give." Now, then, what are royalties? Do they include the Fisheries upon the coast? Is that word of sufficient significance to comprehend those Fisheries? I have read from the Statute, that royalties are reserved to the respective Provinces, and all lands, mines and minerals. What is here referred to is the substance of the thing, not that which issues out of it, though the tribute paid to the proprietor of the soil may, by some, be deemed the ordinary acceptation of the word royalty. This latter restricted meaning could not have been the intention in any of the grants that have been made to the Provinces from the Crown, because the word is associated with those only conveying territorial rights, and the revenues derivable from them are subsequently referred to in other words. Having reference to the language of writers on International law, and to the definition given in ordinary dictionaries as well as in law dictionaries, royalty means the rights and prerogatives of the Crown. We do not pretend—it would be absurd to contend—that, under the term royalties, all regal rights and prerogatives are granted to the Provinces: it means such royalties as the Crown is capable of alienating. There are two kinds of royalties, those which appertain to the Sovereign as the representative of the nation, and those which belong to him by virtue of his Sovereignty, but which are more of a proprietary nature. In Halleck's "International Law," it is said:

"Upon the breaking up of the Roman Empire," says Gibbon, "the princes and cities which declared themselves independent, appropriated to themselves those parts in which nature, most rich and liberal, yields extraordinary products. These portions or reserved rights were called *regalia*. The same writer, in other places, applies the term

regalia both to rights, and to things, and to the things themselves,—to *jura* and *corpora*. So of the feudal and English law writers. They sometimes apply this term to things—as the Crown, the Sceptre, and Royal and Church lands, and sometimes to the dignity, power and pecuniary rights of the King. When applied to the power and dignity of the King, they are called *majora regalia*, and when applied to his fiscal rights, they are called *minora regalia*. The former, says Erskine, are not alienable without the consent of Parliament, while the latter may be communicated to his subjects by the Sovereign himself at his pleasure. The term *regalia*, therefore, differs from Sovereignty, or *jura majestatis*, as being applicable both to things and to rights to things—*corpora* and *jura*—and also as not being inherent to or inseparable from the Sovereign power, for *regalia* may be alienated either with or without the consent of Parliament. When applied to property, it may include both that which necessarily appertains to the Crown and that which is alienable, or which may be passed to individual subjects.”

I will also read from Tomlin’s “Law Dictionary,” under the head “King,” defining what are the prerogatives and rights of the King. He says :

“It is also held that the King is by his prerogative universal occupant, as all property is presumed to have been originally in the Crown.

“The King hath this sovereign dominion in all seas and great rivers, which is plain from Selden’s account of the ancient Saxons, who dwelt very successfully in all naval affairs ; therefore, the territories of the English seas and rivers always resided in the King.

“And as the King hath a prerogative in the seas so hath he likewise a right to the fishery and to the soil.”

I must now ask permission to present a case or two in favor of the construction which I have put upon the word royalties—that is to say : the rights of the Crown in connection with those Fisheries ; and the first to which I shall refer is a case determined in 1876, in regard to salmon fishing, where the Lord Chancellor, Lords Cransworth, Wensleydale and Kingsdown affirming the decree below, concurred in the following propositions as reported in 3 Macqueen’s Appeal Cases, page 419 :

“The salmon fishings in the open sea around the coast of Scotland, unless parted with by grant, belong exclusively to the Crown, and form part of its hereditary revenue.

“The right of the Crown is not merely a right of fishing for salmon, but a right to the salmon fishings around the sea coast of Scotland.

“It is not to be regarded simply as an attribute of Sovereignty, but rather as a patrimonium, a beneficial interest constituting part of the regal hereditary property.

“The assertion that the sea is common to all and that there can be no appropriation of it, except where it adjoins the shore, is an erroneous assertion.”

That is the solemn determination of the Judges before whom the appeal was heard. What was the contention of Her Majesty’s Commissioners and the Lord Advocate, which was sustained by this appeal ?

“All nations being equal all seem to have an equal right to use the unappropriated parts of the ocean for navigation. But those parts of the sea which adjoin the land are appropriated as accessory to the coast that commands them. The doctrine laid down by Heineccius is that now generally received by the best writers. He maintains that the ocean is incapable of appropriation, but that parts of the ocean and narrow seas may be appropriated subject to the rights of navigation. * * * The right of fishing in the sea is totally distinct from the right of maritime dominion”

The point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Government and this House is “that the right of fishing in the sea is totally distinct from the right of maritime dominion.” I hold that whilst the power of legislation and the right of maritime dominion is vested in the general Confederation, there may still remain reserved a right of property in the different Provinces :

“The English,” the case proceeds, “have never pretended to have a property in all the seas over which they have claimed maritime dominion by means of their fleets. But all these portions of the sea adjacent to and commanded by the coast so far as capable of appropriation are held to form a part of the national territory.”

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Hear, hear.

MR. RICHEY: The right hon. gentleman says “hear, hear.” I fully appreciate the view that is taken by him in connection with this subject. When I heard the hon. mover of the resolutions the other night content himself with citing authorities to show that the sea within three miles of the shore was a part of the territory of the nation, I saw at once that he stopped short of that which it was necessary to prove, because halting there the answer would be perfectly obvious, that the territorial right was the right of sovereignty, and the sovereignty being in the Dominion no question could be raised upon it. It is on this account that I have felt it necessary to detain the House so

long, pointing to the fact that the Crown had conceded territorial rights to the Provinces, and that by the British North America Act those rights were confirmed. But to pursue my quotations :

“It is contended that these rights in the sea are national or public rights, which are vested in the Sovereign merely as trustee for the community. Here, however, it is necessary to make a distinction.

“The Sovereign of this country is the supreme head of the nation, and as such vested with the executive power of protecting the interests and vindicating the rights of the people against any outrage or invasion by foreign states. But the rights which belong to the Crown are of two different kinds : 1st.—The *jus publicum* which belongs to the monarch in jurisdiction and sovereign right, and which may be held as a mere trust for behoof of the public ; and 2nd.—The *jus privatum* under which the Sovereign possesses the land and sea adjoining the coast as a patrimonial property, so far as it is capable of appropriation. * * *

“The public rights belonging to the Crown are inalienable, while the private ones, being capable of yielding profit, may be retained or alienated to a subject.”

The distinction upon which I insist is here most clearly drawn, and confirms the view which I have endeavoured to place before you, that whilst as regards the *jus publicum* the right of legislation is conferred upon Parliament, the *jus privatum* has been granted to the Provinces and continues to reside in them. I may be told that the propositions which I have read refer simply to salmon fishing which is regarded as more valuable than other fisheries. There are, however, not wanting other cases to show how specifically fisheries are included under the designation of royalties ; cases to show that fisheries extending two miles from the shore granted by the Crown have been held to be well granted. But it is needless to adduce further authorities upon the right of the Crown in that respect, when we have the authority of the right hon. the Prime Minister himself in the passage which I have read in your hearing. Now it is quite appropriate here to refer to the grant made in 1844 to Nova Scotia of the casual and territorial rights of the Crown. The same words are there employed, “land, mines and minerals, and royalties.” If, then, the fisheries be within the designation of royalties if they were to be considered property which pertained to the Crown, I hold that under that Act, an Act having its operation during the lifetime of Her present Majesty, the

control of those lands, mines, minerals and royalties, were made over to the various Provinces in consideration of their assuming the charge of the civil list of the Provinces at that time, and except so far as the territorial rights and revenues thus granted to the Provinces are taken away by the Act of Confederation, they remain in the respective Provinces. I next enquire, if those Fisheries were vested as property in the Provinces could any right therein be justly ceded even by Treaty without their consent ? In his “Manual of International Law,” President Woolsey remarks :

“An interesting question here arises whether the Treaty making power in a federative union like the United States can alienate the domain of one of the States without its consent.”

The alienation here I admit is not of the domain, but it is of a right in that property, a property which, it is contended, is still in the Province. The same writer argues :

“A States’ territorial right gives no power to the ruler to alienate a part of the territory in the way of barter or sale, as was done in feudal times. In other words, the right is a public or political and not a personal one. Nor, in justice, can the State itself alienate a portion of its territory without the consent of the inhabitants residing upon the same, and if in treaties of cession this is done after conquest it is only the acknowledgment of an unavoidable fact.”

I have read to you the words of the right hon. leader of the Government in connection with the explanation he made regarding the right of property in Canada to those Fisheries—to the effect that there was a sale of them. It was *pro tanto* a sale. It was a lease or license of those privileges to a foreign power. And here I may quote from Chancellor Kent who, in his work on International Law, whilst admitting it to be a clear principle that private rights may be sacrificed by Treaty to secure the public safety, claims that the Government would be bound to make compensation and indemnity to the individuals whose rights had been surrendered. I also call to mind a case which was brought before this Parliament, by one no longer living, but whose name, I am sure, is cherished with respect by all who had the honour of his acquaintance, and were conversant with his ability. I refer to the late Hon. Hilliard Cameron, who, when the Bill to ratify the Treaty was under discussion, and when he was advo-

cating its acceptance on the ground that there was nothing inconsistent in accepting a pecuniary recompense for the privileges conferred, adverted to the fact, in connection with the Ashburton Treaty, that when it was found that Maine had not agreed, General Jackson said: "Agree to the Treaty and we will give you \$1,200,000!" Maine, however, would not agree. A new Treaty was made, and Maine thought she ought to have a Commissioner, and there was a doubt whether the United States could take her territory without her consent; and subsequently she did consent, and was paid for her territorial rights, though awarded less than she had previously refused. I am quite conscious, Mr. Speaker, that I am referring to cases and authorities which cover, in strictness, only the actual cession of territory or private rights, but they announce and illustrate a principle which is applicable to the case before you; and I feel that I may trust with confidence to the members of this House to make a proper application of that principle. Such, then, Mr. Speaker, are the facts and arguments which appear to me to lend some countenance to the resolutions introduced by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell), which give colour to the contention he has put forward, that fishery rights are territorial rights belonging to the various Provinces. I confess that whilst I feel how strongly they do tend to substantiate that claim, I recognise that they are in the nature of a legal argument on which the minds of legal gentlemen might differ. I feel it is rather a precise statement of the rights of those Provinces to place before this House, and to ask it immediately to endorse. The question as to whether they are strictly territorial rights of the Provinces might well be deemed a subject for further consideration, and to be decided by another tribunal. Therefore, whilst I have drawn out these arguments, I present them as leading to other considerations, and feeling that it is not desirable to call upon the House to decide this question of abstract right. I will venture to propose an amendment, which I hope will meet the views of those who contend strongly for the territorial rights being in the Provinces, and will also be acceptable to those who are not prepared to go so far. I

believe that without one word of the argument which I have addressed to the House, there are other considerations to be taken into account sufficient to induce the House to decide that this Award should be appropriated to the different Provinces whose inhabitants are affected by the cession of privileges in their Fisheries. The first of these considerations to which I desire to draw attention is, that this Treaty is limited in its operation to certain Provinces—to Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island; and it was so limited of set purposes and with a special design. Here, again, I must refer to the speech of the right hon. leader of the Government in introducing the Bill to give effect to the Treaty. He said:

"It will be remembered that we have not given all our Fisheries away, the Treaty only applies to the Fisheries of the old Provinces of Canada, and in order that the area should not be widened, it is provided that it shall only apply to the Fisheries of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, so that the Treaty does not allow the Americans to have access to the Pacific Coast Fisheries, nor yet to the inexhaustible and priceless Fisheries of the Hudson's Bay. Those are great sources of revenue yet undeveloped, but after the Treaty is ratified, they will develop rapidly, and in twelve years from now when the two nations sit down to reconsider the circumstances, and readjust the Treaty it will be found that other and great wealth will be at the disposal of the Dominion. I may be asked, though I have not seen that the point has excited any observation, why were not the products of the Lake Fisheries laid open to both nations, and in reply I may say that these Fisheries were excepted at my instance. The Canadian Fisheries on the north shores of the great lakes are most valuable. By a judicious system of preservation and protection we have greatly increased that source of wealth. It is also known that from a concurrence of circumstances and from situation the Fisheries on the south shores are not nearly so valuable as ours, and it therefore appeared that if we once allowed the American fishermen to have admission to our waters, with their various engines of destruction, all the care taken for many years to cultivate that source of wealth would be disturbed, injured, and prejudiced, and there would be no end of quarrels and dissatisfaction, in our narrow waters, and no real Reciprocity, and therefore, that Canada would be much better off by preserving her own Inland Lake Fisheries to herself, and have no right to enter the American market with the products of those Fisheries. This was the reason why the Lake Fisheries were not included in this arrangement."

Then, if those Fisheries are bartered away, and the Fisheries of Ontario,

British Columbia and Hudson's Bay, represented as being so magnificent, are retained and protected, what object induced the sale of the Fishery rights of the Nova Scotians, New Brunswickers, Prince Edward Islanders and the people of Quebec? The object was the maintenance of peace; and, therefore, it was not inappropriate in me to cite from the writers on International Law, passages to show that, where a Treaty is made in the interest of peace, compensation is due to those whose interests are affected. The object aimed at in this Treaty, and the reason why we were compelled to surrender those privileges in our waters, was for the preservation of peace. "It was known," said the right hon. gentleman—

"It was known that what was commonly known as 'the Alabama claims' was a subject of dispute between the two countries, involving the gravest consequences and that hitherto the results had been most satisfactory. An attempt had been made to settle the question by what was known as the Johnson-Clarendon Treaty, but that Treaty had been rejected by the United States authorities. So long as this question remained unsettled between the two nations there was no possibility of the old friendly relations that had so long existed between them being restored, and England felt that it was of the first importance to her that those amicable relations should be restored. It was not only her desire to be in the most friendly position towards a country which was so closely associated with her by every tie, by common origin, by common interest, by common language, but it was also her interest to have every cloud removed between the two nations, because she had reason to feel that her position with respect to the other great powers of the world was greatly affected, by the knowledge which those other nations had of the position of affairs between the United States and herself. The prestige of Great Britain as a power was affected most seriously by the absence of an *entente cordiale* between the two nations. * * * And, Sir, in my opinion, it was of greater consequence to Canada than to England, at least of as great consequence, that the Alabama question should be settled (cheers). Sir, England has promised us, and we have all faith in that promise, that in case of war, the whole force of the Empire should be exerted in our defence (cheers). What would have been the position of England, and what would have been the position of Canada, if she had been called upon to use her whole force to defend us, when engaged in conflict elsewhere. Canada would, as a matter of course, in case of war between England and the United States, be the battle ground. We should be the sufferers, our country would be devastated, our people slaughtered and our property destroyed; and while England would, I believe, under all circumstances, faithfully perform her promise to the utmost

(cheers), she would be greatly impeded in carrying out her desire, if engaged elsewhere. It was therefore, as much the interest of this Dominion as of England, that the Alabama and all other questions that in any way threatened the disturbance of the peaceful relations between the two countries should be settled and adjusted.'

And that, let me say, refers very specially to Canada proper. Encompassed as we are by the navy of England, we have little fear of the consequences of a war between England and any other power. We know her fleets will ride in our waters, and that we shall be secure. It does not so much concern those whose Fisheries have been given away as those who live by the inland waters. The interior of the country would be devastated by a war. This, then, brings the Treaty and the cessions made under it clearly within the rule I have already stated. For what has the pecuniary compensation been given? What should have been aimed and what was aimed at in that Treaty? Reciprocity of trade. Had you obtained the markets of the United States for the coal of Nova Scotia, the lumber of New Brunswick, and the agricultural products of Prince Edward Island, we should not, perhaps, have been urging so strongly this contention, and our resources would have received a great development in those industries. The hon. the Premier strove, I know, for those advantages. It was this Parliament that interposed, by a precipitate repeal of duties, and took away from him the power he could have used so well. He then had to carry on that Treaty, and as he professed, when he introduced the Bill to ratify it, if it had not been for the action of Parliament, he might have been calling on the House to confirm the Treaty that embraced those articles of coal and lumber. Is it not plain, from every aspect from which this case can be viewed, that the privileges in those waters which pertain to the Maritime Provinces alone have been taken and ceded to the United States, and compensation has been paid for them; and is it not the merest equity and justice that those whose privileges have been granted away should receive the compensation obtained? Then, Sir, it is alleged that those privileges have been granted to the detriment of the fishermen and of the Maritime Provinces as a whole. Anything that injures the Nova

Scotia fishing industry, for example, most materially affects the whole Province, as the value of its exports of fish is just twice as much as the value of all the other products combined. With regard to the destructive character of the fishing carried on by the Americans on our coasts, I need only remind the House of the facts presented in the discussion last Session, relative to their use of purse seines and trawls, and to the testimony taken on this subject at Halifax and elsewhere. All the evidence goes to show that the Americans, after having depleted their own Fisheries, are now engaged in the process of destroying ours, and that in five or six years, if their present course of conduct be pursued, our noble Fisheries, yielding millions upon millions of dollars, will become a mere reminiscence. I might cite abundant evidence in support of this view, but will content myself with some statements which we are all bound to respect. On page 220 of the published Debates of last Session of Parliament, I find the following utterances of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:—

“The Commission had established the fact, that the practice now prevailing of using the seines would, if persevered in, entirely destroy the Fisheries. * * * Some of these nets were 250 fathoms long; with them they surrounded and caught all kinds of fish in large quantities, including the small and coarser fish, which usually supplied food to our valuable cod-fishery. * * * If these Fisheries were destroyed—as they certainly would be if this practice continued—the \$5,000,000 would be no compensation for their loss to the Maritime Provinces.”

I will refer also to George R. Young's letters to Hon. Mr. Stanley, which says:

“And upon whom does that loss devolve? Upon the people of the Maritime Provinces—upon that eighty or a hundred thousand hardy sons of the sea-coast, to whom Sir George Cartier pointed, during the debates preceding Confederation, as your resource in case of conflict with a maritime power, whether upon your coasts or in your lakes, or wherever duty might call them.

“It does not fall upon the people of Ontario, of the Far-West, of British Columbia; they were carefully exempted from the operation of this Treaty, as I have already shown.”

This is not a new thing in our experience. I might refer to the evidence of the destructive course pursued by the American fishermen under former Treaties. Now, this loss devolves upon the people of the Maritime Provinces, upon those 80,000

or 100,000 seamen, upon whom you must rely, if at any time it should be necessary to have them rally to your support and defence, upon the lakes of Canada as well as upon her coasts. The loss does not fall upon the people of Ontario and the west, who are protected in the enjoyment of their Fisheries. Is it then not plain, altogether apart from strict technical construction and interpretations, upon the broad principles of National Law and the immutable principles of justice that if, to the detriment of a portion of the community, you concede great privileges to a foreign nation, you are bound to compensate that portion of the community for the injury you have done them. When I contend for an indemnity to those Provinces, I may be told that this Award is not given as an indemnity for damage done, but only as the price of privileges conferred, the price for licensing those Fisheries, and that because the Dominion Government has supreme control over all legislation respecting them, it has the power to legislate them away and place the price in the Dominion Treasury. If it be true that there rests in you this supreme predominant power—that Nova Scotia has surrendered to you her main source of wealth, that she brought so rich a dowry, I have only to express the hope that you will, at least, be generous to her, out of her own resources, and not force her to rue the day when she linked her destiny to yours. I may be told that, because the burden of protection or defence falls upon the general Exchequer, the Dominion is entitled to receive this money. To that I have several answers. In the first place, she assumed that burden of protecting the Fisheries as a part of her duty under Confederation, without any eye to the compensation she is now receiving; it was a portion of the charge that devolved upon her when she assumed the duties of defence; it is a burden which she assumed, not as regards those Provinces alone, whose interests are now at stake, but as regards all the whole Dominion; and further, it is a duty which to-day she continues to discharge, as regards the western Provinces, whilst, by the operation of this Treaty, she is largely relieving herself of her obligation in that respect to the Maritime Provinces. I believe that to-day, owing to the fact of our being able

to withdraw the marine police, you must be saving at least some \$50,000 as a consequence of this very Treaty. I find that the amount which has been expended for protection where the Fisheries are small is high in comparison with the amount expended upon those vast Fisheries of Nova Scotia. And further, the Dominion has not assumed, and I think I will be justified in saying the Dominion does not intend to assume, the full duty of Protection in regard to our Fisheries. I remember some years ago the question was asked, I think in the Senate, regarding the amount expended for the protection of the Fisheries by Canada. In that year it was \$84,000. The inquirer went on to ask what was the amount expended by Britain. The hon. Minister could not give a very correct answer, but said it must have been some hundreds of thousands of dollars. Then we have the observation made by the right hon. the Premier that Britain was obliged to come to our rescue. We have the late Mr. Harrison, in that debate upon the Treaty to which I have so frequently referred, asking as a point to be made in favour of its acceptance, what would be the value of our Fisheries without the protection of Great Britain, and urging that, in order to secure the protection of Britain it was necessary to confirm this Treaty. This matter of protection, moreover, is one which the Provinces were led to expect would be fully and faithfully performed. The Hon. George Brown, in the speech which he delivered at the time when the scheme of Union was under discussion—and I suppose at that time no one was more fully authorised to speak for those who were connected with the negotiations than he—referred especially to the advantages which would be derived by the Maritime Provinces from entering into this Union. Referring to the fact that, under the Reciprocity Treaty, the fishing by Americans in our waters had rapidly increased, and to the effect of the repeal of that Treaty on the American fishing interests, he said :

“The repeal of Reciprocity on the American fishing interest. The Americans, in 1851, had engaged in the cod and mackerel fishing, in our waters, shipping to the extent of 129 014 tons—but under the influence of the Reciprocity Treaty it rose, in 1861, to 192,662—an increase, in ten years, of upwards of 63,000 tons, or fifty per cent. (Hear, hear). The repeal

of Reciprocity will give us back all this increase, and more, for it will be a very different thing in the future from what it was formerly, to poach on our fishing grounds, when these provinces are united and determined to protect the Fisheries of the Gulf. This fishing interest is one which may be cultivated to an extent difficult, perhaps, for many of us to conceive. But we have only to look at the amount of fish taken from our waters by the Americans and other nations, and the advantages we possess, to perceive that, if we apply ourselves, as a united people, to foster that trade, we can vastly increase the great traffic we now enjoy.”

That was the prospect which was held out to the Maritime Provinces, and we are here to-night, in full view of the fact that these interests, which were to have been held so sacredly and exclusively, are now enjoyed only in common with citizens of the adjoining Republic, and we are here discussing the question whether the compensation, awarded for that concession, is to be apportioned to the Provinces which suffer from it or not. I have but one word further to say in connection with this subject, and it is to ask you to consider the precedent you may establish; for if this House decides, by its vote, that the money, which has been received as an equivalent for these privileges, is to be absorbed by the Dominion, I say it will be to establish an evil precedent. It will be to hold out to some succeeding Administration, perhaps that when pressed for means, there are rich resources to which they can apply. But, Mr. Speaker, I shrink from any such suggestion, and only say that it is establishing a precedent which is evil, when it can even be made to point to such a possibility as that. Has not this Dominion, as such, benefitted enough by the Washington Treaty, in the amount saved from the protection of the Fisheries, and in the fact that, by our acceptance of this Treaty, you obtained from the Imperial Government a guarantee of a loan of £2,500,000? For what purpose? Not to be expended in improvements in the Maritime Provinces, but for the purpose of extending your canals and aiding the Pacific Railway. Those advantages reaped by the Dominion as consequences of its acceptance of the Washington Treaty should render it the more ready to view the Award in the light of the obligation to regard the interest of the Provinces peculiarly affected.

To summarise my argument, it is this : Whilst I have claimed that though the supreme legislative power exists in the Dominion, there remains a right of property in the Maritime Provinces which ought not to be granted away without compensation. I have also said that I do not wish to rely solely upon a strict legal argument, a stringent interpretation of the Act of Confederation. I prefer to base my appeal to this House upon other grounds as well. I would place before you then the following propositions : By the Act of Confederation you have received, as you contend, such legislative authority as entitles you to dispose at will of the main source of wealth of one of the most important Provinces within your Dominion. I say one of the most important Provinces, for I have confined myself very much in advocating this question, to the position of the Province of Nova Scotia, not, however, with any disposition to ignore the claims of the other Provinces, and I may say that I think Prince Edward Island establishes a peculiarly strong claim. No one, in my opinion, can read the letter of Earl Kimberly, in which he urges upon the Government of that Island the acceptance of this Treaty, upon the ground of compensation to be made, without feeling that such an appeal being made by the Government of Prince Edward Island whilst it was a separate Province, entitles it to consideration ; but I have confined myself so much to the case of Nova Scotia, because there were certain grounds which I felt I could, in this way, more strongly urge. I say then, that even if we assume your possession of the power you claim as flowing from your legislative authority ; that power of legislation was a trust to be exercised beneficially for those over whose domain it extended. Under the pressure of Imperial interests you have used that legislative authority to ratify a Treaty which confers privileges upon the citizens of a foreign nation, and you have received compensation for so doing. By every principle of public law and national morality, the indemnity should follow the damage. The damage to the Provinces is proved even to the extent on the authority of your own Minister, specially conversant with the circumstances of the imminent destruction of the Fisheries, in which you

have sold those rights. By reason of that sale, you have not damaged the remaining portions of the Dominion, but protected them ; and you have not placed in the Treasury of the Dominion any further charge than previously existed. On the contrary you have, for a time, withdrawn the protection which, under your compact with the Provinces, implied if not clearly expressed, you were bound to afford. You have at the same time relieved the Treasury of a burden which would otherwise have devolved upon it. I ask this House, then, to consider fully and fairly the question which is now placed before it ; to consider the ultimate as well as the immediate consequences of the course which it may see fit to adopt. In pursuance of the notice which I have already given to the House, I beg leave to move that the resolutions proposed to be submitted to the Committee of the Whole be amended as follows :—

In the third Resolution all the words after "That" be expunged, and the following inserted instead thereof :—"the privileges so accorded to the citizens of the United States are in derogation of the rights of British subjects, which enured to the benefit of the people of the different Provinces to which the Fisheries in which they were granted are adjacent, respectively."

In the seventh Resolution all after the word "That" be expunged, and the following inserted instead thereof :—"in the opinion of this House, the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, are entitled to an appropriation of the Award, in such a manner as to afford to the inhabitants of the said several Provinces, the full benefit of the same in proportion to the value of the privileges conceded upon the coasts and in the waters of those Provinces, respectively."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : For once during this Session we have heard the argument on a serious question, carried on upon its own merits. We have heard no personalities, no imputations of motives, no animosities used in this argument, and I can congratulate the House and my hon. friend, and I can congratulate the interests he has advocated so ably before this House. The case is of a two-fold aspect—political and legal. My hon. friend has, after an able argument as to the legal rights of the case and the legal position of the Maritime Provinces, concluded his speech by some remarks as regards the position of the Province in a

political and in a financial sense ; and he has strongly and eloquently appealed to this House, and through this House to the country, as to the sacrifices and the losses which the Maritime Provinces have sustained by the loss of their rights in the waters surrounding their coasts. I am not at all unwilling to admit every right of the Maritime Provinces to a consideration of all the circumstances of the case, I am quite willing to consider their fair claims to consideration at the hands of this House in the protection of those rights which are said to be so inestimable and so extremely valuable, and in the development and encouragement of those rights, I may say that I believe since Confederation there has been a uniform action on the part of the Dominion Government to try and develop them, and to protect them from aggression and invasion. We have done that with no niggard hand, and, until the time that the Treaty threw open those waters to the American fishermen, this country was placed, as the hon. gentleman has truly stated, in such a position as that she was obliged to assume the obligation, which she did most willingly, to protect those Fisheries and rights, and expended lavishly all the means of the country in their protection. I feel, however, that, in the discussion of this subject, not only my hon. friend, but myself, more especially, as a member of the Government, as well as every hon. member of this House, must observe a due degree of reticence. I am unable, in the interests of the country, as a whole, and in the interests of the Maritime Provinces themselves, to enter, without restriction, without limitation, into the discussion of this subject. We all must remember that the Washington Treaty is of a limited duration. We all know the expressed intention of the American Government to put an end to that Treaty. Unless they change that determination, at the earliest moment possible, in a few years we will be placed back in the same position we occupied in 1871, and, therefore, every word that any member of Parliament may use in this House, and more especially every word that may be used by a member of the Government or a leading member of the Opposition, who may fairly be supposed to enter into any succeeding Government—every expression used will be carefully watched and

quoted as evidence against Canada, against its interests, and against the interests of the Maritime Provinces, and of those Fisheries, in any new negotiations that may be undertaken, some three or four or five years hence ; and, therefore, I feel myself obliged to deprive myself of a great portion of the argument which otherwise I might use in strengthening and supporting the case of the Dominion, and the claim and right of the Dominion, on every principle of equity as well as of strict law, to the amount of the Award found in the case. I will only say one thing with respect to that. While Canada has assumed, while the Dominion has undertaken the defence and the protection of these Fisheries, while that duty is thrown upon her by the Act of Union, while we have in view the limited duration of the Washington Treaty, we cannot avoid remembering all the cost, all the expense, all the responsibility of this protection, of this defence, and that it must fall upon the Dominion as a whole—on the Dominion Treasury—while all the benefits of these Fisheries accrue to the several Maritime Provinces. In the past the Maritime Provinces have been, and they will be, during the continuance of this Treaty, which was effected in 1871, the only practical gainers. So much for the appeal to the House,—a just appeal, a reasonable appeal, and one which this Parliament, and previous Parliaments, have acknowledged. We have always acknowledged the obligation to provide for the protection and development of the Fisheries. Before the Washington Treaty, we guarded the coasts of the Maritime Provinces with a fleet of our own, as well as that of the Imperial Government ; and now, during every Parliament, each Government, at every Session, has voted some provision for the protection, for the development of the Fishery interests, and for the lighting of the coasts, so essential to the successful prosecution and enlargement of the fishing trade. As to the legal question, in the first place, it seems to me that the exclusive right of legislation, and the administration of legislation, is vested in this Parliament. The British North America Act declares that the Dominion Parliament is to have the sole and exclusive right of legislation respecting these Fisheries, and that the Dominion

Government must be charged with the protection of all interests relating to the Fisheries. Canada has its coasts, as England has its coasts. The coasts of England belong to England, to the people of England—to the people inland as well as to those on the shores and coasts. When Canada was formed into one great Dominion, the coasts of each Province—the coasts of Quebec, the coasts of Nova Scotia, the coasts of New Brunswick, and the coasts of Prince Edward Island—became the coasts of the Dominion; and with these coasts, go all the Fisheries, and all the seas, and all the wealth of the Provinces, to form the Fisheries, the seas, and wealth of the Dominion. The argument of my hon. friend is based principally on the language used in the British North America Act, which provides that all lands, mines, minerals and royalties belonging to the several Provinces, and so on, shall belong to the several Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, in which the same are situated or arise. Fisheries are not lands, mines, or minerals, nor do they come within the term “royalties.” We know what “royalties” means. My hon. friend has quoted some authorities showing that sovereignties and regalities are the same things. But “royalties” has a distinct signification at law. The word “royalty” in this application, and its evident use in the British North America Act, is limited by the ordinary use and signification of the term. The word arose in its limited legal sense. In its large or general sense the word “royalty” signifies all that belongs to the Sovereign; in its colloquial sense in the English language “royalty” means all that pertains to the royal person, dignity and rank and prerogative. In the legal sense it arose in this way: we know that in England, no matter who may be the owner of the soil, still under the law of England the royal mines mean those mines of gold and silver belonging exclusively to the Sovereign, and that the fact that the owner of the soil may have the fee simple in the land does not give that owner any right or claim to the gold or silver mines on his estate; those belong to the Sovereign, and, when grants were made either to the owner of the soil or to strangers from that owner, the Crown was in the habit of claiming

and insisting upon an annual compensation, a compensation as to quantity, which compensation, in either case, was called the “royalty;” it was a recompense to the Sovereign for handing over that portion of the Royal mines. Hence the expression “royalty,” and this expression has been extended to every kind of charge of that nature, whether by the Sovereign or by the owner of any mine of any kind, whether a mine of gold or of silver, or of iron, of copper, or any other mineral whatever; the word has come to be applied to the rental, charge, or compensation made for the use of a mine. I say, therefore, that this word “royalty” was evidently so used in the British North America Act; and, consequently, in this sense, it does not apply to the Fisheries; it does not apply to the soil over which the seas flow. My hon. friend has truly stated that the argument that the Crown is supposed to own and does actually own the three miles of sea outside the coast, has no connection with this right of fishing. By the general law of nations the sea is common to all; the right of fishing in the sea is common to all the world, that is the general principle laid down by all International writers. The limitation which has been imposed upon that universal right, the limitation of three miles of the sea, bounding the coast, was introduced and finally established by different nations for the purposes of national defences; it was not thought safe to allow foreigners, in no way interested in the welfare and affairs of a nation, it was not thought safe or prudent to allow them to enter upon your coasts; and it came thus to be established, by International comity, as a principal of International Law, that three miles from the coast of any nation belongs exclusively to that nation, and that foreigners are to be excluded from that limit; but, subject to that limitation—which was established, as I have said, from the necessity of excluding aliens from the coasts, and for protecting these coasts from any probable hostile attacks—the sea belongs to every one. Then, as regards the Fisheries within these limits of three miles, foreigners are excluded; but the seas within that limit do not belong, nor do the fish in those seas, nor the right of fishing in those waters, belong to any particular portion of the

population; they do not belong exclusively to the people on the coasts; but just as the right of fishing in the waters surrounding England, Ireland and Scotland, belongs to the whole of the population—both to the people on the coast and to the people inland—and to the people, not only of England, Ireland and Scotland, but of all the dependencies of the British Empire, to every British subject in fact, so also does the right of fishing in these waters surrounding the coasts of the Maritime Provinces of Canada belong to every British subject; and a man living in the centre or any other part of Ontario or the Dominion, if he chooses to go, has the same right to fish within these three miles of the coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island as the people of those several Provinces have; he has precisely the same right; it is no exclusive right. If I choose, I have a perfect right to go and fish there without being interfered with by the fishermen of those coasts. Every British subject has that right; it is a common right, and, being a common right, it cannot be claimed exclusively for the coast inhabitants or for those living in the different Maritime Provinces. So, when Confederation was consummated, when these several Provinces consented to surrender their entities, and to be merged in the Dominion, the coasts of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick, and of Prince Edward Island ceased for ever, for they became the coasts of the Dominion of Canada; their waters became the waters of the Dominion of Canada, and their Fisheries became the Fisheries of the Dominion of Canada. Now, I have contended that the word “royalty” applies in no way to Fisheries; but, even supposing, for the sake of argument, that it did apply to the prerogative right of the Crown; supposing the argument of my hon. friend to be true to the fullest extent, and that the Crown did hand over to these several Provinces these royalties or sovereign rights, and proprietary territorial rights; supposing all this, then I say that the Crown could only hand over that which it had to hand over; it could not hand over the right of fishing, which was not in the power of the Crown either to withhold or give; it might be given or withheld by Parliament, but the Crown could not hand over any royalties, any sovereign

rights, which it had not. The right of fishing is a common right—within three miles of the coast—of all the subjects of Her Majesty; it is one of the *communia jura* belonging to every British subject, and a grant or conveyance of royalties does not convey this common right, simply because not being a royalty, it does not come within the term. My hon. friend has quoted a case which at first would appear to be at variance with the principle I am laying down—the case of *Gamel versus Commissioners of Forests, Woods and Fisheries*, in the Queen’s Appeal Cases—but I find that in that case the decision is not at all a decision on the law of England, or according to the law of England. It is a case which arose in Scotland, and which is based on Scotch law only. I find that, in that case, the whole argument of counsel, and the whole decision of the Courts, are based upon the law of Scotland, no reference being made to the general law of England on this subject; and on a proper examination of the case you find that the feudal right held by the Sovereign, as Queen of Scotland, still existed, and to a larger extent than by the law of England, and the decision was that it was clear, therefore, that the salmon fisheries in Scotland were the property of the Crown, and that the Commissioners of Fisheries, Woods and Forests were the proper parties to pursue, on behalf of Her Majesty. But even in this case we find, even with respect to the law of Scotland, that it is not held to be a right in the nature of a royalty. It is part of the private estate of the Sovereign, more in the nature of regality, as distinct from a royalty; the latter is not one of the *privata patrimonii* held by the Sovereign to support the royal dignity; the *privata patrimonii* do not, even under the law of Scotland, come within the meaning of the term “royalty.” But, as regards England, the law is laid down, again and again, in the words of Chitty, in his work on the Prerogatives of the Crown, that :

“The King has an undoubted sovereignty and jurisdiction, which he has immemorially exercised, through the medium of the Admiralty Courts, over the British Seas, that is the seas which encompass the four sides of the British Islands, and other seas, arms of seas and navigable rivers (but not unnavigable rivers, these belonging to the owners of the adjacent soil) within and immediately connected with the

territories subject to his sway. The law of nations and the constitution of the country have clothed the sovereign with this power that he may defend his people and protect their commercial interests. By implication of law the property in the soil, under these public waters, is also in the king. But in this, as also in most other instances, the prerogative does not counteract or interfere with the natural right of the public to fish in the sea, in arms of the sea, and in creeks and navigable rivers, and to take fish found on the sea shore between high and low water mark. This is one of the *jura publica* or *communa*, which never was vested exclusively in the Crown, and, of course, is not to be considered as a legal franchise."

It is a public right, a common right, a right belonging to everyone and, therefore, it has never been held to be a regal franchise—a royalty—and if not a royalty is not conveyed in the grant of all the royalties to anyone in this Province. True, the right of protecting the sea and the right of ownership of the land belongs to the Crown; true, a general sovereignty exists over those waters, and over the land in those waters, but the Fisheries and the right of using them do not become vested in the Crown, but are *communa jura*—belonging to all the people, and can, therefore, not be granted by the Crown. If that is so, the argument fails. I contend that the rights of legislation involve the rights of administration, and that the rights of administration and the responsibility forced upon the Administration, must be correlative, and all the advantages that are to be gained by that legislation must pertain to the authority which, in the first place, is acted upon by legislation, and then by the Administration which carries out that legislation. I beg leave to move in amendment:

That all the words after "That" be expunged, as also, the proposed amendment thereto, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"By the British North America Act, 1867, the sea coast and inland Fisheries in the Dominion and the control, regulation and protection thereof were vested in the Government and Parliament of Canada.

"That the responsibility and duty of regulating and protecting such Fisheries were, from 1st July, 1867, undertaken by the Federal Government and Legislature.

"That great expense was thereby cast upon and defrayed from the Dominion Treasury.

"That such responsibility cannot constitutionally be surrendered or transferred to any of the Provinces, and if it were possible to do so the transfer would be injurious to the best interests of the Provinces, more immediately

concerned in the development of the Fisheries, as they would be alike legally and pecuniarily unable to bear the burthen and afford the necessary protection.

"That the duty of fostering and protecting the Fisheries is certain to entail great expense on the Dominion in the future.

"That such expenditure and the public advantage to be derived therefrom are correlative, and that the portion of the Fishery Award paid over to Canada constitutionally and of right belongs to the Dominion of Canada."

I would ask, what would be the consequences to the Maritime Provinces, which are more immediately concerned than any other, if that doctrine were to obtain? Do you suppose that if the people of Canada, that if the people inland in Canada, were not interested in the Fisheries immediately, they would willingly bear the chief burden of the protection and development of those Fisheries; and that, in case of those rights being assailed, in case of possible hostilities being threatened, that the whole responsibility would be thrown on the people of the Dominion, the sole advantage for which, pecuniary and otherwise, was to be enjoyed at the expense and cost of the whole of Her Majesty's subjects in this country, and that the Maritime Provinces should have all the property and the rest of Her Majesty's subjects should have the responsibility. It is not in human nature to suppose that the Legislature of Canada, that the majority of representatives here, representing inland constituencies, would agree, or would be allowed to agree by their constituents, to expend all their treasure, and, possibly, all their blood, in defence of these rights, and that everything in the way of pecuniary advantage and gain should be handed over quietly to three or four localities engaged in those Fisheries. I put the proposition in that way so that it will be seen it is utterly out of the question that this right can be surrendered, that the Dominion should assume all these responsibilities and give up every possible advantage which that responsibility involves, when the responsibility of defending and protecting those rights and privileges all fall upon the Dominion. It is true the Dominion has willingly assumed and undertaken them, and she has already expended freely in order to defend them. The votes of Parliament this Session will show the anxiety of the people of Canada to pro-

tect those Fisheries by lighting the coasts, by building harbours of refuge, by building lighthouses, by planting buoys, by maintaining telegraph cables, and by all the other means by which our Fisheries are being developed, and the fishermen protected in the enjoyment and maintenance of their rights. Canada has, with no niggard hand, already gone forward in the defence of those rights, and it cannot be expected that she shall have all the toil, all the expense and all the danger, while the Provinces in the vicinity of the Fisheries are to have all the gain and all the property.

Mr. McISAAC: During the discussion which took place on the adjournment of this debate, fault was found with hon. members on this side of the House for pressing the debate. I fail to see how that charge can be made, how, at least, it can be justified. It is well known the question was brought to the attention of the Government and the House on several occasions last Session. This Session also it was taken up at a very early period. The Governments of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have been in constant communication with this Government, for more than a year, and in the face of these facts, are we to be told that this Government had not yet sufficient time and sufficient information to deal with the question decisively? The hon. the Minister of Railways went so far, the other day, as to say that this was not the time for the hon. member for Inverness to move his resolutions, that he should have done so in the Session of 1878, when the party he supported was in power. I consider that a very extraordinary statement from the hon. Minister, when he and every member of this House must know, that the Award was not paid until some time after he and his colleagues came into office, and that until almost the very time of its payment it was a matter of considerable uncertainty that it would be ever paid. A glance at the hon. the Finance Minister's Budget Speech last Session, proves that to be the fact. In referring to the financial condition of the Dominion, when he and his colleagues took office, on the 19th October, 1878, he said the only source on which he could depend to meet the maturing liabilities of Canada, was the prospective payment of the Fishery Award. The hon.

Minister must now admit that, at least, for six months after the Session of 1878, the Award was not paid. Perhaps he meant that a member who is in opposition, has no right to ask anything of a Government, has no right to criticise any act or policy of a Government. Well, if that is to be taken as sound Parliamentary doctrine, I think I shall be allowed to tell the hon. Minister that, for the last five or six years, his own conduct has often been a very notorious violation of it. If others from Nova Scotia have been committing mistakes in reference to the matter, why did not the hon. member for Cumberland himself get up, and say, and do the right thing. He was in the House in the Session of 1878, and he has been a member of the Government since the payment of the Award, and not a word has he uttered as to the disposition of it, although he owes more to Nova Scotia than any man in this House, or out of it. True, he has made more promises to his native Province than any other man ever did, but that hardly satisfies the indebtedness. He has an opportunity now forced upon him of showing his appreciation of the claims of Nova Scotia, and I hope he will turn it to true account. The fair consideration and settlement of the question, even at this late hour, will fully atone for all the delays complained of. In the course of the few observations I propose to make on the subject, I consider it unnecessary to endeavour to show the benefits secured by the Treaty to the United States, or the value of the special advantages obtained for the Provinces interested. That there is a difference between the advantages interchanged, is beyond a doubt. We must also take it for granted that this difference is in favour of the United States, and that the extent to which this difference is at the expense of the Provinces, is the measure of the damages which the Commission at Halifax was appointed to ascertain, and which by the Award that Commission determined and declared to be five millions and a-half dollars. Under the section of the Treaty authorising the reference, it is plain that the Commissioners were nothing more than a board of assessors, to fix the amount in money which the United States should pay for the injury done to the Provinces by the interchange of concessions. An

Award could not be made in favour of the United States, the Treaty did not contemplate that that country could be the loser by the transaction. It therefore provided, as I have said, for making an Award in favour of Great Britain, which Award is \$5,500,000. One million of that sum was paid by the British Government to Newfoundland, and the balance, four millions and a-half was handed over to the Government of Canada. What we have to consider is, who is entitled to the latter amount, whether the Dominion generally, or merely the Provinces whose sea-coast Fisheries have been affected by the operation of the Treaty. The Confederation Act is always, and properly, referred to for the settlement of this question. It is contended by those who oppose the Provincial right, that the Fisheries which the Provinces enjoyed before the Union, became by that event the exclusive property of the Dominion, and in support of that view Section 91 of the Union Act is invariably relied on. On reading this section, and comprehending its obvious and natural meaning, one cannot see that its object is the transference or vesting of property. It simply confers upon the Parliament of Canada the exclusive Legislative authority over a certain number of subjects therein specifically enumerated. Among these subjects we find Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries, the Postal Service, Sable Island, the raising of money by any mode or system of taxation. In conferring legislative power over these subjects upon the Parliament of Canada the section takes it—that is the same power from the Provincial Legislatures. Whatever powers of making laws respecting these subjects the Provincial Legislatures possessed before the passage of Section 91, became by it vested in the Federal Parliament. Only the powers of legislation over, not the ownership, or property in the subjects were transferred. If the contrary view is correct Section 108 of the same Act and the schedule to which it refers, become mere surpluses in the Act of Union. No one will admit that. This section declares that only the Public Works and the property of each Province enumerated in the third schedule to the Act, shall be the property of Canada. Looking at this schedule, we find it includes Post Offices,

Custom Houses, Sable Island, etc.; thus vesting them in the Dominion Parliament as its property, and showing that section 91 did not do so, and was not intended to do so. We find the Fisheries are not included in the schedule, and therefore must conclude and admit that, the property in the Sea Coast and Inland Fisheries exists exactly where it did before Confederation. We must always bear in mind, that the Union Act makes an important distinction between the legislative powers over, and the property in, certain subjects. Before 1867 the sea within three miles of the shore, was the domain of the Province, and therefore formed a part of its territory. Up to that time the Province had a right to legislate respecting this territorial domain; and by the Union only, that right had been conferred on the Parliament of Canada. It may be said the Fisheries were never vested in the Province, that they always were the property of the Crown. I am not disposed to maintain that they were not the property of the Crown, but if they were the property of the Crown before the Union, I say they are so to-day. I believe the proprietary right did vest, and does vest, in the Crown as a trustee for the benefit of the Provinces which so long enjoyed the Fisheries, and which, to such a large extent, depended on them as a source of wealth, and as a means of livelihood for hundreds of thousands of their population. The British Government practically declared that to be the case, by the payment of a million dollars to the Province of Newfoundland, and, I venture to say, expected that this Government, on receiving the balance, would follow the just example, and fairly apportion it between the other Provinces affected. I trust the example will be followed, especially as the relations existing between these Provinces and the rest of Canada, are supposed to be closer than those existing between England and Newfoundland. It has been said by some, and it has been said just now by the hon. the Prime Minister, that the money belongs to Canada, and should not be paid over to the Provinces affected by the Treaty, because as the right hon. gentleman remarked, Canada in a few years, that is, when the Treaty will be terminated, may have, at a great expense, to protect these Fisheries, and because

Canada now is expending largely in lighting the coast, and improving the coast navigation of the Maritime Provinces. It is well known that this Parliament became bound to protect all the Fisheries in the Dominion as well as the land of the Dominion, when it assumed the Militia and Defence of Canada. The Fisheries were protected by this Parliament before the Washington Treaty, and the Maritime Provinces contributed their share of the cost of the protection given. Should they require the protection the First Minister predicts, and should Canada refuse to give it, I am sure England, as in other days, would come to the rescue. We remember that this House, in the Session of 1871, voted \$200,000 to meet the expenditure incurred in repelling the Fenian invasion of 1870, and this sum was in excess of the Parliamentary provision made for that purpose in the preceding Session. The Maritime Provinces paid at least their share of this expenditure, although it was not they, but old Canada that had been threatened or injured by the invasion. The Fisheries cost the Dominion a large sum of money to-day which, perhaps, is money well spent. I will be allowed to refer to the unequal and unfair manner in which this expenditure is apportioned among the various Provinces of the Dominion. The reference will show that Ontario at least has no reason to complain of her share. I find the expenditure on account of Fisheries for the last year to be as follows: Ontario, for overseers' salaries, \$11,741.40; for fish-breeding, \$7,102.54, amounting to \$18,843.94. Quebec, for overseers' salaries, \$13,606.06; fish-breeding, \$5,772.70; Fisheries Protection Service, Gulf of St. Lawrence, \$8,994.48, in all \$28,374.44. Nova Scotia, overseers' salaries, \$14,312.76; fish-breeding, \$2,687.44, amounting to \$17,000.20. New Brunswick, overseers' salaries, \$10,858.64; fish-breeding, \$1,139, amounting to \$11,997.64. British Columbia, overseers' salaries, \$1,423.73, and Manitoba, \$200. It is necessary to give the value of the products of the Fisheries of the Dominion to properly appreciate the discrimination. The value of the products in the same year is the following: Ontario, \$348,122; Quebec, \$2,664,055; New Brunswick, \$2,305,790; Prince

Edward Island, \$840,344; British Columbia, \$925,766, and Nova Scotia, \$6,131,000. Nearly one-half the aggregate value belongs to Nova Scotia, and if we deduct the shares of British Columbia and Ontario, because they are not subject to the Treaty, Nova Scotia will be found to possess more than one-half the value of the products of the Fisheries in all the Provinces of the Dominion subjected to the operation of the Treaty. The hon. the First Minister, while at Washington negotiating the Treaty, took good care to exempt from its operation the Fisheries of his fond Ontario. In reference to the exemption, we find him, in the Session of 1872, while introducing the Bill giving effect to the Fishery clauses of the Treaty, making the following statement: "He reminded the House that the Lake Fisheries, and the valuable Fisheries of Hudson Bay, did not come within the operation of the Treaty. He believed that, twelve years from now, when the British and American Governments sat down to readjust this Treaty, these Fisheries would be found to be a great source of wealth to the Dominion. The inland lakes were excepted because the Americans had, by their reckless management of the Fisheries, destroyed the value of the Fisheries on the south side of the lakes." If the Fisheries of Ontario, which yield now only some \$300,000 annually, were expected by him, under the exemption, to become in twelve years a source of wealth to the Dominion, what wealth had not the Dominion a right to expect from the Fisheries of Nova Scotia if similarly privileged, when, in spite of the Treaty and the "reckless management" of the Americans, they produce a yearly value of nearly \$7,000,000? We find the Fisheries of Ontario excepted, and we find them, although worth only a trifle over \$300,000, to cost the Dominion, last year, nearly \$19,000, while the Fisheries of Nova Scotia enjoyed and destroyed by the Americans, and still giving nearly \$7,000,000, receive Protection only to the extent of \$17,000. To assume that the Fisheries of the Maritime Provinces were to be protected at the expense of these Fisheries, is something never dreamed of at the time of Confederation. I see before me, on the Treasury Benches, four hon. gentle-

men from the Maritime Provinces, who took a very prominent part, in their respective Provinces, in consummating the Union. I ask them if even the most extravagant opponents of the measure at that time anticipated such a result. Every hon. member in this House must remember the unpopularity of the measure in Nova Scotia, although no one at the time foresaw its effects on the Fisheries. So unpopular was it, that at the next election, the hon. member for Cumberland was the only advocate who escaped to come here to tell the tale. Our harbour improvements and lighthouses, by the terms of Union, are plainly chargeable to the Dominion, although, the hon. the First Minister insinuates their maintenance gives a claim to this Parliament on the price of the Fisheries. He stated that large expenditures are being made in these services. Perhaps there are, but I fail to see that they are made in the direction of compensation to the Provinces affected by the Treaty. Looking at the last Estimates brought down in this House, I observe, that while Ontario gets \$59,850 for harbours and breakwaters, Nova Scotia gets \$21,770, about one-third of the subsidy to Ontario.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I said the Maritime Provinces.

MR. McISAAC: That only strengthens my position more and more. The same unjust discrimination is applied to the other Lower Provinces. New Brunswick gets \$21,000, and Prince Edward Island \$9,900, just a little more than the salary enjoyed by the Cabinet Minister from that Island. We see by this that Ontario which is so much more favoured in its Fishing interests, receives for navigation improvements more than the aggregate provision for the Maritime Provinces for the same purpose, and as I remarked, about three times the grant to Nova Scotia. I may observe that the harbours and piers of Nova Scotia upon which our fishermen and ship-owners so much depend, for convenience and safety in their perilous calling, were not for the past ten years so much neglected, as they had been for the last fifteen months. Useful works that were commenced two years ago are either suspended or abandoned altogether. Piers and breakwaters that had been started and wrecked by recent storms are allowed to disap-

pear, when the timely expenditure of a few thousand dollars in many cases would save the loss of tens of thousands, and be a valuable benefit to the fishermen and others interested in the sea coast navigation. Instances of this description are to be found in the county I have the honour to come from, and they are fully and truthfully brought to the notice of the Government, both by petitions and personal representations, yet, that they are under the consideration of the Government is the most encouraging reply. In the Estimates referred to, it will be seen that this year, the sum of \$2,491,400 is voted for the canals of the Dominion, \$17,400 of this amount is for St. Peter's Canal, the only canal in the Maritime Provinces. Last year \$4,032,000 was voted for the same purpose, of which \$90,000 was for St. Peter's. This expensive attention is bestowed on the canals, because it is well known they greatly contribute to the development of the trade and commerce of the old Provinces of Canada. I shall not refer to the millions and millions of dollars that are expended in the North-West and on the other side of the Rocky Mountains, in building a railroad that will never be of any benefit to the Eastern Provinces. I will simply say that the admitted cost of completing and equipping the Pacific Railway, will be something in excess of one hundred and fifty million dollars, to which Nova Scotia under the ordinary mode of making revenue, contributes more, proportionally, as she does to every Public Work in Canada, than any other Province of the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen say that is not so, but I say it is so, and before I sit down I shall prove it by authorities which are recognised by both sides of the House. The Washington Treaty as we all know, was not negotiated for the settlement of the Fishery question. It was negotiated primarily for the settlement of the Alabama question. But according to the speech of the Prime Minister in 1872, to which I have already alluded, the settlement of the primary question would be difficult, if not impossible, without at the same time settling and adjusting all other questions—including the Fishery question—which threatened to disturb the peaceful relations between England and the

United States. The settlement of the Alabama case, he said was of more importance to the Dominion than it was even to England, therefore he asked the House to support the Bill he was introducing. The Alabama question is settled, and with greater advantage to the Dominion than to England,—its settlement was made practicable at the expense of the Provinces affected. Nothing, therefore, seems to be more just and natural, than that the compensation awarded should be handed over to those who had to make the sacrifice. I would draw the attention of the House to the settlement of the Alabama claims. It is well known the Arbitrators at Geneva awarded \$15,500,000 to the Government of the United States in damages for the depredations committed by the *Alabama* and other vessels allowed to escape from British ports. That amount was paid by the British Government to the American Government. It was the money of the American Government, just as the Fishery Award was the money of the British Government. The two sums legally belonged to the Governments respectively receiving them. Yet we find the United States did not place the money in the American Treasury for national purposes. No, the Government of that Great Country is yet distributing it among those who suffered loss by the acts complained of. England also might drop the \$5,500,000 into the Imperial Treasury, but she did not choose to do so. It would be not discredit to this Government to follow the example. I heard it maintained by some gentlemen, not on the floors of the House, that because so many representatives from the Maritime Provinces supported the Treaty in 1872, that, thereby, these Provinces waived their right to their present claim. I admit no representative from Nova Scotia, as far as I can ascertain, at that time, claimed that the money compensation should go to the Provinces to be affected. I believe, however, they distinctly understood it would be so disposed of, and that in consequence they gave the Bill their support. The answer of the hon. the leader of the Government, before he said Bill finally passed, to the question asked in the House by the present Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, as to what pledge the Govern-

ment would give in reference to the disposition of the compensation, would leave no doubt in the minds of hon. gentlemen on the matter. The answer was, that the money or compensation, would be subject to the vote and pleasure of Parliament, and that the Government could give no pledge as to its disposal. This shows the leader of the Government himself at that time believed the money was not in the nature of an item of ordinary revenue—that it was special or casual revenue and should, therefore, be specially disposed of. The hon. the Finance Minister did not wait for this vote of Parliament, because it seems from his own statement this was the first money he took hold of on assuming office. I may also state that this money was promised to the electors of Nova Scotia during the last election. My friend, the hon. member for Guysborough was frank enough last Session to make the following statement in reference to this matter. He said that he had stated to his constituents, that as we had received an Award of five and a-half million dollars, the fishermen of Nova Scotia would receive their share. He stated that either in building breakwaters, or in some other way the Government would judiciously and wisely expend the money. On the same occasion he said that he believed the same Government that protected the Fisheries in former years would do so in the future, and that when the Estimates would come down, the Government would show that they were disposed to do justice to the Maritime Provinces. I fail to discover what additional or new protection the fishermen received since. It is true that by the influence of the hon. member with the Government, an Order in Council was passed last Session limiting the time for catching lobsters. Perhaps that is the protection he meant and promised. If that is so, and if we are to believe petitions recently addressed to the Legislature of Nova Scotia, we must conclude that that famous Order in Council protected only the lobsters, and probably the hon. member for Guysborough, while it starved the fishermen. If we take the Estimates brought down since that announcement was made, we cannot see that much of the award or any other money had been voted for the breakwaters of Nova Scotia. Of the \$21,000

in the Estimates this year for the harbours and breakwaters of Nova Scotia, I notice the hon. gentleman gets \$5,000 for a burying ground in his county. This may satisfy him, however. Hon. members, say oh no, for a burying ground! I say yes, and refer these gentlemen to page fifty of the Estimates. It may be a misprint, and I confess I was surprised myself when I saw the item, but on recurring to the starving condition of so many of the hon. gentleman's constituents, I thought it rather a considerate appropriation. He says they are not starving—that they are well fed. I hope so. I was told a few days since that the Government sent 350 barrels of cornmeal to these poor people, to be paid for by labour on some public work. I am happy to learn they got relief, although they should have to pay dear for it. This quantity of meal, it is said, was bought at \$3.50 per barrel, making the cost of the lot \$1,225. Of this amount \$140 is for duty, at the rate of 40c. a barrel, imposed on that article by hon. gentlemen last year, as a part of their great protection scheme. They will see now that the effect of that protection on the poor fishermen is to give them only 350 barrels of cornmeal for \$1,225, when, without the protection of 40c., they could receive forty-five barrels more for the same money. It was stated by some hon. gentlemen opposite last year, when this cruel duty was opposed, that cornmeal was used only as feed for cattle; that its imposition would not affect the poor man. But when the wail of distress from Nova Scotia reached them, the only relief they would give was in the shape of this cattle feed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It ought to be oatmeal.

MR. McISAAC: That certainly would be human food, and I am glad to see the right hon. gentleman does not forget its superior virtue, but it seems he and his friends consider it too precious for the starving multitudes of Nova Scotia. I may be asked on what basis I should propose to make an apportionment of the \$4,500,000 between the Provinces claiming a distribution. The basis is quite a natural one. Let the money be divided according to the value of the fish yield of the Provinces affected. Regard

should be had, at the same time, to the shipping, boats, nets and all manner of capital used in the prosecution of the Fisheries of these Provinces. On this basis Nova Scotia's share could not be less than \$2,000,000, the interest of which at 5 per cent. would give the Province \$100,000 year. Two or three hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island, apart from the grounds they advance in common with the other Provinces seem to attach great importance to two special grounds—these special grounds are first that their Province was not a part of the Union when the Treaty went into operation, and secondly that the National Policy does not suit their Province—that it benefits other portions of the Dominion, and that, therefore, the Island should get something for the sacrifice. I believe these special arguments apply equally to Nova Scotia, because it never entered into Confederation as the hon. member for Cumberland must distinctly remember. As to the bearing of the National Policy argument on Nova Scotia, I will merely refer hon. gentlemen to the unceasing migration of the people of that Province for the last eight or ten months, not to any other part of Canada, but to the United States. I would not touch this matter had not hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island done so in discussing the question before the House. The other day the hon. the Finance Minister gave as a reason for asking an adjournment of the debate that the Government were preparing papers in connection with the subject that should be brought down. The debate is resumed but these papers have not come. He, however, stated this evening, that the address of the Nova Scotia Legislature in reference to this question, and the financial condition of that Province, would be laid on the Table before the Debate would close. This information will render it relevant for me to make a few remarks respecting this address which I had an opportunity of seeing in the public papers. It asks, among other things, for a renewal of the better terms subsidy to Nova Scotia. I trust the Government will take that matter into consideration, and see it proper to grant a renewal. I may be told that this is not the time for me, or for any member on this side of the House to make such an application. I may be told the application should have been

made when the subsidy was about lapsing. I can reply that the application was made at that time to the Government of the day by their friends from Nova Scotia in this House, and by the late Government of that Province. The application, however, unfortunately was not successful. It elicited a piece of information which is of importance to Nova Scotia, and that much good the application effected. It is this. The late Finance Minister (Mr. Cartwright) in his reply to the application for a continuance of the \$82,000 better terms, made this statement. "Moreover, an examination of taxation per capita paid by the people of Nova Scotia seems to show conclusively, that in this event they would probably be compelled to pay more into the Exchequer of the Dominion than she could possibly receive again. He refers, of course, to a statement in the first part of his reply, that no additional grant could be made to Nova Scotia without involving similar grants to the other Provinces. This shows, as far as Mr. Cartwright is an authority, that the people of Nova Scotia pay more per head into the Dominion treasury than the people of any of the other Provinces. Sir John Rose, Finance Minister in the right hon. gentleman's Government in 1869, virtually confirms the above statement. In his report on the case presented by Messrs. Howe and McLellan, for better terms, he says: "The undersigned is not insensible to the arguments which were verbally pressed, that the smaller Provinces—Nova Scotia and New Brunswick—are in some respects at a disadvantage as compared with the larger ones; that the cost of their Local Government must necessarily be more per head; that the resources of Nova Scotia are comparatively undeveloped; that the coal trade, on which she depends for a considerable portion of her revenue, is in a condition of unusual depression; and that the physical character of the country entails on her a larger expenditure to secure the necessary means of communication than the other Provinces have to meet." He concludes his report as follows: "The undersigned would add, in conclusion, that he has carefully analysed the estimated local expenditure of Nova Scotia, for the years 1868 and 1869, in conjunction with the gentlemen repre-

senting the Province, and he believes that, if the arrangements proposed are carried out, Nova Scotia will have sufficient means at her disposal to meet those services which devolve upon her by the terms of the Union Act, provided they are placed on a moderate but efficient footing. If, on the contrary, the Province has to depend on the provision made by the existing terms of the Union Act, no inconsiderable deficiency must be met by the imposition of direct taxation." We have it now plainly before us from the pen of these high financial authorities representing the two great political parties in Canada, that Nova Scotia by the terms of Confederation, occupies the most disadvantageous position of all the Provinces of the Dominion. It is as possible as it is proper to do her justice yet. We are often told in Nova Scotia, that members on this side of the House, opposed the granting of the better terms in 1869, and that they will always oppose the interests of that Province. If they did oppose the better terms, I hope they will not oppose the renewal of these terms. Even should some of them offer opposition, the Government is strong enough to grant us justice without them. I should not, however, state that gentlemen of the Opposition in 1869, opposed the better terms on the ground that Nova Scotia had no just claim, they merely disapproved of the mode in which the re-arrangement was proposed to be made. On that occasion the hon. member for Cumberland, if my recollection is accurate, was the only man who declared his Province had no just claim on the merits of the case. He said he would not ask for an increased subsidy to Nova Scotia on the ground of a just consideration of her claims, but on the ground of a legal consideration of the Union Act. The Opposition of that day also opposed the adoption of the Washington Treaty, and if Nova Scotia shall not receive her due share of the award, the opponents of that measure should be considered the friends of that Province. The Government and their friends always claim credit for the addition of \$82,000 to the Nova Scotia subsidy. They should not lose the credit, if they are entitled to much. The 82,000 amounted, in the ten years of its continuance, to 820,000, taken, of course, out of the General Treasury and given to Nova Scotia.

The interest on Nova Scotia's share of the award every year is at least \$100,000 which, in ten years, amounts to \$1,000,000. If gentlemen opposite withhold that fair proportion, they present in point of establishing the credit claimed by their action of 1869, the novel spectacle of being benefactors of the Province by giving it \$820,000 in ten years, and taking from it \$1,000,000 in ten years, and \$1,000,000 annually ever afterwards. In 1869, when the better terms were arranged, the surrender of the Fisheries was not foreseen, and, therefore, did not enter the calculation. It is plain that if the award goes into the Dominion Treasury, Nova Scotia will have paid back, in less than ten years, the amount received by the \$82,000, and who will call the arrangement of 1869 better terms for that Province after that. I hope now both sides of the House will generously unite and raise Nova Scotia to the financial level of the other Provinces. The chief grounds on which the better terms were urged in 1869 were mainly these, 1st.—That by Confederation Nova Scotia was importing more dutiable goods per head of the population than any of the other Provinces; 2nd.—That its Tariff was increased and, therefore, its taxes. As is well known the Tariff then was 15 per cent., and it was promised it would not at any time go beyond that. 3rd.—That the annual amount at the disposal of the Province at the time of the Union, for local services, was reduced at least by \$200,000. These reasons exist to-day as strongly as they did in 1869. To realise the financial condition of the Province, I would refer the House to the Address the hon. the Finance Minister is placing on the Table. Since the sum of \$82,000 was granted to Nova Scotia for ten years, as instalment of justice, under a 15 per cent. Tariff, now that the Tariff is doubled, that subsidy should be doubled also. I would not urge that it should be doubled. Let it be \$100,000, not for a term of years, but for all time to come. That sum, added to the interest of our share of the Award, which I put down at the reasonable figure of \$100,000 also, would give Nova Scotia \$200,000 additional subsidy. This amount, of course, is not to be limited to five or ten years, but is expected to be a perpetual annuity to the Province.

Nothing less would be justice. I hope the Government and the House will fully and fairly consider the whole subject and decide to add, in perpetuity, \$200,000 to the subsidy of Nova Scotia.

Mr. OGDEN: It appears very strange that, during the last few nights, both myself and the county I represent have been made the targets for certain hon. gentlemen opposite. With reference to my speech last year—I would not call those few remarks a speech, but considering that it was my first Session in this House, I thought a few words from me would be expected—I had not been here for five years without opening my mouth, as has been the case with some hon. gentlemen opposite, and I thought I would let my constituents know where I was, and show them that I advocated the same principles here that I advocated on the hustings. The same words I made use of on nomination day I made use of on the floor of this House last year. I said I believed we were entitled to a fair share of the Fishery Award, that, as it came from the sea, the fishermen were entitled to a fair portion of it. I said on nomination day that I had full confidence in Sir John A. Macdonald and his party, and hoped they would be returned to power, believing they would deal justly and generously with the fishermen; and those opinions I expressed in this House last Session. With regard to the National Policy, I pledged myself to support it. I read Sir John A. Macdonald's resolutions to the people and put my own construction upon them. I said I was willing to vote to tax flour 50c. per barrel, that I was willing to vote for a duty of 50c. on corn meal, provided we received a similar protection on every ton of coal imported into this country, and a reduction in duty upon tea, molasses, and other necessaries of life. That was square; the people believed I would fulfil my pledges, and I was returned by a majority of the electors. I did not come in by a fluke, as did the hon. members for Antigonish and Shelburne. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) made a shot at me last night about the starving fishermen in Guysborough county. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) also alluded to me, a few days ago, by putting upon the notice paper several questions relative to the affairs of my

county. Well, I thought the hon. gentleman was busying himself very much about every part of Nova Scotia, and, not only Nova Scotia, but I observe he has also taken the Provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island under his protecting wing. A short time ago he sailed up into the lakes of the Upper Provinces, and inquired how many tug boats there were, and how much coal had been imported for their special use, and at what cost per ton. Looking over the notice paper I find that the name of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), appears thirteen times; that of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), six times; that of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald), eight times; that of the late Finance Minister, ten times; that of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), ten times; that of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cockburn), eight times; that of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Keeler), four times. Several other members have had motions on the notice paper, making an average of four for each member, and none above five; but the name of the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson), one of the youngest members in this House, appears twenty-five times, far exceeding those put by the hon. the Premier, or the hon. leader of the Opposition combined. Now, I was going to suggest that the Government change the order, and set apart one day in each week for the special benefit of the hon. member for Shelburne, for if his questions increase in the future as rapidly as they have in the past, it will be absolutely necessary to do so in order to get through with the business of the House before the first of June. Now, with reference to the starving fishermen in Guysborough county, I am sorry to have the circumstance paraded before the public, and I do not think the fishermen will thank hon. gentlemen for their action. I am sorry to hear it asserted in this House that there is, or has been, anybody starving there. There is no starvation in my county. It is true, that owing to the failure of the mackerel and other fisheries last year—a parallel case has not been known since 1868—I believe there has been in some cases

destitution. As regards the Government supplies to the fishermen, I suppose the Government is fully competent to explain how that was done; but when word came to me that the people were almost starving in some places, and could not procure any assistance, that is where there were no Government works in operation, what did I do? I did not stick a question on the notice paper and then stand up in the House and say that I was receiving too much indemnity, that we were receiving twice as much as we ought to receive, but I dipped down into my own pocket and took out a quarter of my indemnity for this year and purchased therewith, provisions and sent them down to the suffering people in my own county, and so long as I have the honour to represent them in this House, they, I trust, shall never starve. I think it is grossly impertinent of the hon. member for Shelburne to be continually prying into the affairs of other members' counties. It would be equally as impertinent for me to go to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture and say to him, "Will you furnish me a return of the number of pigs taken from some lunatic asylum in Nova Scotia and sent by the hon. member for Shelburne into his county" thus propagating a race of lunatic pigs, and selling them to farmers at \$2.00 each. With reference to the amendment moved by the right hon. the Premier, I do not agree with it, and cannot support him. He may be right from a constitutional point of view, but in equity I think we are entitled to a share and should have it. We want the money badly for our Province as it is almost bankrupt. I think if the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition from the Lower Provinces had only talked a little more fairly, they might have awakened some sympathy for our cause in the minds of Ontario members, and have induced them to vote with us. But it seems no speech made by these hon. gentlemen can be complete unless it contains an attack either upon the hon. the Minister of Railways or upon myself. I am glad, however, to be in such good company and am willing to support the hon. Minister in everything that is right; and I do not know but I would strain a point to support him even if he was not quite right, because our case would not be any better in the hands of our opponents, and I

have a great deal of confidence in the ability of the hon. gentleman. I hope we shall obtain our full share of the Fishery Award. I would object to giving it to the Local Governments to spend in each Province, because I think it ought to be distributed in some way for the benefit of the fishermen. I say these men must and shall be protected; and if the Government should fail to lend them a helping hand when called upon, I would be the first man to vote against the Government.

We never hear of a murder, theft or any kind of crime being perpetrated by those hardy sons of toil; and when hunger, nay, when death itself, stares them in the face, you will find them honest and true, and ready to sacrifice their own lives to alleviate the sufferings of their fellow-men.

MR. BRECKEN: I am sorry to see this important question treated with so much levity by hon. gentlemen on the other side; we have had coal, breakwaters, estimates, better terms, and even pigs, brought into this discussion. The question now under the consideration of the House is this: Have the Lower Provinces the right or not to ask for the money that was paid by the United States for the concessions made to them by the Washington Treaty? I exceedingly regret I was not present when the right hon. the Premier addressed the House on the constitutional aspects of the question; for although my acquaintance with him has been short, his reputation is such that I have formed the impression that to listen to him on a question of constitutionality is to learn something. I do not know what the right hon. member said, but I can draw upon my imagination as to the course of argument he would likely pursue. I am not prepared to say that, by the strict and unbending rules of International Law, the Fishing territory, from which the Americans were excluded previous to the Washington Treaty, is Provincial property; but leaving out of consideration the strict principles of law, I would ask the hon. leader of the Government to say whether we are not in justice entitled to what we are asking for. The Premier is a great statesman, he has a large and generous heart, and an excellent and well cultivated mind; and when he goes down to his little, narrow, cold home—his dust to fraternise with his

kindred dust—before he is consigned to his grave, if a post-mortem were held upon him and his heart examined, we would, I believe, find distinctly engraved on it the words: "Canada and her prosperity, God bless her." I ask him to listen to me; and, although he is a lawyer, he must remember that law is one thing and justice, sometimes, another. I would ask him to consider the claims of Prince Edward Island. I am not asking for pity; I am not begging for bread, I am demanding what I believe to be her right; and I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. The Treaty of Washington was made in 1871; at that time Prince Edward Island was not a part of the Dominion of Canada. It is a calamity for her that she ever threw in her lot with the Dominion. I am loyal enough to believe that the policy of Confederation is one which tends to bind us closer to the Mother Country, and is one which every Canadian should support. We were assured that, if we came into the Union, this little Island of ours would receive many advantages; that the little baby of the Dominion would never want for food. I would like to know what interest the rest of the Dominion has in our Fisheries. If they were developed would it put one cent into the pockets of Ontario or the more distant western Provinces? If they were destroyed would it take a cent out of their pockets? The right hon. the leader of the Government tells us the Fisheries are Dominion property. Technically he may be right, but practically he is wrong. On the very day that the Treaty of Washington was signed, Mr. Fish, Secretary of State for the United States, addressed to Sir Edward Thornton, the British Minister at Washington, a despatch asking that the citizens of the United States should have the enjoyment; or the liberty to fish within the territorial waters of Her Britannic Majesty on the coasts of Canada, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, during the seasons of 1871 and 1872. I was Attorney General of the Island at that time, and when we acceded to the request of Mr. Fish we gave up a trump card. We knew well the value which our American friends put upon our Fisheries. We always considered that, with the Fishery limit in our hands, we were in a position

to deal with the Americans, and that we had then something to offer them in lieu of reciprocal Free-trade. We knew about the difficulties of the Mother Country with the United States—the Alabama Claims—and we unselfishly yielded up our interests, rather than that any trouble should arise between England and the United States. That the right hon. the First Minister may not think that I am drawing upon my imagination, but that I am stating what the Government of Prince Edward Island felt and thought was their true position, I will read from the Minutes of Council of the Island Government, of the date of the 17th July, 1871. The Committee of Council, after referring to the despatch of the 17th June, 1871, from the Earl of Kimberly, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, to Lieutenant-Governor Robinson, then administering the Government of the Island, in which it was strongly urged upon the Government of the Island that, for reasons stated in a despatch of the same date as above from Earl Kimberly to Lord Lisgar, the same course should be pursued as in 1854, and the application made by the United States Government, acceded to by Prince Edward Island, so that the American fisherman might be at once allowed during the present season the provisional use of the privileges granted to them by the Treaty, set forth:

“That they have respectfully to submit that Prince Edward Island is the most fertile and productive Province in British North America, in proportion to its extent. That the natural market for its principle productions is to be found in the United States, as was very satisfactorily proved during the continuance of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. That the Fisheries of this Island are the best and most valuable in America, and are much appreciated by the fishermen of the United States. That the different Governments and Legislatures of this colony have always hoped that these Fisheries would have done much to secure the advantages of another Reciprocity Treaty, or of some Tariff concessions authorising the free admission of the products of our agriculturists, who form the majority of our population, and which would have resulted in promoting the prosperity of the colony. That by the Treaty now under consideration, the inhabitants of the Island are asked to surrender to the citizens of the United States these valuable Fisheries without receiving in return any just or fair equivalent, such as was hoped to be obtained.”

The Minute of Council further sets out:

MR. BRECKEN.

“That the surrender by the United States of the right of fishing down to the thirty-ninth degree of latitude is comparatively worthless to the people of the Island, and as the United States assert that the privileges accorded to their citizens under Article 18 of this Treaty are not of greater value than those accorded by Articles 19 and 20 to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, the amount of money compensation that would be given to the Island would be insignificant. The Committee of Council, by their Minute, further submitted that a commercial arrangement with the United States, in consideration of the use of the Fisheries, would have been most acceptable; but as the Royal High Commissioners were unable to induce the American Government to change its commercial policy, the people of the Island, being extremely loyal, and devotedly attached to British institutions, would be most unwilling to throw any obstacle in the way of an amicable settlement of all causes of differences between Great Britain and the United States, and would therefore willingly accept any reasonable money compensation in addition to the privileges granted as an equivalent, but under the Treaty nothing of the kind was guaranteed them.”

It cannot be said we do not understand the meaning of the word “enough.” I once saw it defined in the *Toronto Globe* as meaning “a little more.” We believed that when we were going into Confederation the Fisheries belonged practically to us. If the Americans were admitted to fish within the three-mile limit we would receive compensation. Looking over the right hon. gentleman’s resolution, I see he says something about protecting the Fisheries. What is that argument worth? If there never had been a Treaty of Washington, the Dominion Government would have been bound to protect the Fisheries. As we have been so often euchred by our Republican neighbours, we hardly expected to receive anything in the shape of compensation for the concessions made to them, and that is, perhaps, the real reason why so little was said about our claim to a share of the Award. Now, suppose no amount had been awarded to the Dominion, or that the Award had been the other way, would not the Fisheries have to be protected at the expense of the Dominion Exchequer. Suppose that Western Canada were subjected to another Fenian raid, would not the Province of Prince Edward Island, in common with the other Provinces of the Dominion, have to contribute her quota to the cost of defending the country. Among the various duties and responsibilities assumed

by the Dominion, when the Provinces of British North America were confederated, was the protection of the Fisheries; and that, too, when there was no expectation of ever receiving a cent from the United States in shape of compensation for the enjoyment of our Fisheries. Here is another answer to the protection and defence argument of my right hon. friend. Suppose, when the term for which the Treaty was made has expired, that the American Government should decline to renew the Treaty, and that we shall have fallen back on the old state of things as they existed before the Treaty, the Fisheries will then have to be protected at the cost of the Dominion; and, Mr. Speaker, that protection, to be at all efficient, will involve more than one or two small steamers such as the *Druid* and the *Newfield*. It will require a small navy to make the protection of any substantial benefit to Dominion fishermen. The cost must necessarily be heavy. I can well imagine what dissatisfaction this expenditure would cause to the people of Ontario and the Great North-West, who have practically no interest in these Fisheries and care very little about them. A strong feeling would soon arise, and the hon. members from the west would object to the expenditure of their taxes to protect an industry in which practically they had no interest. In all probability a pressure would be brought on the Government of the day, the protection would be minimised, and, in effect, American fishermen would fish in our water free of cost. With reference to the National Policy: I made some remarks to the effect that it did not benefit Prince Edward Island as it did other parts of the Dominion. My remarks have been misrepresented. I did not say or argue that, because that Policy was not advantageous to us, that, therefore, we had a right to a share of the Fishery Award. I brought it in, not as an argument, but to show to this House that if we had any claim to a share of the Award, the fact of our not sharing in the benefits of the National Policy strengthened the equity of our case. If we have a substantial, equitable claim, we do not want to be thrown over by the cast-iron rules of International Law. All the attendant circumstances should be considered. Every dollar spent in Prince Edward Island

brings good results. We do not throw away money into the sea, on canals, Fort Frances locks, and a variety of works of that kind. I think we will receive the fairest consideration at the hands of the Government, and then we will be quiet. We are charged with being grumblers. Unless we are continually grumbling and pressing our claims we shall get nothing. I can well imagine some of the difficulties that the Government has to encounter in disposing of the Award, but I press strongly upon them the exceptional claims of Prince Edward Island. Look at our insular position; think of the millions of dollars that have been spent on the Pacific Railway—millions that have irretrievably been lost and sunk, and for which the Dominion will never receive a cent's worth of benefit. If Prince Edward Island were to receive 5 per cent. on the large amounts that have been uselessly squandered in the North-West, we would be satisfied and quiet for the next twelve years to come. As I said, when I addressed this House on a former occasion, the Lower Provinces do not object to the construction of the Pacific Railway. We look up to it as a great work necessary for the development of the now Great Lone Land; but at this time hon. members scarcely realise the difficulties that Prince Edward Islanders have to undergo and how we are in want of the expenditure of public money. Look at our mail communication at this season of the year. I am now ten days without having heard from my home. I heard the hon. the Finance Minister, the other day, say that the result of the Government Railway policy would be that, in a few years, we shall have hundreds of thousands of people in the vast territory of the North-West. I believe his prediction will prove true. Well, Sir, we are helping to bring this about; Prince Edward Island is one-fortieth of the Dominion in population, and more than that in importance. Let us then have our fair proportion in the advantages of being first of the Dominion. I could occupy the time of the House for hours on this subject, but it would not be wise in me to do so. I feel very warmly on it; I hope the Government will take our claim into their grave consideration, and not overlook what is due to that smiling little

Island—the most beautiful, the most fertile, and the most densely populated portion of the Dominion of Canada.

MR. MUTTART: My object in rising, Mr. Speaker, is not for the purpose of making a speech, but merely to say that Prince Edward Island's claims to a separate and distinct share of the Fishery Award have not been abandoned, notwithstanding the decision of the Sub-Committee of the Privy Council. I, therefore, give notice that, when the House goes into Committee, I will take the opportunity of moving the following:—

That after the word "Confederation" at the end of the last paragraph, in the original resolution, the following be added:—"That, while admitting the principle that the injury done to the Fisheries being of a local character, the compensation awarded should be distributed among the various Provinces in the proportion of the disadvantages and losses suffered. That it is, nevertheless, the opinion of this House that the Province of Prince Edward Island is entitled to a separate share of the Fishery Award on the following special grounds, namely: 1st. That before July 1st, 1873, the Treaty of Washington was in full force and effect as respects Prince Edward Island. 2nd. That there was no express or implied surrender of the interests of the Island in the Fishery Award at the time of the Island's entering Confederation. 3rd. That the British North America Act does not apply to a case where an interest in the Fisheries had been sold and conveyed away, and the right to the purchase money had accrued to the Island before Confederation, and such Act does not authorise the General Government to appropriate the proceeds of the sale of the Island Fisheries for the general purposes of the Dominion."

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne): After the able address delivered by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey), I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House at any length, as I have given expression to my views on the rights and privileges pertaining to the Maritime Provinces on this question on a previous occasion. Besides, after the speech of the right hon. the leader of the Government, it is useless for me, representing a Nova Scotian constituency, to speak in favour of the apportionment of this Award in the interests of the Maritime Provinces. Speeches may be made and strong arguments may be advanced, but the power and influence of that hon. gentleman is of sufficient strength in this House to carry any amendment and destroy any chance the Maritime Provinces may have had to

secure a portion of this money. I do not see why I should have been the subject of attack by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Ogden), because I certainly have said nothing to call down upon me his wrath. I occupy a different position to that hon. gentleman. He is a warm and enthusiastic supporter of the present Government, and an ardent friend of the hon. Ministers. No man can be more constant in his attendance on the Government than the hon. member for Guysborough, and therefore he has every opportunity for obtaining information which I am denied. He has seen fit to attack me, because I presented a petition from his county; and also, because I have taken advantage of my rights and privileges, as a member of Parliament, to ask a certain question in reference to the expenditure of public moneys among the fishermen of the county he represents. The petition that I presented, was signed by a large number of the electors of West Guysborough, and it was the unanimous wish of the petitioners that it should be presented by myself, and not by the hon. member for Guysborough; and I can tell the hon. gentlemen that a resolution was passed at that meeting, strongly condemning him for his conduct in Parliament.

MR. OGDEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that a resolution was passed to that effect?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes; and a petition is being prepared, calling upon the hon. gentleman to resign. The hon. gentleman attacked me, also, because I asked for certain other information from the Government; my defence is not to him, but to the people I represent. The only means open for me to obtain information in connection with public matters is by motion or question in Parliament; and by any other course I would receive but little satisfaction. On one occasion, I asked the hon. the Minister of Public Works for a copy of a report in connection with public works in my county, which might have been given me without the necessity of a motion, but I was requested to pursue the proper course, as he then would have no objection to the papers being brought down. The hon. gentleman tells us there are no starving fishermen in the county of Guysborough. In contradiction of that

statement, I may refer him to his hon. colleague in the representation of that county in the Local House. What is more, the starvation of these fishermen is the result of legislation by this Government supported by the hon. gentleman for the advancement of his own personal interest, irrespective of the interests of the county he represents. I think that, in giving a sum of money towards the support of the fishermen of Guysborough, it should have been given without any conditions, and not as an advance to be refunded by a certain time. When the people of Ireland were starving, the Parliament of Canada generously voted \$100,000 towards their support; and we were told by cablegram, the other day, that a portion of the vote was set aside to buy boats and nets for fishermen on the west coast of that Island, but no condition was made, at that time, that the money so expended should be refunded; and I do not see why, especially as the Government receives large sums of money from the fishermen in the Lower Provinces, that any portion of the amount given to them should be awarded on condition of its return. I think we have an equitable claim to a portion of the Award. The Province is in an unfortunate position, financially; and the result is that, during the present year, large numbers of its people have been compelled to leave and find a home in the United States. Unless the Government awards us a portion of the money its action will be most unpopular, and its course will be condemned not only by its opponents but by many of its strongest supporters.

MR. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) : It seems to me that one of the main points to determine in the discussion of this question is: When did the Treaty of Washington come into effect, as respects Prince Edward Island? We are told, over and over again, that it was the 1st of July, 1873; and in the report of the Sub-Committee of the Privy Council this fact is pointed out as the only reason why the claims of the Island are put on a level with those of the other Provinces. Is it true that the Fishery clauses of the Treaty did not come into effect until 1st July? We find that Article 33 of the Washington Treaty provides that the clause relating to the Fisheries should take effect as soon as the laws required were passed

by the agreeing parties. The Province of Prince Edward Island passed the required legislation on the 29th July, 1872, and the Congress of the United States passed the necessary legislation on 1st March, 1873. Let us consider the condition we were in before the Treaty came into force, and the passing of the Acts referred to. When is an Act said to be in force? As I understand it, when it is passed by the House, and the Governor or the President has given it his sanction. A time may be appointed by the Act for its going into force, but that is an independent consideration, and does not apply to the Acts I have mentioned. At that time Prince Edward Island and the United States stood in the position of intending contracting parties. The one had sold rights, and the other had bought them. Section 5 of the Act passed by the United States Congress, on 1st March, 1873, is as follows:—

“That this Act shall not take effect until the 1st day of July, 1873, and shall not apply to any article of merchandise therein mentioned which shall be held in bond on that day by the Customs officers of the United States.”

We also find in Section I of the same Act:

“That whenever the President of the United States shall receive satisfactory evidence that the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Prince Edward Island have passed laws on their part, to give full effect to the provisions of the Treaty between the United States and Great Britain, signed at Washington on the 8th day of May, 1871, etc., etc., he is hereby authorised to issue his proclamation declaring that he has such evidence, and thereupon from the date of such proclamation, etc., etc. According to the terms and conditions of Article 33 of said Treaty, all fish-oil, and fish of all kinds (except fish of the inland lakes and fish preserved in oil) being the produce of the Fisheries of the Dominion of Canada or of Prince Edward Island, shall be admitted into the United States free of duty.”

We find that this could have taken effect any time between the 1st March and 1st July. I would like to call the attention of hon. members, who assert that the Act of Congress passed on the 1st March, 1873, only came into effect on 1st July, 1873, to the peculiar wording of the Act itself. Section I authorises the President to declare, by proclamation, that fish and fish oil of the Island shall be admitted free of duty, as soon as he shall have received satisfactory evidence that the

legislation contemplated by Article 33 of the Washington Treaty had been passed. This means that the most important provision of the Act could have come into force long before 1st July, 1873, and shall not apply to any article of merchandise held in bond by the United States Customs officers on that day. This section does not seem to apply to the whole Act, but merely to mark the time beyond which the Customs officers could not collect duties. Then it was possible for the main provisions of the Treaty to go into effect, in regard to Prince Edward Island, even under the strictest interpretation of the Act, before 1st July, 1873. Section 5, which I have just read, is not a general, but a special, provision; and it was inserted chiefly with the object of enabling Custom-house officers of the United States to deal with the articles in bond at that date. What was the effect of this mutual legislation between Prince Edward Island and the United States? It was to vest in the Americans the right to fish in the territorial waters of the Island for the term of twelve years. The obligation to pay, secured by the Treaty, was held by the Island before the time of Confederation, and was a part of the separate property of the State, the same as the money in its Local Treasury. It also had the same effect as a solemn agreement would have between the contracting parties. It makes no difference whether the amount of payment was settled or not, or whether it was settled by the Award, and the Island held the right to that sum as part of its present assets, just as much as if it were bonds and promissory notes. Suppose I give a legal document to another party, conveying certain property to him for a consideration. That deed vests the right or claim to that property in the person to whom I give it, while it would vest in me the right to receive the consideration to be paid. Therefore, the question is: Whether the rights surrendered by the Island to the Dominion under Confederation took away her rights in the agreement between her and the United States? Did she surrender any bonds at the time of Confederation? No, she did not. Neither did she surrender any money that was in her Treasury at the time. Then how can it be said that the Island yielded up assets

of a similar nature. There is no evidence of it. Besides, the burden of proof is in the Dominion, and if they fail to establish it it must be held that no surrender of the rights referred to was made. It is important to bear this in mind, because, if the Fishery interests were really changed before Confederation into a bond or obligation to receive money, then that is an end to the argument, for no one has ventured to assert that the Island transferred to the Dominion any such bond or obligation or any personal property of that character. At any rate, in this state of the argument, if any one is bold enough to assert it, the burden is thrown upon him to prove the transfer of these particular moneys, and why the transfer was made, and all the circumstances of the transaction. Has this been done? Has it been attempted? No, and it cannot be done; and it follows conclusively from this course of reasoning that whatever property it cannot be shown was handed over to the general Government, that property was retained by the Island for its own use. The Dominion did not go into this matter blindly. It knew of the existence of the Washington Treaty. It knew of the Legislation that had been passed. It knew, or ought to have known, the nature of the obligation we held of the Americans. It did not stipulate with us respecting our share of the Fishery Award. It left that in our hands untouched. They may have made a bad bargain, or an oversight, but that is not our fault. This property was ours before Confederation and is ours still. It should have been handed over to us direct by the Imperial Government, and Canada has no right to retain the money after our claim has been properly preferred. No consideration was ever given or offered for this important part of the assets of the Island. There is no doubt that up to July, 1873, the Island had the right to make that bargain with the United States, with respect to her Fisheries. But there are important considerations to be borne in mind, one of which is that the power conferred upon the Dominion by the Act of Confederation, did not—and could not be construed to—extend to the interest in which the Fisheries had been already sold and conveyed. We must consider, for the moment, what was meant by the right to legislate, respecting the Fisheries. By

Section 91 of the British North America Act, the Dominion has exclusive authority throughout, to legislate in all matters coming within the classes of subjects therein enumerated, and among these are the "Sea coast and inland Fisheries." The powers of the Dominion cannot extend further than these words mean. No doubt it would have the right to legislate respecting the protection or management of the Fisheries. Possibly also it has the power to sell or lease the Fisheries, but the Fisheries themselves are not by this enactment vested in the Dominion. It has no estate or interest in them; but its rights were only created by the Act from which the Dominion derives all its power. If the Dominion has the right to guard and encourage the Fisheries, it is for the benefit of the Fisheries and the Provinces especially interested. If it has power to lease them, it is only as an agent for those Provinces. It cannot do otherwise than to hold them for the special benefit of the different Provinces whose Fisheries are so dealt with. When the delegation from Prince Edward Island came here, in regard to the final terms before entering Confederation, and when the Terms of Union were still pending, the following Memorandum was drawn up:—

"Should the above be agreed upon as a basis of Union, the undersigned will beg to submit a further Memorandum with respect to the Fisheries."

This shows it was the intention of the Island to keep its share of the Fishery Award; or, if not, to receive some further equivalent for transferring it to the Dominion. There is nothing to show that the Island ever intended to transfer its Fisheries gratuitously. Before she entered the Union she passed the necessary legislation to give her an interest in the Award. The Treaty was not dependent on any proclamation of the President. The main provisions could have gone into effect at any time between 1st of March and 1st of July, 1873. It gave to the United States the right to fish in the territorial waters of Prince Edward Island for twelve years, the Island to receive a certain compensation therefor. The one did not surrender its right to a share of the Award by entering Confederation, though it surrendered to the Dominion the power to

legislate respecting the Fisheries. But suppose, for the sake of argument, that even after July 1st, 1873, the Dominion had the exclusive right to legislate respecting the Fisheries—what does this mean? Does this right to legislate give the ownership to Canada? Not necessarily. I may have power to deal with or convey property that is not my own. I may be an agent merely, or trustee for another who is the real owner. And so it seems to me is the relation the Dominion stands in with respect to the Island Fisheries. If Canada ever becomes the owner, a direct transfer will have to be made. As the case now stands Canada is merely a trustee for the several Provinces, and any act it does is for the special benefit of the Provinces. It might have the power to sell or lease the Fisheries to the Americans, but it must apply the proceeds of the sale in the manner directed by the Provinces. It has no right and no authority, under the British North America Act, to take the moneys arising from the Fishery Award from the different Provinces, to which it essentially belongs, and appropriate it to the general purposes of the Dominion. I trust and hope, therefore, that the Government will make some special exception in favour of the special claims of Prince Edward Island and do justice to that Province.

Mr. KAULBACH: The subject now before the House is of very great importance to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. The right given to American citizens, under the Washington Treaty, to fish in our territorial waters was a sacrifice, to a very large extent, of the rights and privileges which our fishermen possessed, without their getting one solitary benefit in return. The Treaty conveys to said American citizens this right for twelve years, over a coast line of 3,160 miles, representing the dearest interests and rights which the poor fishermen of the Maritime Provinces enjoyed. And what do we get in return from our neighbours?—the exhausted fishing ground north of the 39° parallel of latitude, exhausted by the American fishermen long previous to the Treaty. It was not at all probable that our fishermen would leave their productive fields, giving them a comfortable living, and use at any time the exhausted fisheries on the

American coast. True, we are told that we have full access to the American markets for the sale of our fish and oil, which, although correct, has been, and still is, of little service to our fishermen, as the Americans, ever alive to their own interests through our waters with their immense fishing fleets, better equipped in every way for fishing than our own fishermen, monopolise our waters and, with their enormous catches, supply their own markets, thus depriving us of the only benefit we anticipated deriving from this Treaty. Now, Mr. Speaker, had these Fisheries been exclusively our own, we could not only have had the American market but the West India market as well, the latter being, without doubt, very remunerating to us, now very largely supplied by the Americans from the catches they take in our territorial waters. Before the interests of our fishermen were interfered with by this Treaty, we were able to take fish in large quantities in the inshore waters of our coast; now our fishermen have to launch out into the deep waters of the broad and stormy Atlantic at the risk of their lives. Then they were able to use small boats at little cost; now they are compelled to use vessels and large boats, which are very expensive, and often beyond their scanty means to obtain. Then they were able to enjoy their quiet rest and sleep at night; now they are compelled to leave in the darkness of the morning, in consequence of the immense distances they have to go from the coast, and the desire to get back before the return of the next night. Then junior members of the family of the poor fishermen could assist in the catching, as the fishing was close at hand in the bays and harbours, and in smooth water, now only the heads of families can put to sea and prosecute this hazardous industry. Then it was that less clothing was required, as it was only by day and in smooth water that fish were sought for; now the heaviest clothing is needed, in consequence of night fishing and greater exposure. Then, in shallow water, less lines and twines were used, and they of a lighter texture, less cost and no loss; now the heaviest and most expensive have to be used, and then subject to be swept away by the first heavy storm in the ocean. Then they only toiled dur-

ing the summer season at fishing; now the poor suffering creatures have to be exposed to the cold, icy blasts of winter as well, chilled to the very heart to procure a scanty living for their poor, needy and suffering families. In fact, many of our fishermen are now compelled, during parts of the year, in consequence of the sacrifice of the Fisheries and the exhausted state of the fishing grounds, to change their occupation and go as mariners on foreign voyages, and some of them to sacrifice fishing entirely and seek other employments. Now all these difficulties and privations, by the aid of the Fishery Award, could be averted, and the fishing grounds plentifully restored and supplied with the most valuable descriptions of fish, and many of the fishermen induced to return to their original calling. With the poor fisherman placed in this deplorable position, sacrificed and impoverished, I am not requiring too much when I ask for a share of the Fishery Award, rightly, as I believe, belonging to the Maritime Provinces, of which Nova Scotia claims the largest interest, she having, of the 3,160 miles of sea-coast as ceded to the Fisheries under the Treaty, 1,060 miles belonging to herself. Of the one thousand vessels engaged in the Fisheries belonging to the Dominion, upwards of seven hundred are claimed by Nova Scotia—I am speaking in round numbers. Nova Scotia claims 50 per cent. of all the boats engaged in fishing, or about eight thousand; upwards of 50 per cent. of all the fishermen, and upwards of 50 per cent. of all the nets, lines and twines,—that is by the latest returns. Last year's not being given in detail, are not available at present. The Dominion Fisheries, I observe by account, were valued for the year ending June 30th, 1878, \$13,215,678.83. The proportionate value of each of the Provinces being as follows:—

Nova Scotia.....	\$6,131,599 64
Quebec.....	2,664,045 30
New Brunswick.....	2,305,790 69
British Columbia.....	925,776 98
Prince Edward Island.....	840,344 22
Ontario.....	348,122 00

Making, as already stated, a grand total of \$13,215,678.83, showing most conclusively that the value of the Nova Scotia Fisheries is one-half the entire value of all the Fisheries of the Dominion; conse-

quently, according to the value of the Fisheries, Nova Scotia's portion of the Award would be \$2,087,838.14. Now, dependent as Nova Scotia is upon the Fisheries as an auxiliary to her success, of which the above statement is a very evident proof, the \$82,628 given her as an additional subsidy for the years having lapsed, together with the immense amounts spent in reckless extravagance by the late Local Administration in the subsidising of railways, etc., not yet completed—the latter, of course, the Dominion Government are not responsible for—I would ask, in view of these facts, how is it possible for her to succeed without means to ameliorate the unfortunate financial condition in which she is placed, not only that of debt, but without the means to carry on the ordinary requirements of the Province, which position the present Government very readily discovered on their advent to power, and which is rendered still more conclusive and apparent by the experience of the current year. I wish to be clearly understood, in this matter, that I do not wish any part of this Award to be applied to railways but for the express benefit of the Fisheries. The Maritime Provinces, in giving up these Fisheries to the Americans to be used in common with themselves from 1854 to 1866, secured the Reciprocity Treaty, which, whilst it was a great advantage to the commercial portion of Old Canada, merely secured to the Canadian fishermen the United States market for the sale of their fish and oil, now supplied by the Americans themselves from our municipal waters. We have no stronger proof of the correctness of our claim to this Award than the example and principle set by Great Britain in paying over to Newfoundland her portion without an enquiry. In making this request we are endeavouring to carry out the principle of the National Policy, and protecting one of the greatest industries that this Dominion possesses, and fostering, at the same time, a ready cash market for the flour and manufactured articles of the west, the Maritime Provinces being their best market and the fishermen their most extensive purchasers. We expect support at the hands of Ontario and British Columbia in this matter, in lieu of the many benefits they derive by the Act of Confederation, over and above the Maritime

Provinces, the former in Canals, Railways and other Public Works, and the latter in the Pacific Railway and the enjoyment of the rich and abundant Fisheries of the Pacific waters on the other side of this continent without interruption. Considering, by this Treaty, the many deprivations the poor fishermen have been subjected to, and the immense amount saved to the Dominion by not being required to protect the coast territory, I feel that in supporting this resolution for the Award in behalf of the interest of the Maritime Provinces, and the fishermen, I claim to ask it not as a privilege, but as an incumbent right, namely, the \$4,490,882.94 handed over by the Government of the United Kingdom to the Government of Canada, an amount as I hold due to us, be paid over to the Maritime Provinces proportionately—it having been awarded for the privileges and rights, we Maritimes surrendered under Articles 18 and 32 of the Treaty of Washington to our neighbours, over and above in value that received from them under Articles 19 and 21 of said Treaty. The views enunciated by some of the hon. members of this House, and the differences of opinion as expressed by others, respecting these territorial rights, excites a doubt in the minds of many as to the true position of the matter. I hold that we having exercised, used and enjoyed these privileges and rights, the same as Newfoundland enjoyed her rights on her coasts for so long a period, indefeasible as I consider, we reasonably now should claim to hold them upon the well-established, time-honoured, and in this instance, equitable principle, "That possession is nine points of the law." I believe that Great Britain, when paying over the referred-to amount, paid it for the interest of the Maritime Provinces, as an integral part of this Dominion, to be disposed of for the benefit of the fishermen. Our hon. friend from Inverness, the mover of this resolution, in the dramatic part of this exercise, has figured somewhat conspicuously, and for the information of this House, were he in his seat, I would ask him to explain his position. It is asserted that the Commission appointed under Articles 22 and 23 of the Treaty of Washington, and in conformity with the solemn declaration made and subscribed by them on the 15th June, 1877, met in

Halifax and awarded the sum as referred to. I would ask, under these circumstances, how can our hon. friend account for his lack of alacrity and zeal, and want of patriotism in not pressing this claim on behalf of the fishermen, before the present Administration came into power. The Award was made in 1877, and Parliament met, under the last régime, in 1878, of which he was a strong supporter; could he not have had interest enough at that time with the then Premier, now the hon. leader of the Opposition, to have pressed the claim with the same persistent vigour that he is now doing? Was it not the duty of our hon. friend, representing a fishing constituency, and was it not the right of the hon. leader of the Government of that day, to have advised the British Government, before their paying the money over to this Dominion, to make a special proviso, that the amount, when paid over, was to be expended for the benefit of the Fisheries of the Maritime Provinces? Certainly it was. Some appear to question the exact sincerity of the hon. member for Inverness in now pressing this claim, instead of in 1878, which is perhaps severe; but I do say that he certainly is open to censure for neglecting to press it in the Session of 1878, when the opportune moment offered, which, had he done, would probably have avoided the present lengthy discussion, and much disquietude. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that this Award is justly due to the Maritime Provinces, for the reasons I have already advanced, on the principles of equity and fair play, that is to say, that what comes from the Fisheries should be returned to the Fisheries. The fishermen are the bone and sinew of the Province I have the honour to represent, and one of the leading arteries to the wealth and success of this Dominion; and I would fail in my duty to them, whose interests I hold most dear, as well as to my county and Province, were I not to uphold their interests, and to advocate to the utmost of my ability, this, as I hold, so just a claim. I hope this House will see the necessity for complying with this just request and honourable demand for the Fishery Award, and in doing so, I would strongly advise that the money be expended in the erection of fish nurseries or fish-breeding establishments, along the coast, at certain in-

tervals, under the supervision of the fish culturist, Mr. Wilmot; and the fishermen induced, by a compensation amply to reward them for their labour and time, to collect all the spawn, or ova, from the fish, and dispose of them to the fish culturist, which would not only be a nucleus for the recuperation of the now all but exhausted fishing grounds, but a great help to the fishermen whose return of fish, often, is not sufficient to pay their expensive supply bills. Wishing that words could more strongly express the sentiments I entertain on this important subject, on behalf of the interest of the fishermen, and hoping that this "Ship of State" will not leave the poor fishermen as a shipwrecked crew to weather the storms of adversity, but that she will come to their rescue and give them of that which they claim as their own, as the price of what they had to surrender to their Republican neighbours.

MR. WELDON moved the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion to adjourn the Debate *negatived*.

MR. HACKETT: The resolutions submitted by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell), which we are now discussing, are, in my opinion, based upon a sound principle. They state that the Award under the Washington Treaty should be distributed amongst the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces who have suffered by the operation of that Treaty. I have much pleasure in supporting that proposition, as I believe that what came from the Fisheries should return to the Fisheries. This is a principle I have always contended for, and is the only basis upon which this question can now be satisfactorily settled. Any person who takes the trouble to read the report of the proceedings of the Halifax Commission, will see that the Award of \$5,500,000 was based as much upon the losses and disadvantages suffered by the people of the Maritime Provinces, owing to allowing Americans the use of their inshore Fisheries, as it was to the benefits and advantages accruing to the citizens of the United States, on account of having the use of those Fisheries. We, who come from the Maritime Provinces, know something of the privations and hardships of the fishermen of those Provinces, who

MR. KAULBACH.

are compelled to go down to the sea in small boats to make a living for themselves and their families. And, when they find, as they have found during late years, after building and equipping their boats and preparing themselves to prosecute their precarious calling, that the citizens of a foreign country are on the fishing ground before them with their large vessels, fitted with all the modern appliances for catching fish, virtually depriving them of the means of making a living for themselves and their families; and when they further find that these foreigners, by the use of purse seines, are rapidly destroying this valuable industry, and that year by year the Fisheries are becoming less productive, they consider they are only contending for their just rights when they insist upon a distribution of the Fishery Award in their interests. Hon. gentlemen in this House, who are not acquainted with this question, would do well to inform themselves with regard to these facts; and, after doing so, I am sure they would come to the same conclusions as myself. The Fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence are the heritage of the people of the Maritime Provinces; and when they find their birthright taken away from them, and sold to a foreign country, they only do their duty when they insist that the money accruing to Canada by virtue of this sale, should be divided amongst those who have suffered by the sale. True, it may be said, and it has been said, that the people of the Maritime Provinces have, under this Treaty, the right to sell their fish, free of duty, in the United States, and that such right is a great boon to them. Previous to the Treaty coming into force, there might have been something in this; but now such an argument is not worthy of consideration, as the fishermen know that the price of fish in the United States markets is regulated by the supply and demand. And as the Americans, on account of being allowed to fish in the waters of the Maritime Provinces, keep the market overstocked, our fishermen find that they must submit to a great reduction in price; and, instead of being able to control those markets, as they could do under different circumstances, they find that they have to compete with fish caught at their own doors by foreigners.

These remarks I have made apply to the case of the Maritime Provinces generally, and I hope they may be successful in their efforts to obtain a portion of this Award. But, while doing so, I contend that Prince Edward Island has a separate and distinct claim to a portion of this money; and, in doing so, I base my contention upon the grounds taken by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Muttart), who will submit his amendments when the House goes into Committee on the main motion. His resolutions are as follows:—

“1st. That before July 1st, 1873, the Treaty of Washington was in full force and effect as respect: Prince Edward Island.

“2nd. That there was no express or implied surrender of the interests of the Island in the Fishery Award, and at the time of the Island entering Confederation.

“3rd. That the British North America Act does not apply to a case where an interest in the Fisheries had been sold and conveyed away, and the rights to the purchase money had accrued to the Island before Confederation, and such Act does not authorise the General Government to appropriate the proceeds of the sale of the Island Fisheries for the general purposes of the Dominion.”

These grounds are, I believe, well taken; and if hon. gentlemen would study them they must arrive at the conclusion that our claim is not only based upon principles of equity and justice, but is also sound from a legal and constitutional standpoint. We all know that, at the time this Treaty was entered into, Prince Edward Island was an independent Colony, having no connection whatever with the Dominion of Canada. We also know that, before this Treaty could be perfected, so as to make it binding in all its provisions, the Colony of Prince Edward Island was called upon to pass an Act ratifying the Treaty so far as she was concerned. The Government and Legislature of the Island very reluctantly passed this measure, as they were well aware that the people were making a great sacrifice when they were surrendering the valuable inshore Fisheries to a foreign country for the term of twelve years. We find, on looking over the despatches having reference to this question, a Minute of Council of the Prince Edward Island Government, dated the 24th July, 1871, from which I take the following paragraph:—

“The Committee submit that a commercial

arrangement with the United States, in consideration of the use of the Fisheries, would have been most acceptable; but as the Royal High Commissioners were unable to induce the American Government to change its commercial policy, the people of the Island, being extremely loyal and devotedly attached to British Institutions, would be most unwilling to throw any obstacle in the way of an amicable settlement of all causes of difference between Great Britain and the United States, and would therefore willingly accept any reasonable money compensation in addition to the privileges granted as an equivalent, but under the Washington Treaty nothing of the kind is guaranteed them."

Lord Kimberley replies to this Minute of Council, in his Despatch No. 32, dated 3rd September, 1871, in the following manner:—

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch, No. 59, of the 25th July, communicating to me the consent of your Government to the admission of United States fishermen during the present season to the privileges granted by the Treaty of Washington so far as concerns the Colony under your Government.

"Her Majesty's Government have learnt with much satisfaction that the Prince Edward Island Government have so willingly acceded to their wishes in this respect. With regard to the observation contained in the Minute of Council which you have forwarded, to the effect that the Prince Edward Island Government would readily accept any reasonable money compensation in addition to the privileges granted as an equivalent, but that under the Treaty nothing of the kind is guaranteed, I do not understand why the Prince Edward Island Government should object to the reference of the question of the money compensation to arbitration, which seems to be the fairest way of determining such a point, more especially as the fact stated in the Minute that the rights of fishing conceded by the United States are comparatively worthless is, it must be presumed, capable of distinct proof."

It will thus be seen that Prince Edward Island surrendered the use of her Fisheries to the Americans at the urgent request of the Imperial Government, but with the distinct understanding that she was to receive a money compensation for the privileges thus surrendered. Having established this fact, it next remains to be seen whether or not the Island surrendered her right to this money when she came into Confederation. Now, I contend she did not. At the time of Confederation she stood precisely the same as Newfoundland with regard to this Treaty. All the legislation necessary, so far as she was concerned, had been gone through, and it only remained for the Commission

to sit and make their Award, and their not having done so until after she came into the Union, cannot possibly affect her claim to a portion of the Award. Now, Sir, I am not a lawyer and do not undertake to discuss the legal aspect of this question, but I have always heard it laid down as a sound principle in law that what was not included in an agreement was excluded, and when we see that by the terms of Confederation no surrender was made by the Island of any right she held under the Washington Treaty, we must only come to the conclusion that legally and constitutionally she still holds that right. Undoubtedly the British North America Act gives to the Dominion the power to legislate with regard to the sea coast and inland Fisheries; it also gives the right to protect, but it cannot be shown that it gives to the Dominion vested rights held by a Province under Treaty with a foreign country before Confederation. The interest of Prince Edward Island to a portion of this Award, was a legitimate asset of the Province, and cannot be claimed by the Dominion, on any better grounds than the funds in the Local Treasury might be claimed by her at the time of Confederation. It is true, we have been told by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that we have no claim to a portion of this Award, from the fact that the Island came into the Confederation on the 1st day of July, 1873, being the day on which the Washington Treaty came into operation. I cannot understand why the hon. gentlemen, who formed that Committee, should dismiss our case in so summary a manner and on so flimsy a pretext. It is a well-known fact that we had nothing to do with fixing the time at which the Treaty should come into operation; that was done by the Government of the United States, over which we had no possible control; and because they fixed upon that day, it cannot take away from us our rights in this matter. The Island Government and Legislature had done all that was necessary for them to do for the purpose of securing to the Island a portion of this Award long before the 1st July, 1873, and having done so no mere accident can deprive the Island of her fair share. These distinguished gentlemen will have to reconsider

their decision on this question ; and after doing so, and after giving this subject all the consideration its importance demands, they must arrive at the conclusion that their former opinion was given without duly considering the question. The right hon. leader of the Government has stated in his speech this evening that this money should be applied to the building of lighthouses, improving of harbours, etc., in the Maritime Provinces, and that such appropriations are made in the interests of the fishermen of those Provinces. I have great respect for the opinions of the hon. gentleman, but I cannot agree with him in this instance. Under the Confederation Act the Dominion is bound to build lighthouses, construct breakwaters and improve harbours, which is done in the general interests of trade and commerce. We know that the mariners of Norway and Sweden, of France and the United States, derive as much benefit from the lighting of our coasts and the improving of our harbours, as the people of the Maritime Provinces. Then again, look at the large expenditures which take place yearly, for the building of lighthouses and the improving of navigable rivers on the Upper St. Lawrence ; and on the great inland waters of the Dominion this is done, and must be done quite irrespective of the Fishery Award. Keeping our share of this money must be defended on better grounds than these, and better reasons must be given before we will be satisfied. It has also been said that the Dominion has been called upon to expend large amounts of money in protecting the Fisheries of the Maritime Provinces, and as there is a probability of the Washington Treaty being abrogated, or, at all events, not renewed, that large amounts will be required for that purpose again, at an early day. The Dominion assumed the responsibility of protecting our Fisheries before this Award was made, and must continue to do so out of the general revenue, so long as protection is necessary. But who have defended and protected our Fisheries in the past ? Was it not the Mother Country ? We know that it is a matter of history, that, in the year 1870, when Canada was in a better position financially to protect the Fisheries than she is in to-day, that Admiral Wellesley was ordered to dispatch a

sufficient force of British war-ships to Canadian waters, for the purpose of maintaining order and protecting the Fisheries ; and if this protection argument were correct, its logical sequence would be, that Great Britain, and not Canada, has the right to this money. But we know how the Imperial Government acted with regard to this matter ; they at once handed over to Canada the balance of the Award, after deducting Newfoundland's share, thinking that Canada would do justice to all the Provinces, particularly the Province of Prince Edward Island. They did not raise the cry of protection, and that they should be reimbursed out of this money, although they had expended millions of dollars in the protection of these Fisheries. They would scorn to keep the money that came out of the purchase and sale of these Fisheries, and showed, by handing over to Newfoundland her share, that the amount should be distributed amongst the Maritime Provinces. With regard to the special case of Prince Edward Island, I trust that the Government and the House will do us justice. I do not look upon the vote that is about being taken as in any way affecting the Island's interests. Our special case is not connected with the question now before the House. We intend that it shall rest on its own merits outside of the claims put forward by the other Provinces. We do not come here as suppliants looking for charity ; we appear here in the full possession of our constitutional rights and privileges as British freemen, advocating that justice be done our constituents. We appeal to the representatives of the great Province of Ontario, as well as those of the sister Province of Quebec, for justice, in this matter we know we have the sympathy of our friends from British Columbia and Manitoba. We would ask that great statesman the right hon. the leader of the Government, who was mainly instrumental in forming this great Dominion, and who laboured so ably and so well in reconciling the different elements and interests in this Confederation, to consider what may be the result of refusing us our rights. Our people are firmly of the opinion that they have a just and a legal claim to a portion of this money ; and should their just rights be

denied them, I fear that a disturbing element will be introduced into this Dominion that will cause trouble and discontent for a long time to come. As a representative of the people of Prince Edward Island, I am determined to use every constitutional means in their behalf, and by earnest exertion and constant agitation on the floor of this House, to endeavour to obtain justice for them with regard to this important question.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): Before the debate closes I desire to express, in a very few words, my views on a question so important to the Province I represent, and so important to myself, individually, as one of its representatives. Fully impressed with the gravity of the question we are discussing, and the possible results of that question, so far as it may affect public opinion in the country, I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I reply to certain statements that have been made. There is no doubt that the discussion has been forced upon the House, not with a desire to ascertain the truth, or a desire to discuss it in the calm, deliberate, judicial manner which characterised the speech of the hon. member for Halifax, to ascertain whether on the confederation of the Provinces certain rights were reserved which they now claim, and to which the Dominion, under the advice of the hon. leader of the Government, seeks to establish its right, but with the manifest object of promoting dissatisfaction, and trying to impress upon the people the opinion that this House, this Parliament of Canada, not of right and justice, attempts to retain from the Provinces rights to which they are entitled under the law. Believing, as I do, that every man who loves his country, every man who respects the right and desires to support the Constitution, is bound, no matter at what personal consequence to himself, to ignore that view of the question, and do right, though the heavens fall. I shall endeavour to give my reasons to my constituents and the country at large, why I think the amendment of the hon. leader of the Government should be sustained. I approach the consideration of this question with a full sense of my responsibility, and with a knowledge of the feeling which obtains in Nova Scotia. Unfortunately, that Province, like other

Provinces of the Dominion, who were not careful to husband the resources which became their inheritance on their entering Confederation, feels itself in the position of a man whose funds are exhausted, and who jumps in any direction where he thinks he may obtain relief. I can quite understand and sympathise with the people of Nova Scotia in the condition in which they find themselves; but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact, and it is well they should know it from a man whom they feel and believe—I care not what is said to the contrary—will speak fairly, truthfully and honestly of their position, that the position in which they stand was brought upon them by those to whom they entrusted the management of their affairs. This applies not only to Nova Scotia, but to other Provinces. In every instance in which the Terms of Union were either originally settled or subsequently modified in favour of the Provinces, such Province was in a position, if economy, prudence and care had been exercised by its statesmen, to meet all the reasonable responsibilities devolving upon it as a member of this Confederation. Until the recent election changed the political complexion of such Provinces, they had been ruled by men who seemed to ignore their responsibility to the country, and to think their mission was not to economise, but to dissipate and squander the limited funds which the Constitution placed in their hands. Hence we have this question, which originates with a people driven on by necessity, and who are not prepared to treat the question with that calm deliberation they would otherwise bring to bear upon it. But no matter what the excitement of the moment may be, I do not fear that reflection and deliberation, that the second sober thought of the people on this question, as upon all others, will justify the men who resist the pressure brought to bear upon them, and who desire to sustain what they believe to be the Constitution of the country. No one can regret more than I do that I have to put myself in opposition to the views of many hon. members from my own Province, for whom I have the greatest respect, and with whom I have hitherto acted in concert; and it is, therefore, with the greatest possible regret that I am obliged, on this occasion, not only as a member of Parliament, but as

MR. HACKETT.

a member of the Government, to differ with them in the views they have given. I specially regret having to differ with my hon. friend from Halifax. Knowing him so long, knowing the calmness of his judgment, and the thorough sincerity with which he discusses every question; knowing the great labour and thought he has given this subject, and the anxiety he has displayed not to deal with it for party purposes, but with a single view, to reach the right and just conclusion, I will endeavour to show the hon. gentleman where, as a lawyer and a man read in the history of his country, he will be obliged to coincide with the views contained in the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Government. With regard to the observations of my hon. friend from King's, P.E.I., (Mr. Macdonald), it may be said that the claims of the representatives of that Island stand in a somewhat different position from those of the older Provinces, and it may be possible there is something in their view of the case. It is quite true that negotiations did take place between the Island and the United States, with the consent and knowledge, I believe—I was not in the Government at the time—of the Dominion Government, on which, and under which, perhaps, certain rights and considerations may be due to that Colony, which may not be due to the other Provinces. I can only say that, should that, on investigation, be found to be the case, should the Government find, on a full and intelligent apprehension of the facts that, under the Constitution and law, and under the terms under which this Island entered the Union, that any consideration that can be extended to it, the hon. representatives may be quite sure that the fullest and fairest consideration will be given to any claims they may establish. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Brecken), in illustration of the validity of his claim, and of the construction of the Act on which the argument turns, said that, at the time of the negotiations for the Union with Canada, Mr. Laird, the delegate from the Island, placed among the Terms of Union proposed by him, the condition that, should any amount be given as compensation for the use of the Fisheries by the Americans, the Island should receive her share. Does my hon. friend not see how that

argument turns against the user of it, and utterly destroys his pretensions? Because, if that were the true construction of the Treaty recognised by the Dominion, as existing between the Provinces and the Dominion, it would not be necessary to insert such a clause in the Treaty of Union with the Island, thereby making an exceptional Treaty as regards the Island and the other Provinces. On the other hand, the argument proves conclusively that, right or wrong, the hon. the leader of the Dominion Government and colleagues entertained on that occasion the same view of the Constitution, and the effect of the Treaty, that they take to-day; because, when the proposition was made by Mr. Laird, instead of adopting it and recognising the proposition of the Island, the Government declined to accede to the proposal, saying: "That is not the proper construction of the Treaty, and we cannot allow the Island an advantage not granted the other Provinces." That contention shows that Mr. Laird's view was untenable in fact, as well as in the opinion of those with whom he was dealing, as representing this Dominion. With regard to the observation of the hon. member for Lunenburg, as to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, I cannot patiently bear to see an hon. member representing a class so spirited, vigorous and intelligent, speak of them as the poor fishermen of Nova Scotia. I can assure my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulback), that I do not think his own constituents would thank him for this classification. I know the south coast of Nova Scotia and its population well, and a more hard-working, resolute, enterprising and intrepid body of men does not exist in this wide Dominion. They do not live in huts, but in substantial, well-built, comfortable houses, as a general rule; and except in years when the failure of the Fisheries or crops create want or distress, there is no more hardy, healthy people on the face of the earth, nor any better fed than the fishermen of Nova Scotia. They are men not only able to take care of themselves, but to defend their country if need be. If there be exceptions, they are such as you see in every class of society, persons who, for want of economy and thrift, would starve in any position. I should be ashamed, as a Nova Scotian,

to come here and ask the guardians of the Constitution to violate it, if such might be done, simply because hon. gentlemen choose to speak of Nova Scotians as the poor fishermen. I will not follow the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey), over the ground he has trodden so well, but in some respects I would go even further with reference to the claim and character of the right which pertained to Nova Scotia and the other Provinces before Confederation. He traced correctly the history of the Fishery rights of Nova Scotia to the time she obtained responsible Government, and the transfer to the people, by the Crown and Act of Parliament, of what was called the casual and territorial revenue, embracing the Crown lands, mines minerals and royalties. These were held by the Province as part of the public domain until they were freely transferred to Canada at Confederation. I might go further than the hon. leader of the Government, with reference to the territorial rights of the Colonies before Confederation. Before that time, the grant by Nova Scotia of the land under the water, three miles from the shore, would be held, in my humble opinion, a valid, legal grant. But my learned friend will not fail to see a wide distinction between a mere territorial right to the land covered by water, and a right to the dominion over the fish in the water covering and running over that land. That land is claimed because it is a right incident to every British subject. Therefore, my hon. friend will see that, while going even further than my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Richey), or than the right hon. the leader of the Government, and I still stand on firm ground with reference to the general public right in the Fisheries adjacent to the coast, within three miles of the sea-shore. My hon. friend appeared to forget that this is not the first occasion on which the Fisheries of Nova Scotia and the Lower Provinces were made the lever to obtain for the Provinces commercial and other advantages. In 1844, as the hon. member for Halifax informed the House, the Lower Provinces became possessed of these territorial rights. In 1854, by a Treaty made with the Crown, with the consent of Nova Scotia, these Fisheries, now considered so inalienable, in exchange for certain commercial privileges granted by

the United States, were transferred, "given over and sold," to use the phraseology of some hon. gentlemen, to the United States, to the same people who possess the privileges so much complained of now. My hon. friend beside me said it was for value received. I doubt if the consideration was very much greater than the value we have received now. What is the value received? The body of fishermen in Nova Scotia, by virtue of the Treaty of Washington, obtained advantages over their fellow subjects of a very valuable character. Because, while all the other productions of Nova Scotia and of the whole Dominion were excluded by an almost prohibitory tariff from the markets of the United States, the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces had the immense privilege of entering those markets with their fish duty free. So we see that over and above the large pecuniary Award we have received, we have had the benefits resulting from the Reciprocity Treaty, as well as those now enjoyed under the Washington Treaty. But I pass on to ask the House to consider the nature of the vote it is asked to give to-night. It is the fact that, by the British North America Act the rights and privileges referred to, and particularly so far as the Fisheries were concerned, were transferred to this Dominion. That has never been denied.

Mr. WELDON: What part of the Act transfers the Fisheries?

Mr. McDONALD: I am astonished at that question from the hon. member for St. John. The 91st clause of the British North America Act provides that the Parliament of Canada shall make laws exclusively for the sea-coast and inland Fisheries, and my hon. friend will find nothing to contravene the power thus given this Parliament; and he will not deny that the power of legislation is the highest form of sovereignty known to the Constitution of England. Therefore, when the Act which constitutes the Constitution of this country gives to the Dominion Parliament the absolute control of legislation over the Fisheries of the sea-coast and the rivers, I ask him whether, under these circumstances, he could pretend that any power whatever, other than an Act of Parliament, could abrogate that control? But the Parliament of Canada lost no time in exercising the

right thus conferred upon it, and in terms so clear that there could be no mistake as to the intention of Parliament, either in this House or in the Provinces. It is true there was no anticipation of \$5,500,000 coming to us when this House was dealing in the most absolute manner with what is now called private territorial rights in the several Provinces. By the Fisheries Act passed by this Parliament in May, 1868, the laws relating to the Fisheries in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were repealed, with the exception of certain provisions in the revised Statutes of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the words in which they were dealt with are significant indeed, and show that the right asserted by this Parliament is not denied by any local statesman, and has not been challenged up to this hour. It says:—

“ Provided always that such Fishery Officers as may be especially empowered in that behalf by the Governor-in-Council, shall also exercise the powers by the said recited Act and chapter of Acts vested in Revenue and other Officers, Sheriffs and Magistrates, and all penalties and forfeitures imposed under the same shall be paid over to the Receiver-General through the Department of Marine and Fisheries to be applied towards the Fisheries Protection Service, in like manner as other fines and confiscations under the present Act.”

So this Act not only abrogated the laws by which the Provinces had previously exercised their rights, with the exception I have named, but in retaining these sections they made an express provision that, all penalties or loss accruing from the Fisheries should be appropriated by the Dominion Government for the purpose of protecting the Fisheries. Now, I ask my hon. friend if those who governed the Provinces at that time, and who were hostile to Confederation, having had such a fair opportunity to challenge the action of this Parliament, I ask him if they would not have raised the question then which is raised to-day, if they believed there was any foundation for the argument we now hear? For twelve long years these Fisheries have been protected on land and on sea; fleets have been manned, fleets of the Dominion and fleets of the Mother Country, for their protection; and during all that time the Provinces claimed neither to share in the expense nor challenged the right of this Parliament to take the

measures taken. Even this recognition would be quite a sufficient answer to the contention now set up. Let me say this to the country: the strength of a legal claim does not depend upon the value of the estate affected thereby; if we have a right to these Fisheries our claim is equally strong, whether it is worth a dollar or a million of dollars, and it is pertinent to enquire, would the present contention have been raised if this large sum had not been obtained as compensation? But irrespective of the arguments so clearly put by the hon. the leader of the Government, my hon. friend will not deny the dominant power of the Crown and its inherent right to transfer the territory of the Crown without the consent of the Legislature. Sir George Grey propounded this doctrine in the strongest possible manner. Writing in 1854 to the Governor of Nova Scotia with reference to the Treaty of Reciprocity, Sir George Grey said:

“ Article V. runs as follows:—‘ The present Treaty shall take effect as soon as the laws required to carry it into operation shall have been passed by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, and by the Provincial Parliaments of those of the British North American Colonies which are affected by this Treaty on the one hand, and by Congress of the United States on the other.’ ”

He makes this note on it:

“ This Article is, of course, not to be understood as if the assent of the Provincial Legislature, or even of the Imperial Legislature were necessary, in order to enable the Crown to execute a valid and binding Treaty with a foreign country. This is, in all countries, a prerogative of the Sovereign power, and in England the Sovereign power *quoad hoc* is vested in the Crown.

“ But the concurrence of the Legislature may, nevertheless, be required to abrogate existing laws, which may be, in any respect, inconsistent with the intended Treaty, and it is in this sense that I conceive the provision of Article V. is properly to be understood.”

Coming down to the Treaty of Washington in 1871, we find that the right and authority of the Dominion of Canada over the Fisheries is fully recognised in terms by the highest legal authority in the realm. In the 21st Section it is agreed:

“ It is agreed that, for the term of years mentioned in Article 33 of this Treaty, fish oil and fish of all kinds (except fish of the inland lakes, and of the rivers falling into them, and except fish preserved in oil), being the produce of the Fisheries of the United

States, or of the Dominion of Canada, or of Prince Edward Island, shall be admitted into each country, respectively, free of duty."

We have, in the words of the Treaty, a recognition of the authority of the Dominion of Canada over the shores of the old Provinces. The right hon. the leader of the Government has shown beyond dispute that the territorial rights of the several Colonies were transferred under Confederation, and made part and parcel of the Dominion. It was recognised by the highest authority, the Imperial Parliament, declaring that when the necessary laws were passed the Treaty should come into force. If my hon. friend from St. John will venture to contend that the rights of domain now set up remain in the Provinces I shall be very much surprised. Let me ask the hon. gentleman why this right of the Provinces did not dawn upon him last year, and why, when one of his leaders (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) stood before him last Session and declared that, as a matter of constitutional right which no one should dispute, the Fishery Award was a legitimate asset of the Dominion, why did he not rise in his place and inform the hon. gentleman that he was calculating upon money which did not belong to him. The reason the hon. members for Inverness, Shelburne and Antigonish did not take that stand last year is, because it did not suggest itself to them then as a party cry. But if those gentlemen go back to their constituents now with such a cry on their lips, they would be referred to the position taken by the late Finance Minister when he said :

"It would have been alleged, from one end of Canada to the other, that we were about to bribe the electors, and I would have been censured then, as I was censured before, for borrowing money far in advance of my real wants, and that, too, when, as these worthy gentlemen would not have failed to point out, I had not only the Fishery Award, but \$11,000,000 of guaranteed loan to fall back on in any event."

I undertake to say that the hon. gentleman will not recall those words to-day. Neither he nor the hon. leader of his party will venture to say that, when the late Finance Minister said the money belonged to the Treasury of Canada, he made a misstatement or a mistake. But they give leave to their followers to

MR. McDONALD.

ignore the law and the facts, and to make a party cry out of this question. I have to apologise to the House for detaining them so long. I am afraid that in the attempt to be concise, I have not been so clear and explicit as I desired.

MR. MACKENZIE: We are satisfied.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I am glad the hon. gentleman understood me. I can assure him that I am no more anxious than himself on that score, for I want to be fairly and properly understood, and it is for that reason I have stated as a member of Parliament, bound and determined to protect and guard the rights and privileges of the county which I represent, and whose especial duty it is to guard the constitutional rights of this country, that I cannot give my consent to the proposition of the hon. member for Halifax.

MR. FLYNN: If I had any desire to address the House at length this evening, I certainly would have felt satisfied it would be useless to advance any further arguments in behalf of the claims of the Maritime Provinces after the statement made by the right hon. leader of the Government. It is clear to my mind that we are not to expect any share of this Award. I would have been satisfied with the remarks I made upon this subject on a former occasion, if it had not been for some statements made by the last speaker. It would have been quite sufficient, in my opinion, for that hon. gentleman to have endeavoured to advocate the legal view. He holds that the people of the Maritime Provinces are not entitled to their share of the Award, but that it is the exclusive property of the Dominion. Without introducing matter foreign to this discussion, the hon. gentleman referred to the financial position of the Local Government of Nova Scotia, and he has made most unfair statements with regard to their resources, and their want of care in husbanding them. Now, if the Local Government have not the resources to carry on the administration of affairs in the Province, it is due to the Act of Confederation. The hon. gentleman also stated that members on this side of the House were unduly bringing pressure to bear on this question for party purposes. I have not advocated the matter from a party standpoint. I did not wait until this year to make known my views on the sub-

ject, and the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Justice cannot have reference to me last Session, when the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I., made a motion in connection with this subject. I addressed the House at some length, and then advocated, as well as I could, the claims of the Maritime Provinces to the Fishery Award. I believed then, as I do now, that they have a legal right to it. The Minister of Justice drew a very flattering picture of the condition of the fishermen of Nova Scotia; he stated that they lived in fine, substantial houses and were well off. I wish, Sir, that this picture was true. I regret to say it is not. There are many of them very comfortable, but a large number do not enjoy the comfort he speaks of. They are, as a rule, poor, and find it difficult to procure the common necessaries of life. He says that the Fisheries were transferred to the Dominion by the Act of Confederation, which the people of Nova Scotia had learned to appreciate, and that the Act would be sustained in that Province tomorrow. I tell the hon. gentleman he knows little of the Province when he hazards that assertion. Never was there greater dissatisfaction existing against that measure than at present. After thirteen years experience of Confederation, I believe the feeling is stronger against it to-day than it was in 1867. The advantages predicted to follow the measure, and the bright prospects held out to the people in connection with it, have not yet been realised. The Province of Nova Scotia is far from being as prosperous now as it was then. If Nova Scotia is now financially embarrassed, it is due to Confederation and not to the action of the present Local Government or their predecessors. It is due to the hon. the Minister of Justice and his colleague, who are responsible for bringing us into it. I was astonished to hear him say, that the people transferred their rights to the Dominion with their own free will and consent. He knows, Sir, or ought to know, that they never consented to the transfer, that the overwhelming majority of the people of Nova Scotia were opposed to Confederation on any terms, and it was only by manipulating the Legislature and securing a majority there that the Act was carried. But, I would ask that hon. gentleman to

contrast the financial condition of the Province now, with what it was in 1867. We had then, under a 10 per cent. Tariff, nearly completed 115 miles of railway east, as far as Pictou, tapping the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and over 130 miles west, as far as Annapolis. Since then, thirteen years, we have not been able to build more than forty miles east and about sixty miles west; the Provincial Government, is financially embarrassed, and unable to provide for the ordinary services of the Province; while its people, under the present grinding Tariff, are taxed on some description of goods—those used by the poorest classes—as high as 40 and 50 per cent., and still we are refused our share of the Fishery Award. The hon. the Minister of Justice stated that the Maritime Provinces surrendered their exclusive fishing rights in 1854. If we did, we got an equivalent in the free admission of our fish, coal and lumber, to the markets of the United States. That hon. gentleman has also endeavoured, while addressing the House, to create the impression that the Award was given, not for damage sustained by our fishermen, but for rights conferred on our American neighbours. This is not correct. Those entrusted with the management of the case, on behalf of Great Britain, clearly placed before the Commission that the loss sustained by our fishermen was an important element in the case for their consideration. They stated that, if the American fishermen were precluded from fishing in our inshore waters, they would be unable to supply their own extensive markets, and they would, to a great extent, be supplied by our fishermen and a better price realised for the fish they caught. There was abundant testimony to support this part of the case, and we may fairly assume that the Award would not have been so large if this fact had not been clearly proved. It has been contended by the Government that we have no legal right to this money. I think, Sir, a very strong case has been made out fully establishing our legal claim to it. But whatever doubts may exist as regards the legality of our claim, surely no one will contend that we have not an equitable one. Our fishermen, alone, have suffered by the equal privileges granted to American citizens to fish in our inshore waters. No other in-

terests in this Dominion were affected by it; no other class suffered, and none but the fishermen should receive the benefit of this Award. But we are told by the hon. leader of the Government that we have no right to this money, that it is an asset of the Dominion, to be used for Dominion purposes. Having, as I know he has, a large majority to sustain his views, I feel it is useless that I should say anything further, particularly at this late hour of the night; but, Sir, I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without protesting against the views held by that hon. gentleman and his colleagues in reference to the Award. In advocating the claims of the Maritime Provinces on a former occasion, or in anything I have said to-night, I feel it due to myself to say that I have not been influenced by any feeling of hostility towards the Government or with any desire to embarrass them. I believed then, as I do now, that the Maritime Provinces, alone, have a right to this Award. The people of these Provinces with scarcely an exception, believe their claim to be a just one, and no special pleading or vote of this House will change that opinion.

MR. WELDON: I should have thought that a matter involving such a large amount of money, and involving the interests of the Maritime Provinces, was worthy of being discussed on its merits. We have heard a great deal about the North-West, but what we want to hear is something about the East, we want the rights of the Eastern Provinces protected. If we are going to be given away we want to know it. The hon. the Minister of Justice has called upon me, as a lawyer, to answer a proposition he has made in this House with regard to this question. In addressing myself to this question, I wish to confine myself to its legal aspects, with reference to the several Governments concerned. Previous to Confederation, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, were independent and separate Governments, but owing allegiance to the Mother Country. With regard to foreign powers they had no power to make Treaties, or any regulations, except through the Imperial Government. Now, we want to find the position of these Provinces in regard to the Fisheries in our bays and on our shores. We all know

MR. FLYNN.

that there has been a decision before the highest English Court, involving territorial rights, within the marine league, or the three miles beyond the coast, and that decision affirmed that this marine league was part of the territory of the country; therefore, the rights to the Fisheries within these three miles belong to the inland country. With regard to the peninsula of Nova Scotia, the whole of the Fisheries within the three-mile limit belonged, therefore, to that Province. I do not mean in an Imperial sense that it was the property of Nova Scotia, but it was the exclusive property of Great Britain, in trust for the Province. In 1877 a case was taken to the Privy Council from Newfoundland, with regard to rights of Newfoundland in Conception Bay. The judges of Great Britain recognised the rights of the Colony to legislate with regard to that. I do not view this question either as a party or a provincial question, but as a question of justice. If we have the right to that money we are entitled to it. When we went into Confederation it was by the voice of the people, and I abide by that decision; but if we have not deprived ourselves of rights of property, we claim them now. It has been said that so far as foreign countries are concerned, and so far as the rights of fishing are concerned, Great Britain was to represent us. Well, I find that in Newfoundland, in a case in the Privy Council, it is laid down as follows:—

“It does not appear to their Lordships that jurists and text writers are agreed what are the rules as to dimension and configuration which, apart from other consideration, would lead to the conclusion that a bay is, or is not, a part of the territory of the state possessing the adjoining coasts, and it has never, that they can find, been made the ground of any judicial determination. If it were necessary in this case to lay down a rule, the difficulty of the task would not deter their Lordships from attempting to fulfil it. But in their opinion it is not necessary so to do. It seems to them that, in point of fact, the British Government has, for a long period, exercised dominion over this bay, and that their claim has been acquired in by other nations, so as to show that the bay has been for a long time exclusively occupied by Great Britain, a circumstance which, in the tribunals of any country, would be very important. And moreover, (which in a British tribunal is conclusive,) the British Legislature has, by Acts of Parliament, declared it to be part of the British Territory and part of the country made subject to the Legislature of Newfoundland. To establish this proposition it is

not necessary to go further back than to 59 Geo. 3, c. 33, passed in 1819, now nearly sixty years ago. There was a convention made in 1818 between the United States and Great Britain relating to the Fisheries of Labrador, Newfoundland and Her Majesty's other possessions in North America, by which it was agreed that the fishermen of the United States should have the right to fish on part of the coasts, (not including the part of the Island of Newfoundland on which Conception Bay lies,) and should not enter any 'bays' in any part of the coast except for the purposes of shelter and repairing damages, and purchasing wood and obtaining water, and no other purposes whatsoever. It seems impossible to doubt that this Convention applied to all bays, whether large or small, on that coast, and consequently to Conception Bay. It is true that the Convention would only bind the two nations who were parties to it, and consequently, though a strong assertion of ownership on the part of Great Britain, acquiesced in by so powerful a state as the United States, the Convention, though weighty, is not decisive. But the Act already referred to, 59 Geo. 3, c. 38, though passed chiefly for the purpose of giving effect to the Convention of 1818 goes further. It enacts not merely that subjects of the United States shall observe the restrictions agreed on by the Convention, but that all persons, not being natural born subjects of the King of Great Britain shall observe them under penalties. And in particular, by Section 4, it enacts that if 'any person,' upon being required by the Governor, or any other officer acting under such Governor, in the execution of any order or instructions from His Majesty in Council, shall *inter alia* refuse to depart from such bays he shall be subject to a penalty of £200. No stronger assertion of exclusive dominion over these bays could well be framed. As has been already observed, Conception Bay is in every sense of the word a bay within Newfoundland, though of considerable width; and as there is nothing to justify a construction of the Act limiting it to bays not exceeding any particular width, this in an unequivocal assertion of the British Legislature, of exclusive dominion over this bay as part of the British Territory. And as this assertion of dominion has not been questioned by any nation from 1819 down to 1872, when a fresh Convention was made, this would be very strong in the tribunals of any nation to show that this bay is by prescription part of the exclusive territory of Great Britain." By that decision these territories and the three miles from the coast belonged to Newfoundland, and Great Britain only held them in trust. To the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island apply that principle, and then these territories were held by Great Britain in trust for the Provinces. Viewing it in that sense, supposing the appropriation had taken place before Confederation, who was the creditor of the United States? Great Britain, but as trustee for the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New

Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. In this case, the money was paid over to the Imperial Government, and the latter handed it over to the Dominion, and they stood in the same position as Great Britain as trustees for the several Provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. Now, I ask the hon. the Minister of Justice to point out if anything within the four corners of the British North America Act gives these Fisheries to the Dominion of Canada. There is nothing of the sort in that Act. I regret I was not here when the hon. member for Halifax put forward his views, but I understand he put forward the same legal arguments as I would have done. My contention is, in brief, that prior to Confederation these Fisheries belonged to the Provinces, held in trust for them by Great Britain; that Great Britain and the Dominion in regard to the Fishery Award are trustees for these Provinces; that Newfoundland, being awarded a share of the Award, was a recognition of the right of each Province to a share of the Award. I asked the hon. the Minister of Justice to point out what part of the British North America Act conferred this power, and he stated that the 12th sub-section was so clear on the subject that anyone who runs may read it. I contend that that does not convey the property, but only the right of legislation with regard to it. If the Fisheries belonged to the Province, they were the public properties; and in the 117th section it is provided that "the several Provinces shall retain all their respective public property not otherwise disposed of in this Act." The public property is comprised of land, mines, minerals and fisheries.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): In what section is it stated that the Fisheries are included in "lands, mines and minerals?"

MR. WELDON: I understood both the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Halifax to state that the 109th section covered that.

MR. McDONALD: No, I did not say that; I referred to royalties.

MR. WELDON: The 108th section reads:

"The Public Works and property of each Province, enumerated in the third schedule of this Act, shall be the property of Canada."

And the 109th provides that:

"All lands, mines, minerals and royalties belonging to the several Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at the Union * * * shall belong to the several Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in which the same are situate or arise."

I agree that, so far as that section is concerned, it merely refers to lands, mines, minerals and royalties, but I think the matter is made clear in the 117th section.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): The British North America Act is an exception to an ordinary statute, because everything that is not granted is reserved.

Mr. WELDON: The British North America Act is the same as an Act of the Parliament of this Dominion. When the School Case, from New Brunswick, went to the Privy Council, Lord Justice James treated it as any other Statute which they were as capable of construing as either Kent or Story. Taking the sections I have quoted into consideration, I think it is clear the Fisheries were not handed over to the Dominion Government. I am going to give the words of Lord Selborne, one of the ablest jurists in England, in delivering an opinion in the Privy Council, on the 91st Section, which the hon. Minister lays so much stress upon. It was urged by the counsel in that case, Mr. Benjamin, a very able lawyer, with regard to land on the sea coast, that no part of the land in the Province upon the sea coasts could be dealt with, because by possibility it might be required for a lighthouse. I wish now to show what view the Privy Council took of the 12th Section:—

"It was suggested, perhaps not very accurately, in the course of the argument, that upon the same principle no part of the land in the Province upon the sea coasts could be dealt with, because by possibility, it might be required for a lighthouse, and an Act might be passed by the Dominion Legislature to make a lighthouse there. That was not a happy illustration, because the whole of the sea coast is put within the exclusive cognisance of the Dominion Legislature by another article."

That is the decision which Lord Selborne arrived at, referring the words "sea coast" to the land and not to the fish. The 13th schedule of the 9th sub-Section puts the lighthouses under the charge of the Dominion of Canada; but the reply is that the whole of the sea coast is put within the cognisance of the Dominion Government.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): Not at all. He concurs exactly with me.

Mr. WELDON: If these Fisheries were the public property of the Province, can you take it away except in express words? These were a part of the terms on which we entered Confederation: that it would protect our coast and Fisheries and public lands; but Canada has no right to take our public lands, which are protected as much as the Fisheries would be by a navy. Would it be contended that, because these Islands are protected, that because Prince Edward Island is protected by the Dominion, that all this land could be taken. When I was a boy I saw Her Majesty's ships going up and down the coast protecting the Fisheries, and we should have them doing so to-day whether we belong to the Confederation or not. We do not want our Constitution surrendered. We never surrendered it. We have a right to these Fisheries, which, under the British North America Act, remains intact to us to-day. The money held by the Dominion was not paid over to it for its use, but the Dominion simply received it in trust for the Provinces. The people of the Lower Provinces depend upon these Fisheries for a living, just as much as the farmers of Ontario do upon their broad fields. We wish to claim our ocean crops in the same way as the Western men do their field crops.

Mr. DOMVILLE: The hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who was elected for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), pretends, to-night, to represent the whole Province of New Brunswick, and by so doing he has taken away the laurels from the member for Queen's and other representatives of the Province. I would like to know who represents New Brunswick after that. I must, however, tell my hon. friend that his remarks are most illogical. No doubt he will plume himself in New Brunswick for the stand he has taken to-night, as he contends, in obtaining its rights in regard to the Fishery Award; and will seek also to obtain the credit for having sought for a portion of the said Award. He will see that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) does not back him up. Had he, as a lawyer and advocate, proved his case, I would have voted with him, irrespective of party or consequences; but he

has failed to do so. He proclaims that he will vote for justice and right, constituting himself sole judge and jury in the case. To gain the ear of the House and to convince the country that he is right in his decision, he started with the doctrine of the sovereign rights of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and sought to establish his cause on a territorial basis; but he had not gone far before the real secret came out, namely, that he was sowing discontent, or trying to, amongst the Maritime people; because he tried to make his argument stronger and more conclusive by stating, as a ground to rest his cause on, that the North-West was being built up at the expense of the whole country, which was unfair, and that, consequently, New Brunswick should get a money concession also. I say that is illogical. If he had wished to gain his object legitimately, he would have based his argument on what was just and right in itself. He endeavours to carry his point by sending broadcast through the country what he must know is a false doctrine, and endeavours, in the most unpatriotic manner, to make discord in the various Maritime Provinces. If he was correct in his views, that the North-West was getting what was not her due, why should a second wrong be committed by giving New Brunswick what does not belong to her? I suppose it is a lawyer's view of "justice." The hon. gentleman said each Province owed separate allegiance to the Mother Country. As a constitutional lawyer, it was an insult to the intelligence of this House for him to tell them that. To prove his case, he asserted that we owed our existence somewhat as a corporation did, and derived our charter from the British Government, and could not go beyond the four points of that constitution. He cited the case of the Quebec Lieutenant-Governor as an illustration. We were, as he said, under the necessity of getting rid of him; thus showing that we had a right to interfere with the affairs of that Province, or any other Province. Because the Lieutenant-Governor held his office at the will and pleasure of the Governor-General-in-Council, he undertakes to tell us that each of the Provinces has territorial as well as sovereign rights. The hon. member knows better than that, and can give no authority for such a statement.

He says further, as conclusive evidence, that when he was a youth, a British man-of-war was in the habit of guarding the Fisheries, which went to prove that being the property of Britain she guarded them. If the British Government guarded these Fisheries it was because they owned them solely, without respect to the territorial rights he speaks of; and when they ceded them to Canada they withdrew their fleet and handed the whole thing over to her. It was evidence of the intention of the British Government that the Government of Canada, for the future, should own these Fisheries, and was henceforth to guard them at her own expense, which she has done since Confederation. Now this argument should have been based, in my judgment as a New Brunswicker, on our just rights, if we had any. My hon. friend has not proved to the House that we have suffered in any way by this arrangement. If Canada had not obtained that money for the Fishery claim from the British Government, would he have undertaken to have said we had a claim on the Dominion Government for it, and on what would he have based his claim? No, Sir. But because some of our assets, he claims, realised a value, he undertakes to tell us that we must have a second bargain with the Dominion. When we entered into the Dominion, we handed over our assets to the Dominion, and got what was considered at the time a *quid pro quo*, and now we must abide by the results. In giving my vote to-night, I do it with just as much regard to what is right and wrong as the hon. member does. I seek to make no political capital out of this as my hon. friend does. The intelligent county I represent will return me as long as I give an honest vote, even if I make a mistake, in giving it, from their point of view. They do not expect me to endorse or give any clap-trap vote to gain cheap popularity. I feel they will be better pleased with an honest vote, even if it should be in a direction that would prevent New Brunswick receiving a sum of money that she was not entitled to; and I hope always to vote on a broader basis than on a party or unpatriotic one, such as my hon. friend contends for to-night. When I moved my resolution against the hon. the Minister of Railways last year, in regard to his policy and management of

the Intercolonial Railway in the interests of the Province of New Brunswick, did I get any support from gentlemen from New Brunswick, or hon. members on the other side of the House? No; not one of the Opposition members said a word in the cause, or stood up for our rights, although they pretended they were willing to back me up in the lobbies afterwards. The people of New Brunswick will view this feeble effort of the Opposition to cause trouble as it deserves. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), has said to-night that he accepted Confederation with all its consequences, which is a candid admission coming from him, and in the same breath he said it had ruined and was ruining New Brunswick. Illogical again. Why should he accept a policy which was to ruin his Province? I intend to vote for the resolutions of the right hon. the leader of the Government; first, because we have entrusted to him the Government of the country and have confidence in his judgment as a constitutional lawyer; and, secondly, because I have heard nothing to refute the arguments brought forward by the right hon. gentleman and other members against the adoption of the resolution of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell) and I am willing at any time to meet my hon. friend from St. John and other members from New Brunswick, either in my own county or theirs, and prove the soundness of the vote I am about to give to-night.

MR. FORTIN: Having moved in this matter last year, I desire to make a few remarks on the present occasion. The resolutions presented by me in the last Session of this House were not to the effect that individual Provinces had territorial rights to the Fisheries, and that the Maritime population had an absolute right to the Fishery Award; but they expressed the idea: "that it was equitable and right that the money which came from the Fisheries should be returned to the Fisheries." When we brought these resolutions, in reference to the disposal of this Award, before this House, when we defended our ideas on the subject, had we any personal or sectional motives in so doing? No; none, whatever; the resolutions are on the records of the House and speak for themselves. Our ideas were based on broad International

grounds; because the Fisheries are an important element in the general resources of this country, because the fish taken by the fishermen are sold, some in this country, but the greatest part is exported to foreign countries, which brings in money that adds to the public revenue and which is otherwise expended in every part of the Dominion. In moving our resolutions on this matter, we were inspired by a national spirit. I believe in the National Policy, but believe, also, that it should be extended to the extremities of the Dominion, and not confined, in the practicable application of its benefits, to the centre only. There is no industry that requires the effective and friendly hand of the Government, more than the Fisheries, because it is generally carried on at great and peculiar disadvantages. The avocation of the fisherman has to be carried on in storms and against high winds, frequently at the peril of life and property. In this country, on account of the severity of the climate, our fishermen are compelled to suspend operations entirely for a considerable portion of the year, and even in the summer, sometimes, for weeks together. I hold under my hand a carefully prepared statement showing that the fishermen of Gaspé and of Labrador, for instance, cannot fish, on an average, more than 100 days out of the 365 days of the year. In the face of these facts, surely they are entitled to some measure of aid from the Government, in the way of ameliorating the hardships and disadvantages peculiar to their hazardous calling. When I proposed my resolutions last year, we did not pretend that we had exclusive rights to that money, or that we had territorial rights; I did not pretend, nor do I now pretend, that this is not Federal money. I have the honour to represent a county in which three-fourths of the population live directly by the Fisheries. I would be very sorry to see the Fisheries under the control of the Local Governments, because they would not have the power, perhaps not the will, which the Federal Government has to protect them. When I submitted these resolutions I said: Is it not right and equitable that this money should be expended in such a manner as to foster these Fisheries? If a proper policy were adopted in this matter, we would be enabled to renovate the

fishing grounds, some of which have been exhausted during the last twenty-five years, and to further develop the present productiveness of now existing, and at present used, fishing grounds, so that their productions would become perpetual and a permanent source of support to the people for all time to come. If something is not done in this direction, the manufacturers will lose the support of the best customers they now have. What do the economists say? That the home market is the best for the tradesmen. The artisans of our towns and the farmers comprise our markets in the centre of the country; but is not the best, the largest, purchasing market, to be found in the Maritime Provinces, with their half a million of people who live by the Fisheries. It has been said that fishermen are, in general, an improvident class. Unfortunately, the majority of them do spend everything they earn; but they are, for all that, a fine, hardy, moral class of men who deserve, at least, as much consideration from the Government as any other class. They consume three times more dutiable and manufactured goods, than do the farmers, head for head, of their comparative population. I regret being unable, at this moment, to find some accounts sent me by fishery merchants of Gaspé, which go to show the amount of goods they consume. I voted for the National Policy, but under the expectation that its provisions would be extended to every class. At present, by that policy, the fishermen and mariners are, in some ways, taxed heavier than they were before its introduction. They should, therefore, receive some consideration from the Government in the way of protecting their interests, as a set-off to their somewhat increased burdens. In addressing the House last year, I endeavoured to prove—and trust that I made myself understood by the intelligence of this honorable House, because I used irrefutable arguments, adduced from the testimony given before the fishery Commission at Halifax—“That to admit the Americans to a participation in our Fisheries would be to lessen the productiveness of these Fisheries to our own people.” When one farmer alone cultivates a given area of ground, he has a chance of reaping from off the whole area, or at least so much of it as he chooses to sow;

but put two farmers upon this same area, and its produce has to be divided between them. It is precisely the same with our Fisheries. Before the Washington Treaty our fishermen had their Fisheries to themselves; but their chance of securing fish has, since then, been vastly reduced, by admitting the Americans to share in our grounds. I shall vote for the proposition of the right hon. the leader of the Government, because, if it is carried, it does not shut out the solution of the difficulty for which a great many hon. members from the Maritime Provinces, like myself, have been working patiently since this Parliament met. The hon. gentleman, the member for Inverness, who introduced the resolutions now before the House, tried to throw aspersions on my course of action. He wanted the country to believe that I brought in my resolutions late, and for some purpose. Well, I always have a purpose in what I do, but it is, as invariably, a straightforward purpose. My purpose then was to give a chance to all parties concerned to study the question, so that it might finally come before Parliament with a good chance of success in the right direction. If these resolutions of the hon. member for Inverness had not been introduced, I would have brought in my resolutions, not unaided, but with the consent and approval of all my friends; and would have endeavoured to lead the country to perceive that what we asked was equitable and just. But I was shut out by the resolutions now before the House, but next year I shall bring mine forward again, with the full belief that the House will accept them; and if this be so we will have no reason to regret the action then taken, as it will prove the direct means of increasing the protection, and, consequently, the production of the Fisheries. Considerable efforts are being made in that direction in the United States, because the Government of that country has become enlightened on the subject. There they now fairly perceive that the sea, equally with the choicest of the land, is capable of producing for the wants of consuming millions. This year they have tried an experiment which has already proved fruitful. If no protection is extended to our Fisheries, the cod and other fish on the banks will be destroyed by the Americans.

Many of our Fisheries are still fairly good. I demonstrated, last year, however, that many of our Fishery banks are already half ruined; and if the Americans are permitted to come for many years longer, and to employ their present means of fishing, the half of our present fish production will have disappeared in ten years. I hope, Sir, the Government will take these facts, and all their attendant circumstances, into serious consideration. Every hon. member representing a fishing constituency, who has addressed the House on this occasion, has testified to the great importance of this industry, to the whole country; and it is to be hoped that the Government will so weigh the matter, as they will be induced to protect our people against the greed of American fishermen, and against their destructive fishery appliances which have tended to making fortunes for them at the price of destroying our Fisheries. In addition to this we should also endeavor to recuperate or replenish the Fisheries, now exhausted on many of our banks and other fishing grounds. Acting under the full conviction of the soundness of these opinions, and with the knowledge of the defeat of the resolution now before the House, I intend to support, by my vote, the amendment of the right hon. the leader of the Government.

MR. CASGRAIN: This is a very important question, and ought to be treated not from a party point of view. I have read attentively the amendment to the amendment, and declared myself strongly in favour of it. It expresses exactly the Constitutional Law under which we live, and disposes entirely of the abstract question of the Constitution. But we must not confound two things that are very different, the abstract question of property in the Dominion as to the Award, and the particular use to be made of the sum awarded, so as to meet the justice due to the parties the most interested, and not only protecting the Maritime Fisheries, but also maintaining and developing their productiveness. Though this Award is a general compensation to the Dominion, doubtless a part of it has been designed for the Maritime Provinces as damages for expenses or injuries that have resulted to certain private individuals in the different Provinces. Part of it must be

paid to the private sufferers. I do not mean that it shall go to any of the Local Governments, however. There are to-day on the Bay of Fundy and the Bay of Chaleurs, and on the St. Lawrence coasts, private grants of land and rights that date beyond 1763, which must be protected and maintained as they then existed. Special grants have been given to holders of Fisheries by the Crown of France, in the Bay of Fundy and in Quebec. I know one instance where we have a right in Kamouraska, in regard to a porpoise fishery granted by the King of France. I give this as one of the instances of the neglect to look at this matter historically. You speak of the three-mile range before 1763, while it did not exist *quoad* those private rights. I quote this fact in support of the position taken by the hon. the leader of the Government, because it shows the money must not go to the Local Legislatures, but must be divided between the Dominion Government and the private individuals who have suffered. I intend voting in favour of the amendment to the amendment, reserving my opinion as to what may be done afterwards to better the position of the different Provinces.

MR. KILLAM: After hearing, last year, for a whole afternoon, the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin) expatiating on the Fisheries question, during which he enunciated so warmly the doctrine that an amount should be set apart for the benefit of the Fisheries, it is cruel to our feelings to see now the hon. gentleman come here and complain because the Government have not adopted his idea as to the disposition of the Award. As to his devotion, the hon. member for Gaspé deserves the sympathies of the House. Nobody could be better informed on the subject. But we have yet to learn from any speech made by either himself, or the member for Halifax (Mr. Richey), or any other member, what the Government intend to do with the Fishery Award, which is the great question before the House. I would like to call to the minds of hon. gentlemen the course that has been pursued on this question from the start. Last year we had the Saturday afternoon speech from the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Fortin). This year the subject was brought up by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell), on the 22nd.

MR. FORTIN.

March. On that day the hon. the Minister of Finance said it was not advisable to discuss it because he had some papers to lay on the Table which would give us a more intelligent understanding of the question. We waited until the present occasion, when the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey), stated it was out of order. The policy of the Government on this question has been one of delay. They desired to do nothing but to stave the subject off. Of course the Government can impose any policy on this House they choose. They have got the money and they mean to keep it. They will not even execute the public works in Nova Scotia, that are absolutely required. Several applications have been made to them, and the applicants have scarcely received a civil answer. The fishermen deserve to have their works assisted and promoted, the harbours improved, the rivers dredged, so that they may carry on their business more successfully. The fishermen are patient, they do not make much noise, but they are waiting for the good time coming. The fishermen believe this Government has never done the first thing for them, except to increase their taxation; but they are waiting for an opportunity to help put in a new Government, which will have more consideration for their claims than the present one.

MR. ANGLIN: There are important questions raised by the amendment proposed by the hon. the Premier, and I would like to enter into their consideration at some length, but as the hour is late, I must content myself with simply expressing my dissent from some of those propositions. I am not prepared to accept the proposition that the Fisheries belong to the Dominion and not to the Provinces: to the Dominion in its own right and not as Trustee for the Provinces. Nor am I at all prepared to assent to the proposition put forward by the hon. the Premier, that the Dominion is justified in putting this money into the General Treasury, because, hereafter, some troubles may arise involving the Dominion in expense for the protection of those Fisheries. That would be a reason why, if this Treaty were renewed from time to time, the proceeds of the Fisheries should go into the Dominion Treasury for ever. The right hon. gentleman chose to assert that the persons living

on the sea-coast and engaged in the Fisheries, have advantages greater than the people who live in the interior, because in addition to the lands they possess, they possess also the opportunity of fishing in our waters. Anyone knowing the position of the fishermen of this country must be aware that the right hon. gentleman has represented their position as more favourable than it actually is. Their lands are generally poor, and of those who live upon them few are farmers; they depend almost exclusively upon what they draw from the sea. It is true enough that the people of Ontario have a right to come down and share in those Fisheries, as have the people of any other part of the British dominions; but, as a matter of fact, they do not do so, and it is only from the fishermen themselves that anything given to the Americans has been taken away. It has been alleged that our fishermen suffer no injury by reason of the Treaty, and, therefore, have no claim for damages. The fishermen of the Bay des Chaleurs complain that the fishermen from the United States come in and spread their enormous nets, sweeping the whole bay, so that the fishermen have very little chance of doing as well as they would do were the Americans excluded. I do not allege that the Provinces, as Provinces, have a right to this money; but the people have an equitable right to ask that it be applied judiciously and carefully, for the advancement of the Fisheries and their protection, and in assisting the fishermen in their most arduous and dangerous occupation. Very much less has been done towards the promotion of the Fisheries than was promised, and very much is required to be done. If the Estimates when brought down showed that the Government intended to be more liberal than formerly in this respect, they would be in a much better position than they stand in now. They say in this Parliament we have a legal right to this money—a right to apply it as we please. They apply it all to the use of the North-West, and have none to spare for the Maritime Provinces. They stand upon the strict legal right to do as they please, and they please that very little of it shall be appropriated for the benefit of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces.

MR. GILLMOR: I have listened to the arguments on this question very attentively. I have never had any doubt as to the equity of the claim of the Maritime Provinces to this money. I have listened to the speech of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey), and his clear, lucid arguments, and I am sure that, whatever may be the result of this discussion, the Maritime Provinces are indebted to him for the able manner in which he has advocated their interests. He made out his case very clearly, not only as to the equity, but the legality of the claim. Although I am not free from party feelings, and am sometimes animated to a considerable extent by them, yet when I see the delicate position in which the Government are placed, I would not try to embarrass them. I think they are in a position to judge quite as disinterestedly on the merits of the case, as hon. members working against them. This question ought to be treated fairly, and I am inclined to treat it fairly. I was pleased with the arguments of the hon. the leader of the Government. His points were very strong, but I rather inclined to the conclusions arrived at by the hon. member for Halifax. Perhaps I may be somewhat influenced in my judgment. I agree with the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Justice in regard to the poor fishermen. There are a large number of this class in my riding, and, I say it with no desire to flatter, that there is no class of persons in the county of Charlotte who are in more comfortable circumstances than the fishermen. There is no reason why this money should be devoted to their special benefit on the ground of their poverty, because they are quite as able to sustain themselves as the other classes of the community. At the same time I do not agree with the stress laid upon the idea that the money should be expended for the protection of the Fisheries. We do not know where the Dominion might be invaded first; but I hope, whether it is divided among the Provinces or not, that something will be done for the fishermen. I do not consider that the lighthouses on the coast are of very great benefit to them; I do not know of any especially erected for their benefit. For the past few years I have been trying a fog-horn in a locality where

a great many fishermen reside. A small appropriation of \$2,500 was voted in 1878, for a pier and break-water at Grand Manan. This was a small amount, but it would have afforded protection for the small boats. That sum, however, was never expended. I think that the least that can be done for the fishermen is to build small breakwaters where boats can run in in stress of weather.

MR. GIROUARD (Kent): I should have allowed this question to pass, as I have done many others since I have had the honour of sitting in this House, without speaking, were it not that the interests of my constituents compel me to address the House. The question which has engaged our attention until this late hour of the night is one of the very greatest interest to the inhabitants of New Brunswick. It is to them a question of the greatest importance as well as to the people of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. And among the inhabitants of New Brunswick none are more affected by this Fishery question than those who reside along the north shore and that of the Strait of Northumberland. I have the honour to represent a county, a large number of the inhabitants of which subsist entirely, or partially, on the products of the Fisheries; and it is my duty to express to the House the opinion of those persons who are directly interested in that important industry. I say that this question is one of vital interest to the Maritime Provinces, and this is why I say so: The Fisheries furnish daily food to thousands of persons who devote themselves exclusively to that industry; they are also of great importance because they constitute one of the principal resources of the Lower Provinces, if not the most important of them. The value of our Fisheries, as shown by statistics, clearly proves that a considerable amount of labour and of capital is annually employed in that industry. It is in truth to us an unrivalled source of wealth. Last year statistics showed that the value of fish exported to foreign countries amounted to \$3,499,516. The value of fish taken on the coast of New Brunswick amounted, according to the last report, to \$2,305,790.69; on the coast of Nova Scotia to \$6,131,599.64; and on the coast of Prince Edward Island to \$840,344.22; giving a total of

\$9,277,734.55. This does not include \$3,937,944.28 for the other Provinces, which should be added to the latter amount, making the grand total for the whole Dominion, \$13,215,678.83. Such, Mr. Speaker, is the value of our Fisheries; the amount is a large one. Further examination of the statistics shows us that there are engaged in this industry, in Nova Scotia, 11,367 vessels and boats, giving employment to 26,527 men; in the Province of New Brunswick, we have engaged in it 4,636 vessels and boats, providing work for 8,712 men; and in Prince Edward Island, 1,804 vessels and boats, giving employment to 51,296 men. This gives a total for the Maritime Provinces of 17,807 vessels and boats employed in the Fisheries, providing employment for 92,535 persons. Is not this, Sir, a productive industry, and an important source of revenue, especially to the Lower Provinces? An examination of the topographical features of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island will show that the population has settled almost exclusively along their shores and their rivers. Fish are found in greater or less abundance along all the shores of these three Provinces, and the French Canadian, English, Irish and Scotch inhabitants exact from the sea a part, and frequently the whole of their livelihood. Not only is fish an article of export, it is also an article of food, and the most valuable one which the inhabitants of the Maritime Provinces have. It forms a large part of their daily food, and often, in severe years, whole families, whole neighbourhoods, derive the subsistence from the products of the Fishery entirely. If to the amount exported to foreign countries and to the amount consumed in the Lower Provinces, we add the fish of all kinds distributed over the markets of Ontario and Quebec, we shall be still more forcibly brought to admit that, the Fishery question is not only not less important than any other which can be brought before this House, but that on the contrary it ought to command the most serious attention of the representatives of the people. I share the opinion of the mover, the hon. member for Inverness, so far as this, that the Provinces that have suffered must be first indemnified; but that must be done in a judi-

cious manner, and without doing an injustice to the sister-Provinces. I may be mistaken, Mr. Speaker, but it did not appear to me that the hon. member acted sincerely in bringing this motion before the House. I surmised that his course was purely and simply a pretext for attacking the present Administration, and for embarrassing them. And did he not at once avail himself of the opportunity to vent his spleen? When we desire a thing, Sir, we take means to obtain the object aimed at. But what means has the hon. member taken to obtain his object? He attacked, he even insulted those to whom he is applying for a favour. Therefore, he holds but little to that favour. He claims to lay great stress upon his motion. If that be so, Mr. Speaker, it is more for his own sake than for that of his electors, who thus have a very maladroit representative. We have received an indemnity for our Fisheries, which means, in the first place, that our Fisheries have been injured; and next, that the party paying the indemnity has made restitution of a sum representing the value, or nearly so, of the damage done. The American Government paid that indemnity, but the question now before the House is: to decide what use the Government should make of this money, received as compensation for the injury done to our Fisheries by American fishermen. I am of opinion that a certain amount, the interest at least, should be applied to repairing the mischief which has been done. Now, there is a difference of opinion as to the manner of applying this money. My hon. friend from Inverness admits, as I do, that the Maritime Provinces have suffered considerably from the interference of Americans upon our fishing banks. Since he is desirous that that money should be made over to the Provinces which have suffered injury, he must therefore wish, as I do, that the Fisheries should receive the compensation which is their due. Now, as the Prime Minister has so well shown, there is but one Government which has the control and care of our Fisheries, that is the Government of the Dominion. It alone has the right of protecting and improving our Fisheries. The Provinces could in no way apply this money for the advantage of the Fisheries, which are entirely beyond their control. To distribute this sum of \$4,500,000

among the Local Governments would be to deprive the Government of the Dominion of the means of protecting our Fisheries. We ought, therefore, to leave that considerable sum in the hands of the Federal Administration; but as its acquisition was brought about through the Fisheries, we naturally expect to be treated with liberality when our fishermen apply for assistance and protection, of which they certainly stand in need; and the Government of the day will permit me to offer them the following advice: Immediate steps should be taken for the improvement of our Fisheries, which have been hitherto too much neglected, for the question of our Fisheries is deserving of more than secondary consideration. The Fisheries have always been one of the principle resources of Canada. Before the conquest, ratified by the Treaty of 1763, the resources of Canada, and they were enormous, consisted of the Fisheries and the peltry trade. The peltry trade, the exportation of furs, is almost ruined, exhausted; but we still have the Fisheries. That industry should be protected by the creation of a fund, the interest of which should be devoted to the development of our Fisheries, and used to repair, in every possible way, the injury which they have suffered from the acts of American fishermen. In this way the products of our Fisheries would be considerably increased; our fishermen would derive from them, both for themselves and for the country, greater advantages, and their labour would become less severe and less dangerous. These few suggestions will, perhaps, not receive the approval of hon. members from the Western Provinces, because they represent constituencies which are much less interested, or are not interested at all, in the Fisheries. But if this line of reasoning is followed, may not representatives from the Maritime Provinces say: "Of what use is the Pacific Railway to us? Why should enormous sums of money be expended to promote emigration and colonisation?" Answer may be made to us that the fertility of the soil in the west, which furnishes, in part, the flour used by consumers in the Lower Provinces, decides, or rather justifies, the Government in the encouragement of colonisation, and the promotion of agriculture. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia,

and Prince Edward Island, owing to the fact that they are all surrounded by bays and rivers, have advantages over Western Canada which compensate for the inferior quality of their soil. These advantages are the vast and rich Fisheries, which, if they were protected and encouraged, would be unrivalled in the world. Therefore, the principal resources of the Maritime Provinces are the Fisheries, just as the Western Provinces have their cereals. Now, if the National Policy means protection to all the industries of Canada, protection must not be confined to manufactures, mines, and agriculture; it must also be extended to the Fisheries. I am in favour of national protection, but I would have it complete. I do not wish for it only for manufactures and mineral products. I want it for all our sources of revenue, and especially for our Fisheries, which stand in great need of protection, exposed as they are to be exhausted. Hon. members from the Maritime Provinces made sacrifices last year, in order to come to an understanding with the hon. members from other Provinces, as to the question of Protection. It is now the turn of the latter to show good will towards us. As I am responsible to my constituents for my words, as well as my votes, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I shall vote in favour of the amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the Government, whose good inclinations, so well known in fact, lead me to anticipate protection for our Fisheries, which may be doubted by the mover of the resolution. In conclusion, I may state that we must not think only of protecting coal and flour, of protecting one Province to the detriment of the other, but that we must have especially, it may be above all, mutual and equitable protection.

Motion made and question proposed on amendment (*Sir John A. Macdonald*).—
[*Vide page 1187.*]

The House divided:—Yeas, 126; nays, 30.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Angers	Landry
Arnell	Lane
Baby	Langevin
Baker	LaRue
Bannerman	Little
Barnard	Macdonald (Victoria BC)

MR. GIROUARD.

Beauchesne McDonald (Pictou)
 Benoit Macdonell (N. Lanark)
 Bergeron Mackenzie
 Bolduc Macmillan
 Boulbee McCallum
 Bourbeau McCuaig
 Bowell Macdougall
 Brooks McGreevy
 Brown McInnes
 Bunster McLennan
 Burnham McQuade
 Cameron (N. Victoria) McRory
 Carling Malouin
 Caron Massue
 Casey Merner
 Casgrain Méthot
 Cimon Montplaisir
 Colby Mousseau
 Connell O'Connor
 Costigan Oliver
 Coughlin Olivier
 Coupal Orton
 Coursol Quimet
 Currier Paterson (South Brant)
 Cuthbert Patterson (Essex)
 Daoust Perrault
 Dawson Pinsonneault
 Desaulniers Platt
 Desjardins Plumb
 Domville Pope (Compton)
 Draw Poupore
 Dugas Rinfret
 Elliott Ross (West Middlesex)
 Ferguson Rouleau
 Fitzsimmons Routhier
 Fleming Royal
 Fortin Ryan (Marquette)
 Fulton Ryan (Montreal Centre)
 Gault Rykert
 Gigault Skinner
 Gillies Sproule
 Girouard (Jac. Cartier) Strange
 Girouard (Kent, N.B.) Tassé
 Grandbois Tellier
 Gunn Thompson (Cariboo)
 Haggart Tilley
 Hay Tupper
 Hesson Vallée
 Hilliard Vanasse
 Hooper Wade
 Houde Wallace (S. Norfolk)
 Hurteau Wallace (West York)
 Ives White (Cardwell)
 Jones White (North Renfrew)
 Keeler Williams
 Kilvert Wiser
 Kranz Wright.—125.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allison Kaulbach
 Anglin Killam
 Bill King
 Bourassa Longley
 Brecken Macdonald (Kings, PEI)
 Burpee (Sunbury) MacDonald (Victoria, NS)
 Daly McIsaac
 Doull McLeod
 Dumont Muttart
 Fiset Ogden
 Flynn Pickard

Geoffrion Richey
 Gillmor Robertson (Shelburne)
 Hackett Rogers
 Haddow Weldon.—30

Question *resolved* in the affirmative.

MR. KILLAM: I wish to say that I have not stated any opinion as to the merits of the question or as to how the Fishery Award should be disposed of. I have challenged the opinion of the Government in regard to its disposal. I regret that I have to vote with the Tory supporters of the right hon. gentleman opposite, but I have no other recourse on this occasion.

Main motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following Motions for Returns were severally *agreed to* :—

Order of the House.—Return showing the quantity of lumber purchased for the use of the Intercolonial Railway, from October 1st, 1874, to March 1st, 1880; the names of the persons from whom it was purchased, the quantity supplied by each person, the prices at which it was furnished, and the amount paid him.—(*Mr. Anglin.*)

Order of the House.—Copy of all papers having reference to the late appointment of Postmaster at Mount Pleasant, county of Durham.—(*Mr. Williams.*)

House adjourned at

Twenty-five minutes after

Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 8th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

MR. ROYAL moved :

That the Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Emerson and Turtle Mountain Railway Company, be withdrawn, and the fees paid thereon refunded, less the cost of printing and translation.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think the motion went far enough. When the Government interfered and prevented a Bill being heard before a Committee, he thought the whole of the cost should be refunded.

MR. LANGEVIN said the promoters of the Bill had to run the risk, and the course taken was the ordinary one. He did not think the House should go further.

MR. ROYAL said in framing his motion he had to take the wording of the report of the Railway Committee, but there was a great deal in what the hon. member for Lambton had said, as the promoters had been compelled to come from Emerson to Ottawa, and had been put to great expense.

Motion agreed to.

INSOLVENT BANKS AND INSURANCE COMPANIES WINDING-UP BILL.

(Mr. Abbott.)

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

MR. ABBOTT, in introducing a Bill (No. 97) To provide for the winding up of Insolvent Banks and Insurance Companies, said: This Bill has been rendered necessary by the repeal of the Insolvent Act. Under the system which prevailed while that Act was in force, there were separate Acts providing for the winding-up of these companies, which referred for their details and machinery principally to the Act of 1875 and its amendments. There is now no machinery in existence which would enable an insolvent bank or insurance company to wind up, and I think it is desirable that it should be provided. The principle of the Bill is a little different from that of the two Bills which have thus become practically useless. I have entertained the opinion that a bank or an insurance company was in a different position from an ordinary trading company. In banks, of course, there are usually a vast number of shareholders, and these shareholders, though they may have paid up their shares, are still liable to the double liability according to the Banking Act. In insurance companies, as a rule, there is an immense balance of the unpaid stock uncalled for generally, but always unpaid—and the imprudent, or useless, or reckless, calling in of this in the enforcement of the double liability would cause distress among a vast number of people. Besides that, the amounts which are dealt with through the banks and insurance companies are extremely large in comparison with the ordinary revenues arising from corporations. For these reasons, among others that will suggest themselves to every hon. gentleman, I think it expedient there should be more precaution adopted in the appointment of a liquidator of a bank or an

Mr. ROYAL.

insurance company than has been thought necessary in ordinary trading corporations and firms. The main principle of the Bill in such cases is the course which is suggested, and has been approved by the Banking and Commerce Committee in the case of the Consolidated Bank, that is to say, that the three parties who have the greatest interest in the proper winding-up of insolvent banks and insurance companies, should be represented on the liquidating board, that is to say, the public, the shareholders, and the creditors; and the Bill provides a mode by which the Government may name one liquidator, the shareholders one, and the creditors one, the Government and creditors' liquidator ceasing to hold office as soon as the creditors are paid off, as soon as it becomes a mere-domestic question, as it were, for the shareholders themselves to carry on the liquidation of the bank. I do not propose in this Bill to divest the corporation of its assets, or to vest them in these liquidators. I think that unnecessary, because we know its affairs depend entirely on those who manage it, and therefore, as the directors of these institutions afford every means of collecting their debts, for making their calls, and for doing all the other matters which are requisite, I simply substitute these liquidators for the directors of the bank. As these liquidators represent every interest themselves, it seems to me the plan affords reasonable probability that the bank or the insurance company will be wound up with the greatest possible care and attention. I do not know that any more explanation is needed by the House until the Bill is printed and circulated.

MR. IVES: I had the honour to introduce a Bill which has had its first reading and has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, having for its object to provide the machinery for winding up insolvent insurance companies. We had a meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee several days ago, and I expected at that time that the Bill would be referred to a sub-committee, composed of several members whom I had named, one of whom was the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), and others being leading lawyers of this House. But to my surprise the chairman of the Committee informed me that, at the request of the Govern-

ment, the Bill was to stand. I was afterwards informed by the hon. the Minister of Justice that his desire was that my measure should stand until a Bill which was being prepared by the hon. member for Argenteuil should be introduced to the House, and have its second reading, and be referred to a Committee also. Now, it seems to me that, if that course is persisted in, unless the Government make these measures Government measures, in a certain sense, and give them precedence upon Government days, we shall have no legislation this Session upon this subject. The Bill of the hon. member for Argenteuil is introduced to-day; in the natural course of things it cannot reach a second reading, probably, during this Session. Now, it seems to me that it is not absolutely necessary that the measure of the hon. gentleman should be read a second time, and referred to a Committee, but that we proceed with my Bill, because, I suppose, the only object of the hon. member is to obtain the best possible legislation upon this subject. We have in his Bill, which I see is printed, his ideas on the subject. We propose to make him a member of this Select Committee, and it seems to me we might proceed with my measure, having the advantage of his ideas in the Bill he has drafted. If there is to be legislation on this subject this Session, it seems to me either that the hon. gentleman's measure should be read and referred immediately, or that I should be permitted to proceed with my measure. I do not suppose it matters very materially to the House—it certainly does not to me—whether my Bill or his Bill becomes law. Now, although the two Bills differ in some respects they are not so dissimilar as to render it impossible to incorporate his ideas in my Bill. He proposes to appoint three liquidators; I propose to appoint one receiver. He proposes that the stockholders, the shareholders, and the Government, should appoint each a liquidator; I propose the Court should appoint the receiver. The difference is not so great but that his proposition should be incorporated in my Bill, if the Committee should judge it well. At all events, unless we proceed with my measure we shall probably have no legislation at all. I notice to-day on the Order Paper we have a matter put down far above my Bill, that is, the

motion of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Rochester) for the consideration of his resolutions. That has been going all during the whole Session; discussions have been begun upon Notices of Motion, and, if not completed, have been given precedence over Public Bills and Orders. It seems to me if that practice is continued much longer, many important Public Bills on the Notice Paper will not reach a second reading at all.

MR. BLAKE: It will be recollected the Speech from the Throne stated that the subject of insolvency would receive consideration at a very early stage in the Session. The hon. the First Minister stated that the measure of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) embodied the Government policy upon that subject. The view of the House upon that measure has been already emphatically declared. I suggested that it really was of importance, in matters of such great moment as the administration of insolvent incorporated companies, that the Government should take the responsibility of these measures. The hon. Minister, at the time, took the responsibility of seeing that measures were placed on the Statute Book. I have repeated since that such measures should be carried through by the Government. Now, no person in this House, on the Ministerial Benches, or anywhere else, is better qualified to prepare such a Bill than the hon. member Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott); nor do I wish to say that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is in the slightest degree unworthy to prepare such a Bill; but, in a matter of this kind, it should be brought forward on the responsibility of the Government; and, if not directly, then let it be by putting the measure on the Government Orders. The suggestions of the hon. member are worthy of consideration, and the questions raised by these suggestions will require very careful attention.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I would suggest that my hon. friend's Bill, which is now before the House, receive its first and second reading, and that then, by mutual consent, the Bill of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), should get its second reading, and that both Bills go to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, and the Government will undertake the

responsibility of aiding and assisting the legislation.

MR. MACKENZIE: You will not adopt the child.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD? We will adopt the child.

MR. MACKENZIE: Oh, you will.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes; everything but the rag baby.

MR. ANGLIN: Then the hon. the member for Argenteuil will be the putative father.

MR. KILLAM: I think that a great mistake was made, in repealing the Insolvent Act, by the hon. the leader of the Government, who generally agrees with me on commercial questions of this character. I think we ought to profit by the experience of other countries, that it is necessary to have some law to enable the honest debtor to get clear of liabilities incurred perhaps not on his own responsibility, and prevent him from being placed in a position in which he can do nothing in the future. I believe we will have to go back to the old state of things again before long; it will be necessary, it will be found, to have some sort of Insolvent Act. The great cause if all the difficulty has been the negligence of creditors. They say: We appoint Inspectors; let it go; we had better take ten cents and clear it off. The practical solution of the difficulty is for creditors to look after their rights. We will probably return before long to a new Insolvent Act embodying the provisions of those of 1869 and 1875.

Bill read the first and second times, and referred.

Bill (No. 6) To make provision for the winding up of insolvent incorporated banks and other companies (*Mr. Ives*) read the second time and referred.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Ontario Reformatory for Boys.—(*Mr. MacDonald, Pictou*).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders in Prince Edward Island.—(*Mr. MacDonald, Pictou*).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Industrial Refuge for Girls of Ontario.—(*Mr. MacDonald, Pictou*).

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion: "That Mr. Speaker now do

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Ways and Means."—(*Sir Samuel L. Tilley*.)

MR. KILLAM: Before the hon. gentleman moved the House into Committee of Ways and Means, on the 9th March, I hoped we would have some indication from him that he intended to abandon a part of the policy, which was adopted last year, in relation to the industries and productions of the country. I had hoped we would have had some information that would have been useful to the commercial men of this country in the direction of the remarks made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (*Mr. Charlton*), as to the duties upon agricultural products. I had hoped the shipping interest would have received the benefit of his kind consideration, and that we would have been informed that he was about to remove his absurd and useless duties upon breadstuffs and grains passing through this country. I believe that the policy of the hon. gentleman, in placing restrictions on the grain trade of the West going to Europe, by way of Montreal, is one of the most ridiculous policies that ever was submitted to an intelligent Parliament. I think the time has arrived when hon. gentlemen should come to this House and acknowledge their error, and express themselves willing to again restore to our ports the trade of which they have been deprived. I read the other day a petition presented by gentlemen connected with the barge trade through the Welland canal. They came here to ask the Government to reduce the tolls. They represented that if those tolls were reduced, the 7 per cent. of the grain shipments from the west that went by way of Montreal might be materially increased. I believe that would be a good thing for this country. These gentlemen further said that if the Welland canal tolls were reduced by one-half, Montreal could be made of much more importance as a shipping port. I desire, however, to say as little as possible upon this subject, because hon. gentlemen are too weak on this point to be attacked severely in reference to it. While every facility should be given for shipping the products of the North-West to Europe, we are confronted with the policy of the hon. the Finance Minister, and compelled to submit to all the

restrictions that can be imposed to make business disagreeable to the trade without being profitable to the Government. I hoped that when the hon. gentleman on the 9th of March, rose to explain the policy by which he proposed by taking 5 per cent. off playing cards, and putting it on valentines and chromos, to place the finances of the Dominion on a sound basis, that he would have remedied the error of the grain duties. There were persons who had believed in him to some extent. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, I have met gentlemen who had an idea that while this was a new policy, the hon. the Finance Minister would readily change it for the better, if he found it did not work well. I hoped he would have remedied the defects which appear so prominently. We have submitted to the Tariff for twelve months. We have seen arbitrary diversions of trade in certain directions against the wishes of the people. The annoyance to everybody engaged in trade has been of an exasperating character. But what benefits have we received? We are told that an order came from Manitoba to Berlin, or some other western town, to supply 2,000 wagon wheels, and that was proof of the immense advantages of the National Policy in assisting the industries of the country, I cannot congratulate Manitoba on being compelled to send so far for such goods; but if the hon. the Finance Minister would only carry out his policy to its legitimate conclusion, he would compel every man in Manitoba not only to buy his wagon wheels, but everything else in Western Ontario, and a trade would spring up between the two sections which would astonish everybody. The best thing to do for the people, is to let them follow their own inclinations in matters of trade. Let them adopt trades which best suit their interests, and not compel those to manufacture who wish to engage in other pursuits. The best thing for Canada is to adopt the policy which will bring the greatest good to the greatest number, and enable the people to remain by their old homes to adopt the principles which the people of England have taught us, and make this a free country for everybody to settle in. The sugar question is a notable instance of the manner in which this National Policy is enriching manufacturers at the

expense of the people. There is no use in my reciting the facts in this instance, they have been stated over and over again. The hon. the Finance Minister has never attempted to deny them in any of his speeches. He cannot show that any advantage, except to the manufacturers, has accrued by taxing the people 1c. too much a lb. on sugar for manufacturers' benefit, with a loss to the revenue of \$600,000 a year. On this question the hon. gentleman stands on the narrowest ground that any Finance Minister ever stood upon. In fact, the hon. gentleman's assumed knowledge of the sugar trade only places him in the light of a walking compendium of financial ignorance. He knows nothing about it. He will be taught by experience just as the hon. the First Minister will be taught by experience about the Dominion lands as to the revenue he may expect from them. I regret to know that the Maritime Provinces have produced a man, so thoroughly incompetent to understand the subjects affecting their best interests, as the hon. the Finance Minister. What does his arbitrary division of trade amount to? Let me ask the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). He has told us, repeatedly, in his speeches that the great misfortune of this country was the balance of trade against it. He has assailed us Session after Session from the gallery, in his paper and since in his seat, stating in effect that, all we had to do was to make the country so poor that we could not import foreign goods, and we should be perfectly prosperous. This hon. gentleman (Mr. White), and the hon. the Finance Minister consulted to propound a sugar policy and secure the West India trade. If there is anything in the balance of trade theory; if it be true that it is not for our interest to be able to buy in foreign countries; if it be best that we should not have any money to spend abroad, the hon. gentlemen are right. They may succeed, but I doubt, if under their policy, they will get many to settle on our waste lands. The people who are responsible for the balance of trade in a country, are, or ought to be those who produce and earn money. If Government devise arbitrary tariffs to destroy our industries and force trade into wrong channels for the purpose of making up an imaginary

balance sheet in their ledgers, we shall see the country injured. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) the other night enlarged upon the enormous trade already existing between Canada and the West Indies. Vessel after vessel was carrying the products of Cuba, Jamaica, and Porto Rico to Halifax, and the enormous freights by the Intercolonial in consequence, were weighing down the wheels and axles of the cars and causing the accidents we have recently heard about. Only a short time before, he had told us that the balance of trade against us was reducing us to a ruinous condition of poverty. What is true in the larger sense must be true in the minor. The hon. gentleman must admit that, if the balance of trade against us is so destructive, then no possible good can be derived by increasing that balance against us in the trade with the West Indies. In former years the balance of trade with the West Indies was in our favour, and the hon. gentleman worked for the purpose of destroying that balance. If he is to be the Finance Minister who shall succeed the present one, we should expect something less contradictory in his theories. The balance of trade between the Dominion and the rest of the world is of variable quantity; may perhaps increase and decrease with our prosperity, but it is true that the balance of trade against a country is a sign of depression, and the balance in favour of that country is a sign of prosperity, then the hon. gentleman on the Treasury Benches have got the argument entirely against them. While the hon. member for Lambton was in power, the actual balance against this country decreased, but when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they constantly increased the balance against us. They increased the adverse balance from sixteen millions in 1868, to thirty-eight millions in 1874, while under the Government of the hon. member for Lambton, the balance against us fell to fourteen millions. I believe that this country is largely dependent on others for its prosperity, and that it should not build a Chinese wall about itself, and shut itself up from all communication with its neighbours. The policy for Canada is to have as far as possible, perfect and absolute Free-trade with everybody, while it is a growing country, with a vast far west to open up

and a railway to complete from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I would tell the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeComos), that if the Liberal Party receive a chance, they will build that railway more quickly and cheaply than it can otherwise be built under the exervating policy of the party now in power. Our best policy is to allow the people to do as they choose, to follow those industries they consider the best, and not to compel them to establish this or that trade or monopoly for the benefit of this or that party. The people of this country are too intelligent, they have too many common schools to accept such a doctrine as that of the National Policy. In the great contest in England lately neither party has attempted to revive the exploded theory of taxing one industry for the benefit of another. In referring to sugar the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) made a laboured statement the other night to the effect that in 1877 the price of sugar was so many cents a pound; in 1878 it was less; in 1879, still less; and in 1880 still less again. The hon. gentleman tried to convey to the House the idea that sugar had decreased in value during the last two or three years, on account of the National Policy. I want to ask him whether the first or the second years decrease was due to the National Policy or not? It may be that sugar is cheaper now than it was then. Suppose it is higher next year, shall we blame the National Policy for it? We intend to treat these facts logically, and we intend to deal properly with hon. gentlemen when they come here as demagogues and tell us that because they got up this great National Policy, therefore, the people of this country are prosperous. The hon. member for Cardwell might just as well have commenced to argue on the price of ships. He might have said that, because a ship cost less than five or six years ago, the National Policy was a great institution. Could not the hon. gentleman have also explained to the House that the price of ships, for seven years back, had decreased, and that decrease was owing to the change of Government in 1873? His argument would have been worth just as much as it was on the sugar question. I know myself the prices of ships have decreased. The cost of building ships has decreased since

1873, perhaps 17 or 18 per cent. I am fully aware of the actual decrease, where ships have been built by shipbuilders at their own expense, and not by contract; but I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to the fact that, that decrease is by no means due to the National Policy. Perhaps a ship can be built now for less money than before the new Tariff, but anyone who pretends that ships can be built for less money because an additional taxation has been imposed upon the materials entering into their construction, pretends something which he is hardly able to sustain. Everything the present Government has done in relation to the shipping interest is not to encourage but to destroy it. Let the hon. member for Cardwell remember this question of shipping when he comes as a newspaper man into Parliament. I was thinking of comparing the hon. gentleman to Cobbett, who tried so long to get into Parliament, and who, when he got in, was such an utter failure. Cobbett, however, was a man who had economic views worth something, and if he did not say anything to electrify Parliament he was, at all events, a man whose opinion was worth listening to, entirely unlike the hon. member for Cardwell, who is so utterly ignorant of the commercial affairs of this country that he mistook his vocation when he came here to enlighten this Parliament upon sugar duties and matters of that kind. The hon. the Finance Minister told us the revenue he expected to derive from the spirit duties had decreased, and he congratulated the House and the country on the fact that, although he had lost the revenue, the temperance cause had been the gainer. The hon. gentleman has made a great mistake. What are the facts with regard to the liquor traffic? Liquors are like all other luxuries. When the country is able to spend the money for luxuries it will have them. In England it has been observed that when the country was not prosperous and the people were not able to increase their wealth, the consumption of liquors did not increase. I know that though gentlemen opposite with their majority are likely to hold the benches they now occupy for some years, it is my duty to impress upon them some facts useful to them in framing their

policy so they may do the least possible injury. I am willing, on all occasions, to give information to people who need it so much; but while I do this, I am bound to make the reservation that, I shall treat these gentlemen with the consideration which they deserve, and shall refer to the finances of this country in the way which I consider most calculated to make them go sooner to their political grave. I pretend to say that the consumption of liquors is the same as that of any other luxury. When a country is wealthy the people spend more money in every kind of luxury; they spend more in sugar and more in beer, and the English figures in my hand will prove it; but if I cannot get the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Annapolis, who is occupying it, I shall have to go on without their distinguished consideration. These figures have been carefully collected principally from reports submitted to the English Parliament, and from the recent report of a Committee of the House of Lords upon the Temperance question. I will give these to the hon. the Minister of Finance as soon as he can give me his attention; and then he can deliver a good temperance lecture in St. John. The figures are these: the increase from 1861 to 1865 in the value of property, and profits assessed to income-tax in the United Kingdom, was £15,000,000 per annum, or at the rate of about five per cent; from 1866 to 1869, £8,000,000 per annum, or only 2 per cent; from 1870 to 1876, £25,000,000 per annum, or 5 per cent. In the first of these periods, the consumption of certain articles per head, increased as follows:—Wine, 33 per cent; spirits, 22 per cent; malt, 21 per cent; tea, 26 per cent; sugar, 15 per cent., and tobacco, 12 per cent. In the second of these periods, that from 1866 to 1869, the period of least progress, there was no increase in either of these articles except in tea, 12 per cent, and sugar 13 per cent. But in the last of the periods referred to the increase, was wine, 13; spirits, 26; malt, 10; tea, 18; sugar, 25; and tobacco, 9 per cent. That was the time when prosperity increased in the greatest ratio. Hon. gentlemen may claim that this is a calculation per head; that the population of

the United Kingdom was increased at the same time. I say that when the earnings increased the consumption of luxuries increased also. Now, we have made less revenue from spirits here at all events; that is shown by the returns. The hon. the Minister of Finance said it was the spread of temperance principles. I admire my hon. friend; he is a good advocate of temperance out of Parliament, but I do not believe he understands the economic policy suited to this country. In what particular have the imports of this country increased? What sign of prosperity has been shown? I see in almost everything a decrease. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the items of coffee, tea and tobacco, in which there has also been a decrease in the six months returns for 1878 and 1879, submitted to this House. The result of the hon. gentleman's policy is to prevent the people from enjoying the luxuries of life. He may say that he is an advocate of the cause of temperance. Now, I have shown him that when the people are poor they are able to buy less, and consume less. This policy is a policy of poverty that deprives the honest hard workingmen of this country of the benefit of those things that they would have been able to buy but for it. I do not mean to say we cannot stand this policy; we can bear a great deal of taxation. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, took credit the other night for every prosperity which exists in this country in any branch of industry whatever. Now, the hon. the Minister of Finance knows at the bottom of his convictions—if he has any—that there is not one single foundation for the assumption he has taken that such prosperity is attributable to the National Policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell him about shipping.

MR. KILLAM: I do not think it would be worth my while. The hon. gentleman told us it was the policy of his party to encourage ship-building. He told the House the Government was going to return all the duties paid on articles used in the construction of ships. We waited for about six months and then an Order in Council was promulgated, by which the Government undertook to pay back duties to the extent of half a dollar

per ton. The hon. gentleman congratulates himself upon having done justice to the shipbuilders, but he has not done so. Those of St. John claim that \$1.95 per ton is the drawback that should, in justice to them, be allowed them. The shipbuilder is taxed directly and indirectly at least \$2 per ton, and that I maintain, is a moderate calculation. As I said in 1874, shipbuilders are willing to contribute their share towards the burdens of the country. I am quite willing that shipbuilders, and all others, should bear a fair share of the taxation, but they decline to be satisfied with the hon. gentleman when he tells them, "We will tax you so much, and then return it," but fails to do so. It will be necessary for the hon. gentleman to fulfil some of the pledges he has made to his constituents, or else he will be attended to at the next election. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) will supply the figures to prove the amount of duties paid on ships and materials. In the calculation I have made, bar iron is included. We could not buy it in the Dominion. There was a time when we could have purchased it from the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville); but, as my hon. friend from Westmoreland remarked, the National Policy has shut down his mills. The Coldbrook rolling mills were destroyed by the National Policy. Where are the 200 men who were employed in those works? The disastrous effects of the National Policy upon the private interests of the hon. member for King's are to be regretted, but it serves him right for supporting a Government whose policy is calculated, not to build up rolling mills, but to destroy them. If it is in the interests of the Dominion to put a tax upon sugar, for the benefit of Redpath, why should it not be in the interest of the country to put a tax upon bar iron for the benefit of Domville? Why is not Domville as deserving as Redpath? I desire, before bringing my remarks to a close, to ask again the hon. the Finance Minister what he has done for the the improvement of the shipping interest? I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman considers himself responsible for the rise in freights in New York. These things are not dependent on his financial policy or his financial speeches. Last July, grain freight in

New York for European ports were six shillings. To day they are about five shillings, and on the day the hon. the Finance Minister took credit in this House for the boom in the shipping trade, freights were about three shillings. I do not charge that the hon. gentleman is responsible for the fall from six to three shillings. Far from it. Nor do I intend to give him credit for the increase from three to five shillings. I want, instead, to impress upon the House the utter absurdity of the hon. the Minister of Finance getting up here and proclaiming to the people that he assisted the shipping interests by raising the price of freights in New York. I wish I could congratulate the hon. gentleman for his protection of the coal trade, but I do not think the increased duty will add very much to the production of coal. I think, however, that there will be a good trade in this article this year. The price of coal in the United States has risen 55 per cent. in five months. I maintain that the coal trade has never been benefitted by the policy of the hon. gentleman. From a return recently laid before the Nova Scotia Legislature, we find that the sales were less during the past year than during the previous year, the principal difference in the trade being that less was sent to the United States, by about the additional quantity which went up the St. Lawrence. In conclusion, I may say, that hon. gentlemen may amuse themselves by taxing this industry and that; by diverting the trade from one Province to another, and by telling the people of the Maritime Provinces that they pay less on their molasses if they do pay more on their corn-meal, but that will not convince the electors of the justice of their course. Certainly, this Tariff has advanced particular industries and injured others, and the people generally are suffering from its evil results. The policy is one which, while it scarcely excites the admiration of anyone, creates dissatisfaction and disgust among the many. The people, however, can bear for a while the increased taxation and submit to its annoyances, knowing as they do that the next general election will relegate its authors to the positions they deserve.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre): Mr. Speaker, this debate has been prolonged

to such an extent that the House is growing tired; and the country is sick of hearing a re-hash of the arguments of last Session against the National Policy. I do not think it is fair to judge of the effects of this policy, when it has only been one year in operation; but, judging from the results which have come under my own observation, I hold that it has been successful, and has realised the expectations of its most ardent advocates. It has restored confidence to the people of the Dominion; it has increased our commerce, both at home and abroad, given employment to the idle of past years, and has a tendency to develop the resources of the forests and mines. At the early part of the debate the hon. member for Centre Huron stated that, if the hon. the Finance Minister could show him that twelve industries had been started, giving employment to 1,200 people, he would be convinced that the policy was a success. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not in his place, for I could tell him that not only have 1,200 additional men been employed, but that in the city of Montreal there are to-day between 4,000 and 5,000 more operators employed than there were a year ago, and more than would have been employed had the National Policy not been in existence. As a proof, I will recite what has been the effect in that city. We have to-day a sugar refinery, which I must confess the people of this House and the country, from the frequency with which it has been referred to, think has become nauseous. That industry ran down under the policy of the late Administration, but it was restored under the National Policy. Not only has it been reopened, but it gives employment to several hundred operators. A similar industry, giving employment to 300 or 400 operators, has also been opened; and the effect of the policy has been that the Hudon Cotton Factory, which I am glad to say has been in successful operation in Montreal for years, has this year increased its capacity 100 per cent. Then the policy has had the effect of bringing into existence a woollen manufactory, and we have had a silk manufactory established within twelve months. But this is not the only effect. There is not an industry in the city—iron, brass, woollen, boot and shoe factories—that are not employing from 50 to

100 per cent. more than they did a year ago. Some eight or ten days ago I was very forcibly struck with the remarks of a manufacturing gentleman from Montreal. I happened to meet him casually at the Russell House, and he said it was a pity that so much time should be wasted in discussing the Tariff question, which, he remarked, every intelligent man must admit to be a success. "I cannot for the life of me," he said, "see why the members of the Opposition adopt the suicidal policy of trying to run a Tariff of which some of their warmest friends are its strongest supporters." "What effect had it on yourself?" I asked. "Well," was the reply, "not a year ago I was employing only 140 men, while to-day I am giving employment to 300." "Is it not possible your case is an exceptional one?" "I think not," was the response, "I have no hesitation in saying that there is no branch of industry in the city of Montreal that is not to-day employing more men, and is in a more prosperous state than before." Well, I hold that this beneficial effect is not confined to Montreal, but has been felt throughout the length and breadth of the land, wherever any manufacturing industry has been in existence. With the permission of the House I will read an extract from a journal commenting on the admissions of the St. John *Telegraph*, a paper which, I think, is certainly not favourable to the National Policy, or to the hon. gentlemen who sit upon the Treasury Benches. In regard to the effects of the National Policy that journal made a series of damaging admissions the other day. Speaking of a large furniture house in St. John, it said: "The National Policy had compelled them to stop importing from the States, and to manufacture at home; and that in consequence they are now selling home-made furniture as cheaply as it can be made in New York, and more cheaply by 35 per cent.—the amount of the Canadian duty—than it could be imported for." In other words, it admits that the National Policy has established an important industry in St. John, while the consumer is also benefitted by a reduction in price. Allow me to proceed a step further in that direction. I have already stated that the Hudon Cotton Factory had in-

creased its capacity 100 per cent. I find in an authority, which I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will dispute, the *Toronto Globe*, the following article:—

"It is reported that the Hudon Cotton Mills is shortly to enlarge its working capacity and staff of operatives, by building a new wing, adding 250 new looms, an extra engine of great power, and 200 more hands. They are to restrict themselves to the manufacturing of plain cotton. The Canada Cotton Company, reinforced with the addition of \$10,000 bonus from the Cornwall Council, is also said to be on the eve of enlarging their staff. The new addition will be 200 feet long, the dyeing houses will be enlarged, 200 looms will be added to the 400 at present running, and the extra hands employed will number over 150. The Stormont Company, Cornwall, are also enlarging their mills 60 by 100 feet, adding about 200 looms, and bringing on 100 more hands."

That is testimony which cannot be doubted, and it is a corroboration of the statements I have made regarding the effect of the policy in Montreal, and in other parts of the country. Allow me to show what the effect has been on one of the most important industries in Canada. Hon. members are aware that the Grand Trunk Railway is a most extensive corporation, giving employment to thousands of operatives. Yet, while that corporation has been in existence, up to within the past year, they only manufactured thirty-five locomotives in Canada. Their locomotives were formerly imported from England and the United States, and, I regret to say, chiefly from the United States. The effect of the policy has been, that during the past year they have constructed twenty locomotives at their shops in Montreal, besides building a number of drawing-room cars, and an increased number of rolling-stock of every description, and giving employment to additional operatives, and full employment to their permanent staff, that were working half and three-quarter time before. It is utter nonsense to tell those men you are paying more for your sugar, which is not really the fact. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) put that matter so clearly before the House, that there is no possibility of disputing his statement. I hope the facts I have cited will give us an additional convert, in the person of the hon. member for Centre Huron. I have one more quotation from an independent source, the

Post. There has been a great deal said about the exodus from Canada. I regret to say that there is an exodus. It is not of recent date, but has been going on for the past twenty years from all parts of the Dominion; but I am prepared to say it is less now than it was a year ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite wish to convey the impression that the people are going to the United States, when the truth is the great mass go to our great North-West for the purpose of settling there. But let me quote:

"The Liberal journals are full of emigration to the States, and are magnifying and multiplying the numbers as rapidly as they can. As a matter of course the whole blame is laid upon the National Policy. There is, no use in denying the fact that a number of people are leaving Canada for the United States and the North-West, though not in such proportions as the *Globe* would lead us to believe, and not certainly in numbers as great as at former periods. A season of prosperity in the States has always the tendency to attract people from Canada, some of whom stay there, but most of whom return with some means, and the present 'exodus' is due entirely to such natural causes. If the National Policy had not been inaugurated there would just now be a real exodus."

There is no question but what that would have been the case. But there is another quotation with which I will have to trouble the House. It has particular reference to the elections which have and are taking place in Great Britain, and is taken from the *Free Press* of this city:

"Toronto, April 1.—The Liberal gains in England are received with demonstrations of joy by the Canadian Reformers. Should Beaconsfield be defeated, a demonstration is being contemplated by the leading Reformers of this city. It is felt that a change of the Ministry in England will be fatal to the Canada Pacific Railway, and strengthen Mr. Blake's hands in his assaults upon the Government policy."

What is this demonstration for? What is this great rejoicing about? Is it because a change of Government is likely to take place in the immediate future? How is that going to help our friends opposite to regain their seats on this side of the House, or is it because they gloat over the hopes of a change there it would be more unfavourable to the Dominion than if the British Government remained as constituted at present? If such is the case I can only pity the hon. gentlemen. I believe if we could dive down into the innermost depths of their hearts we would find that that is the feeling which actuates

them. I hope that all true patriots will unite in the support of this National Policy, which will have the effect of further extending our commerce both at home and abroad, in developing our manufacturing industries, and developing the resources of the Fisheries and Forests, and by that means creating a united, happy, and prosperous people.

MR. BURPEE (St. John): The introduction of the new resolution by the hon. the Minister of Finance on Tuesday last, and the speech made by that hon. gentleman, opened up the subject anew, and required an answer from some hon. member on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman went over a great deal of the ground he traversed in his Budget Speech, and he added much that was new and much that was local, that requires that I should at least say something on the subject. The hon. gentleman's speech was very lengthy, very fluent, and contained so many promises of prosperity for the future, that it reminded one very much of the speeches he made before Confederation. Those of us who followed that hon. gentleman through that campaign have been much disappointed in the results of his pledges at that time, and will not have much confidence as to the effect of his pledges for the future. Indeed, so utterly have the repeated promises made by the hon. the Minister of Finance to the Lower Provinces been falsified, that grave apprehensions exist in the minds of the members on this side of the House as to the sincerity of the assertions he now makes. The good results anticipated by Confederation will soon disappear if the present fiscal policy of the Government continues. The hon. gentleman went through the yearly Estimates since Confederation, comparing the increases from 1868 to 1874, and from 1875 to 1879, and by deducting several new expenditures, sought to show that our present estimates are not excessive. I do not intend to follow him through these Estimates, as, no doubt, the hon. member from Centre Huron will. No hon. member of this House can expect, considering the increased necessities of our extended territory, but that in many items our expenditure will increase, in others it certainly might be considered high enough and stop. For the first few years of Confederation the addition of new

Provinces added to our expenditure, and can easily be understood. The fixed charges, such as Interest and Subsidies, cannot be changed much. So long as we continue to borrow money, no great reduction can be made on the list, Charges on Revenue. But the items under ordinary controllable expenditure can be controlled, and very many of the items can be kept nearly stationary, if not reduced. Under this head these expenditures were increased, from 1868 to 1874, by \$4,700,000. Under the late Government the increase stopped, and a reduction commenced, so that from 1874 to 1878 the items under controllable expenditure were reduced by \$1,780,000. We now see by the Estimates submitted for the year 1881, an increase has again commenced. There is quite a large increase on the item Civil Government, which should not be; an increase on Legislation, Public Works chargeable to Income, Lighthouse Service, North-West Indians and Post Office. There is an increase in all these items of over \$500,000. After deducting the additional interest for that year, of \$698,000—and the estimated decreases for other services—the net increases on the controllable expenditure is over \$500,000, to which should be added \$300,000 for Dominion Lands, formerly charged to Income, now for the first time charged to Capital Account. This makes the total income, including interest, \$1,500,000. I am satisfied that many of these items might have been reduced instead of increased. When we refer to our debt and the increased Interest Account against the Dominion, we are led to consider our public works, which the money was borrowed for, their paying capacity, and whether they pay running expenses, leaving out any interest on the cost of construction. The hon. the Minister of Finance referred in his speech to the cost of the Intercolonial Railway. He referred to its construction as a necessity, and an obligation under the Terms of Confederation; he also referred to the enormous expenditure of running the railway since its completion. Both of these statements are true; but, Mr. Speaker, this is just one of the large expenditures where not only a large amount of interest might have been saved annually, but a larger amount

that is now paid every year to make good the running expenses. The Intercolonial Railway should have been built through that part of the Dominion where it would have been shorter and gone through a well settled country. It would then have cost eight or nine million dollars less, have been self-sustaining, and thereby saved from \$400,000 to \$450,000 a year in interest, and some \$500,000 a year in running expenses, over and above the earnings, which is now taken out of the revenue of the Dominion. If the Intercolonial Railway had been built where it should have been, and when the people of New Brunswick were induced by the hon. the Finance Minister to believe it would be, so much of this enormous expense would have been saved. Mr. Speaker, considering the great mistakes in the past, on such works as the Intercolonial Railway, more care should be taken in future, with regard to our public works, in order, as much as possible, to avoid similar unproductive expenditures. There has been spent some \$22,000,000 to \$23,000,000 in building the Intercolonial Railway, on which the Revenue has had to pay a million and a half dollars a year. There has been spent a like amount on canals, etc., since Confederation, on which the Revenue is paying a million dollars a year. Since the year 1872 the receipts from Canals have been \$3,230,000, and the working expenses in running them \$3,205,000, leaving a surplus of only some \$24,000 in seven years. Slides and Booms have done little better; during the same time the receipts from this source have been \$738,300, and expenditure for working them, \$589,000, leaving a surplus of \$149,000 from 1872 to 1879. In later years, however, the receipts are being greatly reduced—from \$98,000 in 1872, to \$65,000 in 1879. The Prince Edward Island Railway, also, has been run at a loss to the Revenue of an average of \$95,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, when we consider the unproductive nature of the public works of the Dominion, and the enormous tax they now are on the Dominion Revenue, we may well ask what will be the result of such taxation on our revenue when the Pacific Railway is open and running from Lake Superior to Winnipeg, and from thence to British Columbia. The expenses for running such a line will

be something enormous after it is built. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Finance Minister also referred to our increased debt, taking up the increase from 1867 to 1873, and asserting that the Macdonald Government had increased it about \$24,000,000, and that the Mackenzie Government had increased it, from 1873 to 1878-9, to something like \$55,000,000. He, Sir, surely should not fail to include in the responsibilities of himself and colleagues, the expenditure for 1874. If he had done that, the debt due to them would have been increased to \$32,600,000. During the first four or five years after Confederation, however, very little money was spent by his Government on the public works of the Dominion, either out of the Consolidated Revenue, or on Capital Account. During that time they spent on Public Works chargeable to Capital, some \$10,500,000 from Revenue, which, for comparison, should be added to their expenditure from 1867 to 1874, making in all the debt increased by his Government from 1867 to 1874, by \$43,000,000, and by Mr. Mackenzie's Government, from 1874 to 1878, \$32,000,000. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Finance Minister again referred to the taxation of New Brunswick under the present Tariff, and the duties per head paid by that Province, as compared, stating that her dutiable consumption was \$1.40 per head less for 1879 than 1878. The dutiable consumption is no criterion of the percentage of taxes paid. While New Brunswick, in 1879, fell off very largely of imports as compared with 1878; yet the rate per cent., under the present Tariff, on her imports was 4 per cent. higher than the Dominion taxation. The imports of New Brunswick in 1879 was only about half what it was in 1866. In 1866, the year before Confederation, New Brunswick imported \$10,000,794 worth of goods, on which the Customs duty collected was \$1,033,609. In the year 1879, it imported \$5,337,958, on which the duty collected was \$1,044,807, showing about half the quantity of imports, yet a larger duty collected.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Everything that we brought from other parts of the Dominion were called imports in 1867; and under the Trade Returns in 1866-7 the imports from Ontario and Quebec were entered as imports from other Provinces.

MR. BURPEE: The comparison the hon. gentleman has made does not give the right way of looking at the taxation under the present Tariff. If the hon. the Finance Minister will compare the imports and duties paid by the several Provinces, as compared with New Brunswick, he will find that ever since Confederation, New Brunswick has paid 3 or 4 per cent. more than the general taxation of the Dominion. He remarked also upon the receipts and expenditures from the Dominion and from New Brunswick, respectively. I do not refer to this in a sectional spirit, but the hon. gentleman brought the subject up, and told us that New Brunswick's receipts from the Treasury of the Dominion were greater than her payments into it, leaving out of account Civil Government, Legislation and North-West expenditure, which he said New Brunswick had paid nothing towards, and that she has nothing to complain of as regards the financial arrangement made with the Dominion. Sir, I shall be prepared to show that New Brunswick does pay a great deal more into the Treasury than the hon. gentleman gave her credit for in his speech the other day, and which he has repeated several times.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. BURPEE (St. John, N.B.): Before you left the Chair, Sir, I was dealing with the statement made by the hon. the Finance Minister in his speech, on Tuesday last, with regard to the receipts and expenditures of New Brunswick in connection with the Dominion. I will submit the statement, showing receipts and expenditures, without the items for Civil Service, Legislation and the North-West Territories—as he said we paid nothing towards these—for the first ten years of Confederation:

Ten Years--and dividing the Receipts and Expenditures of the Intercolonial Railway among Provinces.

Provinces.	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Surplus.	Deficits.
O. and Q.	\$152,594,001	\$98,959,196	\$53,624,805
N. B.	15,754,121	14,057,991	1,696,130
N. S.	17,048,791	17,725,498	\$724,707
Manitoba.	925,523	1,679,262	753,739
B. C.	2,630,875	3,561,461	930,586
P. E. I.	1,711,330	2,812,300	1,100,970
N. W. and Joint Ex- penditure	7,599,219	50,581,738	42,982,519
			\$55,320,935	\$46,492,521

Then, if you add to the receipts and expenditures, as per population, the total expenditure of the North-West Territory, Civil Government, and Legislation, and other such items in the Public Accounts, as are not chargeable to the Provinces directly, which amounts to about \$42,982,000. Divide that among the Provinces *pro rata* with these results:

Ten Years of Confederation Accounts, including Total Receipts and Expenditures as to North-West Territory and Joint Expenditures.

Provinces.	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Surplus.	Deficit.
O. and Q.	\$152,594,001	\$131,734,009	\$20,859,992
N. S.	17,008,791	22,243,368	\$5,234,577
N. B.	15,754,121	17,385,155	1,631,034
Manitoba.	925,523	1,857,973	932,450
B. C.	2,630,875	4,260,461	1,629,586
P. E. I.	1,711,330	3,907,645	2,196,316
			\$20,859,992	\$11,623,963

FINANCIAL Position of the Provinces with the Dominion of Canada, for first ten years of Confederation, from 1867 to 1877.

Provinces.	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Surplus.	Deficit.
Ontario and Quebec	\$149,162,842	\$93,344,344	\$55,818,498
New Brunswick	17,106,186	16,597,810	508,376
Nova Scotia	19,112,640	21,173,040	\$2,060,340
Manitoba	876,723	1,599,262	722,539
British Columbia	2,557,675	3,441,461	883,786
Prince Edward Island	1,596,624	2,624,258	1,027,735
North-West Territory and Joint Expenditure	7,599,219	50,581,738	42,982,519
			\$47,676,920	47,676,920
			\$ 8,649,984
				Balance

This statement shows that Ontario and Quebec had largely contributed to the Dominion over and above their receipts from it, and that New Brunswick had paid into the Exchequer more also, than she withdrew from it, by \$508,567, the first ten years after Confederation. For the first few years after the Intercolonial Railway was opened, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were charged for all the working of the Intercolonial, and so placed in the above statement, that is, the receipts were credited to the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and the expenditure charged to them. If we take out the Intercolonial receipts and expenditure, and charge and credit the same to the other Provinces per population, we have the following results. The population, on which I have estimated, is that of 1871:

This includes all the charges in the Public Accounts, taking out the items chargeable to the several Provinces, and every joint account, Legislation, and Civil Government, Pensions, Superannuation, and some other items chargeable to the whole Dominion, which are now divided among the whole of these Provinces per head of population. I think the result shows that New Brunswick does not stand badly towards the Finances of the Dominion. Then, Mr. Speaker, if we take up the twelve years' receipts and expenditures since Confederation up to June 30th, 1879, exclusive of Legislature, Civil Government, and North-West Territories, we have from :

Provinces.	Receipts.	Expenditure	Surplus.	Deficit
Ontario and Quebec.....	\$186,709,732	\$118,771,872	\$67,937,860
Nova Scotia.....	20,957,698	21,079,616	\$91,918
New Brunswick.....	19,747,544	17,130,874	2,616,670
Manitoba.....	1,646,811	2,410,429	763,618
British Columbia.....	3,769,887	4,886,559	1,116,672
Prince Edward Island.....	2,443,413	4,409,627	1,966,214

In this statement, the large receipts from New Brunswick in 1878, enable her to show a much larger surplus in the above account. If we add to the above the additional expenditure for the full twelve years on joint account, per Province, as per the ten years' statement—which amounts to a little over \$55,000,000—we have a surplus of about \$20,000,000 to the credit of Ontario and Quebec, while, in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, Manitoba, British Columbia, and Prince Edward Island, we have a deficit of about

\$13,000,000. In the case of New Brunswick, if we deduct from the expenditure charged against that Province the \$150,000 a year since 1874, for the giving up of her export duty on lumber, we will find, if any deficit, a very small one indeed, after paying her share of Legislation, Civil Government, North-West Territories, and all the joint accounts. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the receipts from the several Provinces of the Dominion, since their entering Confederation, up to the year 1879, show a taxation on Ontario and Quebec of \$186,709,000, or \$65.80 per capita; on New Brunswick of \$19,750,000, or \$70 per capita; on Nova Scotia of \$20,987,000, or \$54.50 per capita; on Manitoba of \$1,650,000, or \$41.20 per capita; on British Columbia of \$3,770,000, or \$62.10 per capita; on Prince Edward Island of \$2,443,000, or \$26.84 per capita. This shows how largely New Brunswick pays into the Dominion Treasury as compared with Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia. It will be noticed how largely Ontario and Quebec have paid in more than they have drawn out. In 1877, a very careful and exhaustive enquiry was made by an expert in commerce, thoroughly acquainted with commercial matters, who not only had access to all Customs books in Montreal, but had the assistance of the mercantile men in Montreal, as well as to the amount of duties collected in that port on merchandise forwarded and consumed in Ontario. The result contained in a report to the Department was that a little over 50 per cent. of the collections in Montreal—which comprise nearly all the collections in the Province of Quebec—was for goods consumed in Ontario. Therefore, the Customs returns in Ontario show but little over half her payments into the Treasury from Customs collections. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that New Brunswick does not owe the Dominion one dollar. I think that these facts answer the statements of the hon. the Finance Minister, so far as regards New Brunswick. He referred also to Savings Banks in New Brunswick as a proof of prosperity. Now I find that the deposits last year in the Savings Bank of St. John amounted to about \$22,000 more than the withdrawals. But I do not think that affords a true indication of the condition of the labouring classes in that

city. No doubt many persons deposited their money there in order to have greater facility in withdrawing it when required, and for the purpose of getting the rate of interest allowed them until they can find better investments, men comparatively rich. The hon. gentleman spoke of the West India trade of New Brunswick as having been greatly revived, and there being no lack of demand for freights. I have not heard so good a report as that. I have not for years known freights to be so low as at present. It is true a large amount of shipping has visited St. John during the last few months, but it was caused by a great grain block in New York, where vessels remained for months without getting freights, and some of them came to St. John and took freights at a very low rate rather than wait any longer in New York. The hon. gentleman spoke of the flour trade, and of it being so much cheaper in Canada than in the United States. Larger flour dealers in St. John have told me that they could repeatedly buy flour in New York cheaper than in Montreal or Western Canada. I suppose his information came from the same parties who wired him last Session that the duty on cornmeal would be paid by the shippers in New York, a statement laughed at by the House. The hon. gentleman made some disparaging remarks regarding the petition presented to this House from the city and county of St. John against the Tariff. There were some 2,800 names on that petition and 230 since received, making over 3,000, and I venture to say there were not twenty of those names that were not those of voters. A number of them were supporters of the hon. gentleman in his last election. The petition was a *bonâ fide* one, representing large interests—among whom were many manufacturers—and did not deserve the sneering manner in which the hon. gentleman spoke of it. I do not believe the National Policy is by any means as popular in the Dominion to-day as it was when it was inaugurated. I do not believe, if the country could pronounce upon it to day, it would be sustained, but would be defeated by an overwhelming majority. With the exception of a few manufacturers, the feeling of the country is decidedly opposed to that policy. Many manufacturers are opposed to it in

its present shape; and further, I believe there is a feeling among many hon. members in this House adverse to that policy, who, a year ago, supported it, and they would be glad to return to a revenue Tariff. There are many hon. members who are very reticent in respect to this policy, particularly from the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I think all the predictions made last year from this side of the House, respecting the effects of this Tariff, have been fulfilled. We said there would be a large increase of taxation; the returns for the last six months show this to be true. The increased duty upon raw materials has dissatisfied many manufacturers, and in many cases, defeated the object the Government had in view. It is, moreover, creating a feeling of dissatisfaction in some of the Provinces, which will increase. Before Confederation we were not led to suppose a Protective Tariff would be imposed on this Dominion. We were told otherwise. The present Finance Minister himself then told us no such taxation would exist, that the taxes would not be more than \$2.75 per head for a quarter of a century. The policy of several members of the Government, before Confederation, was opposed to Protection. At a time when the Tariff ranged from 20 to 30 per cent. in old Canada, the present hon. leader of the Government declared that it must be reduced to meet the wishes of the people of the Maritime Provinces before they would enter the Union, and it was so reduced to a 15 per cent. Tariff. Sir A. T. Galt has been referred to by the Premier as the father of the present Tariff and the National Policy. In 1866, Sir A. T. Galt made a Budget Speech, which is interesting now in view of his connection with the present Government. He was then the present leader's Finance Minister, and was introducing a lower Tariff to meet the case I have just spoken of. As Sir Alexander Galt's position then and until a very recent period was so different from what it is now, it seems very fitting to bring forward his utterances and have them freshly recorded again. I quote:

“The Government proposes to make these articles free, and they believe that by doing so manufacturers of all these classes of goods, on which a rate of 20 per cent. is now imposed, and

which will be reduced to 15 per cent., will be able to manufacture the same description of goods more economically than before, and offer them to the public at lower but remunerative rates. This advantage will therefore be gained by these changes, that while they will be able to supply our people with goods 5 per cent. cheaper than under the existing Tariff, the manufacturers will be placed in a more favourable position than now with regard to competition in foreign markets. (Hear, hear.) I think that so far from these changes injuring them, as some may perhaps fear at the start, their position will be greatly improved. (Hear, hear.)

"Hon. Mr. HOLTON: How? By higher protection?"

"Hon. Mr. GALT: No, but by cheapening every article that goes into consumption in the manufacture of their goods. I have no hesitation in expressing my individual wish, Sir, that we are in a position now to abolish Customs duties on all of them. (Cheers.) And I hope the day will come * * when we may be able to make a clean sweep of all Customs duties on manufactured goods. (Renewed cheers.)"

In 1876, Sir A. T. Galt made another speech in Toronto, quite as strong, and in the same sense, as the one which I have just read. His Tariff policy in 1866, and again reiterated in 1876, is very different from the Protective Policy of the present Government. His Tariff policy of 1866 was quite in accord with the policy of the Liberal party in New Brunswick at that time, lead then by the present hon. Minister of Finance. It is the policy of the Liberal party in New Brunswick to-day. The platform of the Confederate party in New Brunswick at that time was well defined in the columns of the *St. John Telegraph*, in large, bold type, mostly in capital letters, which read as follows:—

"Millions of money by the building of the Intercolonial and Western Extension. St. John must become the centre, the ocean terminus, the Liverpool of America! Free trade, an extended market, and emigration and settlement of our wild lands, and hundreds of other advantages for which our merchants, our mechanics, our lawyers, our physicians, our who'e people have for years been praying, hoping, working, will be guaranteed by this Union. With Union our mechanics and labourers will be certain of constant employment, summer and winter, all the year round, at good wages, while the cost of living will not be increased one per cent. Our merchants will be enabled to extend their trade to all parts of British North America. Our mechanics will then find a market in which they may sell all the goods which they can possibly manufacture, and soon will find it necessary to enlarge their factories and employ hundreds of men where they now employ only tens. Our shipbuilders will have the markets of France thrown open to them for

the sale of New Brunswick ships—the finest, most substantial and the best sailers in the world. And our bankers will find that by the immense circulation of British capital and British gold, now guaranteed to us, their occupation will be gone. No longer will exacting money-brokers be enabled to keep the nose of the small trader to the grindstone and fleece him of one per cent. per month, as they have been doing for years past."

The *Telegraph* has continued and remains the advocate of the Liberal cause and the same commercial principles, while he who was its editor at that time—1866—is now the editor of a Tory paper and the advocate of a Protective Policy. This was the programme laid in the Province of New Brunswick for carrying Confederation. We may come further down still, and we find, in 1874, the hon. the Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) denouncing the hon member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) for putting a 2½ per cent. increase, saying he was entering the thin edge of the wedge of Protection; and we find, in 1878, the hon. the present Minister of Finance saying, in St. John, that no increased taxation should take place. We find him making the following statements, in speeches delivered by him at that time, during the 1878 election campaign. He said:

"It has been stated that Sir John A. Macdonald said that he would adopt the United States Tariff of 35 per cent. Now, when 12½ per cent. was sufficient for the five years, and for the last nine months 10½ per cent. Tariff was enough to meet the requirements of the country, can any one suppose him so insane, so mad as to ask or say he would put on an average of 35 per cent? or to say he would put on an average Tariff of 35 per cent. when 12½ or 13 per cent. is amply sufficient to meet the requirements of the country. There are but two public men that I know of in Canada who advocate a cent. per cent. Tariff. Neither of these gentlemen are now in Parliament.

Again he says:

"If I had been in Parliament last Session, I would not have voted for increasing the duty on unenumerated articles from 15 to 17½ per cent. I am now coming to the delicate question of flour and coal—the great question on which this election is to be run. I have no hesitation in saying that, if I had been in the House last Session, when supporters of the Government proposed a tax upon these articles, I would have voted against the motion."

We are also assured by the right hon. the leader of the Government, as to reduction of taxes, in a speech made at Sweet'sburg, and reported in the *Montreal Gazette* of 10th July, 1877, as follows:—

"We had made up our minds, as the whole people of Canada had done, that Confederation was necessary for the good of the country. We had to please the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and their Tariff ran from 5 to 12 per cent., while ours ran up to 20 per cent., and the great cry raised against us in the Maritime Provinces was, that by coming into Canada, we would put excessive taxes upon them. We met them half way, and reduced the duties to 15 per cent."

So that we have, up to 1878, no announcement of this enormous Protective Tariff. I might allude, for one moment, to the taxation as it began in 1867, and as it is to-day. The Tariff, at Confederation, averaged 10 per cent. in New Brunswick; now it is 20 per cent. for the Dominion; it was, in 1867, 10½ per cent. for the Dominion generally, and in New Brunswick, 24 per cent., and will likely be larger, when the full year's returns are in, which will give full effect to the increased taxation. The hon. the Minister of Finance in his first speech on the Budget referred to the taxation between Great Britain and the United States, endeavouring to show that the present Tariff favoured Great Britain and dealt heavily against the United States, which is not the case. Now, the true way to test this, is to take taxable merchandise. There was a large reduction made in the list of free imports by the Tariff of last year, reducing the Free List from about \$25,000,000 to about \$10,000,000 from United States imports; and from \$6,500,000 to about \$4,000,000 from Great Britain. The Free List left from the United States, now comprises such imports as fish, under Treaty, say \$500,000; wool for manufacturing, over \$1,000,000; settlers' effects, \$700,000; hides, over \$1,000,000; raw cotton, nearly \$1,000,000, and a number of other items for manufacturing purposes, which it is to our advantage to admit free of duty, and, therefore, should not be admitted into a calculation to show the percentage of taxable imports as between one country and another. The six months' comparative statement laid before the House, on which the calculation is made, is what we have now to go by, although I do not admit the result of taxation under it is the same as will be shown when the full year's return will be compiled. By the six months' statement, the average of duty on imports from Great Britain, on

goods dutiable and free, in 1878, was 19¼ per cent.; in 1879, 19¾ per cent. From the United States, 1878, 12 per cent., and 1879, 15 per cent. Taking the dutiable goods only, the average rate of duty on imports from Great Britain, in 1878, is 19½ per cent., and in 1879, 24 per cent., an increase of nearly 5 per cent.; while on imports, from the United States on dutiable goods alone, in 1878, was 22 per cent., in 1879, it was 23 per cent., an increase of only 1 per cent. This is the true way of getting at our taxable imports. The hon. the Minister of Finance also said, as comparing six months of 1878-9, the decrease of imports of dutiable and free goods for this period was, from Great Britain, only 7 per cent., while the decrease on dutiable and free goods from the United States was 33 per cent. To apply the same rule to the dutiable goods only, the decrease of imports from Great Britain was 15 per cent., and from the United States 18 per cent. This is the only fair comparison, as in the imports from the United States in 1878, in the free goods, there was a large amount of grain, etc., *in transitu*, more than was allowed by the statement referred to. We now come to the manufacturers, who, as a class are not benefitted by the Tariff, the enormous increased duty on materials for manufacturing purposes, has more than neutralised the advanced duty on the manufactured article. Besides the increased capital necessary under the present Tariff to do business, has, and will interfere with their progress. For example, take agricultural implements; manufacturers have complained of the disadvantages they are under by the present Tariff, while they get an increased protection on manufactured articles from 17½ per cent. to 25 per cent., the increased duty on materials and fuel is from 6½ per cent. to 16½ per cent. Take the iron foundry business; while increased duty on manufactured articles is from 17½ per cent. to 25 per cent., the increased duty on materials and fuel is from 4½ per cent. to 14½ per cent. Again, take the nail manufacturers; while the increased duty on nails is from 17½ per cent. to 25 per cent., at present prices, the increased duty on iron, materials and fuel is from 6¼ per cent. to 20 per cent. On nails and tacks combined, the increased duty on the manufactured is from 17½

MR. BURPEE.

per cent. to 25 per cent., and on the material and fuel from $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 17 per cent., making a discrimination against the one of $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the other of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., as compared with the 1878 Tariff. On carriages, the duty on manufactured articles is increased from $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 30 per cent., while the duty on raw materials and fuel is increased from 13 per cent. to $23\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. On boots and shoes, the increased duty is from $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 25 per cent., while the increased duty on the materials, fuel, &c., for making them is from $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 19 per cent., or 1 per cent. worse off than before. Harness and saddlery manufacturers get an increase of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty on the manufactured articles, and pay $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 15 per cent. additional on the mounting and materials for manufacturing. Materials for construction of ships have been increased from $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. to 13 per cent. Materials, provisions, &c., for lumbering, have been increased from $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 22 per cent.; and so on among nearly all the manufactures, except sugar refineries, cotton and woollen manufactures, and, perhaps, furniture. Other manufacturers do naturally ask why such special advantages should be given them as admitting their raw materials and machinery free. It has been said that prices of such goods have not increased. Mr. Speaker, we know better, as the several circulars distributed to the trade will corroborate; some things have advanced three or four times, and are still advancing, all of which the consumer has to pay. Now, the hon. the Finance Minister, last fall, visited several manufactories throughout the Dominion. I am satisfied that, in a great many cases, there was a great deal of dissatisfaction expressed, when he made his visits, that never came to light. What do we find on examination: that in Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Brantford, Oshawa, St. Catharines, Guelph, London, &c., we find him visiting a wealthy class of men, representing some \$32,000,000—some worth \$20,000, \$40,000, \$100,000, \$500,000, and from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000; all these immense fortunes were made under a revenue Tariff, and, considering the depression this country has been passing through, no class of our population has suffered less than our manufacturers.

Now, it would seem to me that these manufacturers visited by the hon. gentleman, were many of them desirous to obtain some advantages, and it was no wonder he was treated so well in his journeyings, besides it gave them an opportunity to gain a cheap and widespread advertisement, if nothing else. The manufacturers of St. John have not the same chance and advantages as those in Ontario, who have the best water power in the world, at a very low rate, and possessing direct railway and water communication to their mills, besides having a market at their doors. We, in New Brunswick, were once told that the Maritime Provinces after Confederation would do the manufacturing for all the west; and Sir, we find on the Welland canal alone there are some fifty manufactories and mills, and these Ontario manufacturers do now manufacture very largely for the Lower Provinces. I took some pains to find out from the banks in St. John, and by other means, about how much there was paid for purchases made in Ontario and Quebec annually. In two banks I found it was nearly \$3,600,000. We may, therefore, take it that there are \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 worth imported from Ontario and Quebec into the Province of New Brunswick yearly, and a larger amount for Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; certainly, the course of trade between the Provinces is directly the opposite of what we in the Maritime Provinces were led to expect as the result of Confederation. Ontario and Quebec have monopolised largely our trade, while we do very little more now in Ontario and Quebec than we did before Confederation. Our imports in New Brunswick from Canada in 1866 were \$300,000, and our exports some \$82,000; while now our imports from Ontario and Quebec into New Brunswick alone is between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000, and our exports are very little more than in 1866. I know one manufacturer in St. John, a supporter of the hon. the Finance Minister, who told me he considered the Tariff no good to him whatever, that he was no better in his business for it, in consequence of the large increase on raw materials and fuel. He is quite a large manufacturer of all kinds of iron goods, castings and so on. He said: in 1876 he employed thirty men; 1877 fifty-one men; 1878, forty-seven men;

1879, twenty-three men. In 1876 he paid for wages \$10,000; 1877, \$15,400; 1878, \$14,300; 1879, \$6,700. Also the carriage makers in St. John are complaining that they are employing but half the hands in 1879 they did in 1878, only working three-fourths time, and have large stocks on hand. We have also the harness makers complaining bitterly. The hon. the Minister of Finance will remember the remarks made by a Mr. Harris, when visiting his place, that he now employed about 60 men, when a few years ago he had 300. He will remember the complaints made by the manufacturers of boilers and locomotives, as to the large advance on iron, tubes, etc. The complaints of the nail manufacturers as to injury done them; and so on through the entire list, except the cotton factory. The hon. gentleman, last Session, reminded us of a glass factory in St. John that had started as soon as the National Policy was announced, and, strange to say, it has been shut down ever since. He also reminded us of a pottery in St. John that would be started afresh because of the National Policy; it has done nothing since. The Coldbrook Nail Works have been stopped ever since. The Coldbrook Rolling Mills have also been stopped; and of our saw mills, out of twenty one in St. John, last Session, only five or six were seen running. Our shipyards were nearly deserted. There were other industries which might be mentioned, but it is not necessary. I do not say this sad state of affairs is all due to the National Policy, but hon. gentlemen opposite have been asserting that great prosperity has been the result of the National Policy, and that at no time since Confederation has the country been so prosperous. This was said by the hon. the Minister of Finance at Sherbrooke, which is not true. I believe that these industries will come up again; that they will gather strength, more particularly in Ontario and Quebec; but the present policy of the Government will not be the cause, as it is not in the interest of the general manufacturers, much less of the general industrial classes of our country. Mr. Speaker, this protective policy of the Government is opposed to the interests of the Maritime Provinces, and, as it is now, will be more and more in future. It will draw from them their trade and commerce

MR. BURPEL.

to the West. We can have no better evidence of the effect of the Government policy than is set forth in the *Toronto Mail*, the Government organ, so late as December 24, 1879, as follows:—

“Montreal being the nearest great city in Canada, became after the Union the metropolis of a large section of the three Eastern Provinces, and even of Newfoundland. The eastern sections of Nova Scotia, the northern parts of New Brunswick, all dealt with Montreal in preference to Halifax or St. John. * * * Montreal became, consequently, very rich for a time. The railways continued to extend westward; western cities and towns began to dispute with Montreal the manufacturing monopoly she had apparently established. * * * Toronto and Hamilton, in particular, took up the business of supplying Ontario with manufactures, and it is in the west here that the great cities of the future must expand. Toronto holds the key of a great destiny. She may, and will, with proper energy and judicious aid, become the metropolis of a great region, ceasing only at the foot of the Rocky Mountains. It will be her own fault if the crown of commercial and trade supremacy is removed from her further westward still. All the forces of emigration, of agriculture, of railway building, of heavy public expenditure, are operating to develop the west. Toronto should be able to keep hold on the supply of the west. The tendency of the time has been for some years past, and accelerated by the National Policy, still is to bring the retail distributor, or even the consumer himself, into more direct relations with the producer. This seems to operate in two ways. It cuts off from many cities, such as Halifax, St. John, Quebec, and some western cities as well, a good deal of the trade formerly done with them, and it tends to destroy the usefulness of the specially mercantile classes—the middlemen. Two or three things seem to us to be inevitable in the future. The mercantile classes will have a hard time of it. * * * The larger cities, which by natural selection will survive, or which will grow gradually, will increase rapidly in population and wealth. The agricultural lands in the neighbourhood of the great cities will double or quadruple in value. The west will fill up with a population too adventurous and too excited to settle down at once to manufacturing industry. And thus, from Toronto westward, there will be an immense field for trade development, a great population calling out for clothing, boots and shoes, hardware, machinery for agricultural purposes, etc., and, in time, for the luxuries of household life. For some years, at least, the forces of the Government will be brought to bear on the development of the west, etc.”

That shows that the policy of the Government is to build up the west at the expense of the east. Mr. Speaker, I now come to the lumber interest, which is a very important interest in the Dominion, yet the Government have increased the taxes on this industry from 10½ percent. to

22 percent. The returns show that the value of the lumber exported from Canada during the twelve years from 1868 to 1879, was \$261,614,178, while agricultural products were \$202,404,000, and animals and their products, \$150,975,000. This shows that the lumber interest, although it has had three or four years of great depression, yet, taking all the years since Confederation, has very largely overshadowed every other industry in our exports from the Dominion of Canada, reaching an export in 1873 of \$28,586,816. To our people in the Province of New Brunswick this lumbering interest is by far the largest and most important, not only by giving employment to so large a portion of our population, but furnishing freights for our ships, as will be seen by the exports from that Province. Our total exports in 1868 was \$4,125,000, of which \$2,909,000 was lumber; in 1869, \$4,815,000, of which \$3,560,000 was lumber; in 1870, \$4,363,000, of which \$2,952,000 was lumber; in 1871, \$4,541,000, of which \$3,043,000 was lumber; in 1872, \$4,740,000, of which \$3,360,000 was lumber; in 1873, \$5,650,000, of which \$3,979,000 was lumber; in 1874, \$6,142,000, of which \$4,712,000 was lumber; in 1875, \$6,050,000, of which \$4,585,000 was lumber; in 1876, \$5,950,000, of which \$4,165,000 was lumber; in 1877, \$5,574,000, of which \$4,456,000 was lumber; in 1878, \$6,268,000, of which \$4,500,000 was lumber; in 1879, \$5,372,000, of which \$4,031,734 was lumber, and there is no doubt but the exports for 1880 will be very much larger in New Brunswick as well as over the Dominion. This statement shows the importance of that industry to New Brunswick; and notwithstanding the hon. the Minister of Finance had so often represented it as a waning industry, yet it has steadily increased in volume and importance ever since 1868. The hon. the Finance Minister alluded to the fact that, while the prices of lumber had advanced of late, hon. members on this side of the House did not increase the wages of their men. The taxes imposed by the present Tariff on this industry is a complete answer to such an assertion. While there is an advance in the price of lumber, the cost of getting it to market has in consequence also advanced; and while the labouring man does not at

present get more than half the wages he did a few years ago, the cost of living to him has greatly increased by this National Policy. It is estimated, after careful enquiry, by persons who have spent a lifetime in the business, that the capital invested in the lumbering business in the Dominion is \$100,000,000; that our average production for exports and consumption has, for a series of years, reached \$30,000,000 annually. The same enquiry has shown that the cost of production has been 65 per cent. labour, namely, \$19,500,000; farm produce 30 per cent. \$9,000,000; the remaining 5 per cent. \$1,500,000 for sundry other materials. The result shows that this large amount spent in this business for labour, will employ 83,900 able-bodied men all the year round, at an average wage of 75c. per day, which provides for 420,000 of our population of 4,000,000. In the Province of New Brunswick it gives employment to 17,000 men, and at the same wages provides for 85,000 of her population. Mr. Speaker, I mention these facts, to show the importance of this industry, to show the very large proportion of our population it supports, and that instead of taxing it by an increase of 11½ per cent., the Government should foster and encourage it in every possible way. It is a fact, Sir, that the increased tax on put on this industry now comes out of the labouring man, who is working for about half the wages formerly earned, and at the same time paying more for the clothing he wears and the food he consumes. Mr. Speaker, the shipping interest is similarly situated. I have heard it said by the hon. the Minister of Finance that the shipping interest has improved, and that the shipbuilding industry has improved under the National Policy. I do not, however, know of any place where this is the case, but the very reverse. In 1862, the Tariff upon materials used in the construction of ships was 52c. per ton; in 1865, 63c. per ton; in 1878, 80c. per ton; and in 1879, this tax on shipbuilding was increased from 80c. per ton to \$1.95 and \$2.00 per ton. The hon. the Minister of Finance, in the city of St. John, during the 1878 elections, spoke most distinctly against any Government taxing the shipping interest, and he condemned the late Finance Minister for, in 1874, putting a

slight tax on some ship materials which increased the duty from 60c. to 80c. per ton. He, Sir, used that argument in every speech against the late Government during his canvas in the 1878 elections. I will read some remarks made by the hon. the Minister of Finance during that time. Referring to the shipbuilding industry, in his speech at the Mechanics' Institute, he said as follows:—

“Had I been in Parliament when these alterations in the Tariff were made, I would have taken exception to almost every change made by Mr. Cartwright. First, Mr. Cartwright proposed to place a duty on ships' materials of 2½ per cent., the railway impost. After the Union the duty on this class of goods was struck off. This was done because we thought that the shipping interest was one that required all the assistance which could be given to it. We all agreed that articles which entered into ships should be as free as possible. Mr. Cartwright proposed to change all that in 1874, but the shipping interest at that time was not in as good a condition to bear additional taxation as it was in 1867.”

Again in Carleton, St. John, he said :

“As to ship materials I said I would not have added a duty on them, for how is shipbuilding now? That industry is almost dead in the Maritime Provinces, etc.”

Now, the shipbuilding interest, in 1874, was in no more depressed condition than it was in 1879, when he imposed this additional taxation on shipbuilding material. We find that the hon. the Minister of Finance, during his visit to St. John, visited none of the shipbuilding yards, although he might have done so with advantage to himself. The drawback of 50c. a ton does not place the shipbuilder in as good a position as before the National Policy; nothing less than \$1.15 a ton drawback will do that. There is another matter I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance to. It is an article published in the *Monetary Times* of February 27th, and speaks of Senator Fabre, thus :

“Senator Fabre, in a letter sent from Paris recently, complained that the Province of New Brunswick had, by sending inferior ships to Europe for sale, lowered the estimation in which our ships had been previously held there.”

This is a most slanderous and false assertion. That statement has not been contradicted. The hon. gentleman's expenses were paid—some \$1,500—by Canada, for the purpose, it is said, of enabling him to negotiate some reasonable terms be-

tween France and Canada, for the entering of our ships there on the same terms as Great Britain; and we find, from this article, that apparently to let himself down easily, he condemns the ships of New Brunswick. I do not believe there are better ships in the world; some new ships are now classed fourteen years; and I think it due to New Brunswick shipbuilders to make this statement, and call the Government's attention to this article. The hon. the Finance Minister, speaking of the taxation on ship materials, gave the most distinct promises, that the drawback would be such as would place this industry in as good a position as it was before; indeed, he said, in a better position. His own words there uttered, which I will quote from *Hansard*, page 425, conclusively proves the statements I now make, as follows:—

“There would be a drawback on ship materials equal to the duty paid (except cordage)—10 per cent. All new vessels built, of any description, treated as exports.”

On page 722, I find him thus reported:

“The proposition is to protect the shipbuilders, and give them cheaper materials. We enable them to build cheaper than before,” etc., etc.

On page 738, he further says:

“The intention of the Government is, that everything that enters into shipbuilding, that has paid duty, will be refunded, whether the vessel went out of the country or not, except steamer machinery.”

And on page 1308, he states:

“Now, we come to a very important industry, on which you would suppose, from statements made, we were imposing increased taxation, instead of relieving it. Our drawback system must be a benefit to it,” etc.

These promises made by the hon. the Finance Minister in his Budget Speeches when introducing his Tariff a year ago, that the shipbuilding industry would certainly be placed in as good a position as before, has not been carried out. At a meeting of the shipping interest held a few days ago in St. John, strong resolutions were passed remonstrating against this unjust tax, and reminding the hon. the Finance Minister of his promises made last Session, also the promises he made to a deputation that waited on him at the Park Hotel in December last. The Order

in Council granting a drawback of 50c. a ton contains only a few of the articles on which a drawback should be given, a list of some six items, as iron, iron bars, spikes, chains, paints and canvas, whereas there are some forty or fifty items on which shipbuilders are entitled to a return duty, and they will not be satisfied with the manner in which they are treated by the Government. There is over \$10,000 now due parties in New Brunswick for duty paid on ship materials promised them by the hon. the Finance Minister, when he said they should be put in as good a position as before his Tariff passed, if not better. The sugar trade has been referred to a great many times, but I will give it a brief notice to show what the Tariff has done since it came into operation. We have been told that sugar has been sold as cheaply as under the old Tariff, and as it is in the United States market. The average price per pound of granulated sugar, comparing the year 1879 with the years 1878, 1877, and 1876, has been quoted by the hon. member for Cardwell as a proof of the fact, which is not fair. What we want to know is how have the prices been, since the new Tariff came in, under it, as compared with what it would have been under the Tariff of 1878; and if anyone has followed the New York rates in bond, also Montreal prices, once a week or once a month, since the new Tariff came in, they would soon see the difference between the prices of sugar under the old and new Tariff, and they will also find that the decrease in collections on the low-priced sugar, as compared with the higher grades, will be a loss to the revenue of at least \$600,000 a year, and an increased taxation on the consumer of a cent a pound. I have kept a record of the sugar trade every week since the new Tariff came into operation; and for the eleven months, under the new Tariff, the prices have averaged 9½c. per pound, whereas, under the old Tariff, it could have been furnished at 8½c. per pound; and although the refineries in New York pay 80c., per 100lb., more duty on raw sugars, the prices of granulated in New York, for home consumption, has averaged 20c. per 100lb. less than the Canadian granulated is furnished to the Canadian consumers. The assertion made that the Tariff has benefited the sugar interest in St. John

is untrue, as the six months' statement furnished this House will prove. It shows, that while the trade in Quebec and Nova Scotia has largely increased, in Ontario and New Brunswick it has largely decreased, as follows:—

	Imported for six months' ending December 31,	
	1878.	1879.
Ontario.....	\$32,617,040	\$9,685,012
Quebec	19,820,932	46,048,911
Nova Scotia.....	5,817,637	14,239,716
New Brunswick....	3,945,552	2,228,719
Manitoba	378,603	16,979
British Columbia...	771,698	495,859
Prince Edward Isl'd.	515,410	349,646

This shows that under the present arrangement Ontario and New Brunswick are suffering by the new Tariff on that industry, and the trade being diverted from them to Quebec and Nova Scotia. We have also been told that the prices of woollen and cotton goods have not been increased. Now, prices have increased, not only on account of rise in prices of the raw material, but owing to the increase in the Tariff, also other manufactures would like to know why such industries as cotton and wollen manufactories should be protected to the extent of letting machinery, raw material and dye stuffs free, in addition to from 17½ per cent. to 25 per cent on the manufactured article. The following figures will show the enormous taxation put upon those goods: for it is absurd to suppose that when the importers are obliged to pay these enormous additional duties, but what they have to charge it to the consumers. Some of these goods cannot be made in the Dominion, and those that can be made have been advanced in proportion to the additional taxation. I have taken a good deal of interest in ascertaining the increased taxation on such woollen and cotton goods as are very largely consumed by our people, and will mention an instance as an illustration of the increased taxation, etc. There was imported by one of our largest wholesale houses in St. John, a bale of woollen carpets, value \$412; paid duty, under the National Policy, \$157.10, or 38 per cent., whereas, under the former Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would have been \$72.10. For those who could afford to buy tapestry, Brussels, Axminster, Kidderminster, etc., a duty of 20 per cent. is charged, discriminating in favour of the

rich ware 20½ per cent. A case of cotton goods, value \$171, paid 30 per cent. duty, or \$51.30, while under the old Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would have been \$29.92. A case of pilot cloth, for fishermen, value \$494, paid 31½ per cent. duty, or \$155.50, while under the former Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would have been \$86.45. A case of president cloth, value \$235, paid 40 per cent. duty, or \$93.73, while under the former Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would have been \$41.12; these goods are chiefly used for heavy overcoating, etc., for winter wear, and largely used. A bale of blankets, value \$69, paid 44 per cent. duty, or \$30.30, while under the old Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would have been \$12.07. A case of brown duck, for men's overalls, valued at \$403.61, paid 30½ per cent. duty, or \$122.23, under the former Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would have been \$70.52. A package of jeans, value \$92.88, paid 37 per cent. duty, or \$34.59, while under the former Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would be \$16.27. A package of overcoating, for winter, value \$427, paid 41½ per cent. duty, while under the old Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would be \$74.72. A bale of blankets, value \$223, paid 43 per cent. duty, or \$95.75, while under the former Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would be \$39.02. A bale of flannels, value \$807, paid 30½ per cent. duty, or \$244.27, while under the old 17½ per cent. Tariff, it would have been \$141.22. A case of cloth tweeds, value \$728, paid 32½ per cent. duty, or \$234.63, while under the old Tariff, 17½ per cent., it would be \$127.40. One case of Oxford shirting, value \$409, paid a duty of 39 per cent., or \$159.35, while under the old duty, 17½ per cent., it would be \$71.57. Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the hundreds of instances that go to show the enormous increased taxation under the National Policy on the staple dry goods that compose three-fourths of our consumption, and will also show the enormous duty charged on the consumption of the middle and labouring classes, nearly double what it is on the consumption of the wealthy, etc. When the hon. the Minister of Finance was in St. John last fall, he was informed by a friend of his of the amount of commercial depression, of suffering and distress that prevailed in the city, and was appealed to

for help by his friend. The hon. gentleman replied: "Tell me what can I do to relieve you." The hon. the Minister of Finance promised that he would do all he could, and that he had a Government at his back who would carry it out, etc. I would advise the hon. the Minister of Finance, if he wishes to carry out that promise, to put the duties back to where they were before. Let him relieve the fishermen and ship-builders of taxes which bear heavily upon them; let him take the duty off breadstuffs and fuel, off dry goods and groceries; let him refund the \$1.15 additional duty collected on ship materials since the National Policy came into force, as promised. These are some of the ways that his friend might have suggested, and if the hon. the Minister of Finance wished, he could have not only greatly relieved his constituents and his native Province, but the Dominion at large.

MR. GUNN: I rise to point out to the House the unpopularity of the coal tax in Ontario. It has pressed heavily on people of limited means and small incomes, and it has not benefitted Nova Scotia one iota. The trade of that Province must be done with nearer by-ports, for coal can be sent from the mines of Nova Scotia to Boston and Portland, and pay there a duty of 75c., besides freight, at a less cost than it can be shipped to Ontario. Protection appears to have been designed for the benefit of the few, and taxation for the many. There is a lead mine in my neighbourhood, which certainly deserves some Protection. It was carried on by English capital; and the company worked it four years, disbursing during that time \$200,000; and they were granted a Protection of 10 per cent., and during the time it was in operation, the owners did not produce 10 per cent. of their gross outlay, and they were compelled to shut down the works, under the new Tariff, which increased their taxes, and gave them that insignificant and insufficient Protection of 10 per cent. Now, sugar is one of the articles that has been protected too much. I believe the figures given by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Burpee) are as nearly accurate as they can be, and I find they agree with my own. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) gave 9c. as the price for granulated sugar last year. My own figures are 9½c., the

average price from the time the refinery started last year, up to the end of that year, 1879, and the average price was 9½c., from the 1st April, 1879, to the 1st instant, one year. Under new Tariff, consumers, had to pay more for their supplies, and the Treasury received less duty; under prior Revenue Tariff, the Treasury would have received half a million dollars more revenue, and the people would have bought their sugar three-quarters of a million dollars lower than they did. During six months ending 31st December, 1878, and during six months ending 31st December, 1879, the former period under revenue Tariff, sixty-two million pounds paid a duty of \$1,368,935; and during latter six months under our Tariff, sixty-four million pounds, paid only \$1,125,034, a loss of \$243,901, and but for twelve million pounds imported, over No. 14, by the trade, which paid \$2.43 per cwt. duty—the revenue would have lost \$100,000 more: in other words had all the sugar been imported by refiners, the revenue would have been reduced below \$2,000,000 for the year. At the rate they paid, (refiners) take the entire quantity of raw sugar required in the Dominion at 120,000,000, it would have produced only \$1,980,000 duty, and the new Tariff must drive all the trade into refiners hands. When the new refineries are opened in Halifax and Moncton, there will be more competition, but they may pool their earnings and keep up prices, as other rings have done before. Let us contract or compare, the duty paid by our refiners with the duty paid by American refiners during same time, and then compare the price at which each sold, duty paid; our refineries paid \$1.65 per cwt., and the average price at which they sold granulated sugar for the year ending 31st March last, was \$9.25 per cwt., and the American refineries paid \$2.45 per cwt. duty, and sold during the same period, namely, from 1st of April, 1879, to 1st of April, 1880, at \$9.00 per cwt., that is the latter paid 80c. per cwt. more duty on raw, and sold granulated 24c. per cwt. less, equal to, on 120,000,000 raw \$960,000 more revenue on the quantity required by the Dominion; and the Americans sold lower on the outturn of refined, say 105,000,000 at 24c. equal to \$252,0000, together a loss on our trade

amounting to \$1,212,000, and on the American trade equivalent to \$18,180,000; apply our Tariff to the trade of England, and for this one item alone, the people of Great Britain would have an annual loss of \$24,240,000. The difference given between the figures given by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and mine, are ¼c., and ½c. on one year's consumption of refined, amounts to \$131,250, but let us take his own figures, and thus estimate its cost to the country direct and indirect, with what we would have paid under the old Tariff; 105,000,000lb. at 9c., amounts to \$9,450,000, and the average price in New York was 5.86, with 25 per cent and 1c., gives \$246 duty; together 8.32., and amounting to \$8,736,000; deduct this from the price paid under war tax, and you will find you have paid in excise of this Tariff, \$714,000; and then count the loss of revenue on 105,000,000lb. refined, at 5.86, thus would have paid 2.46 duty per cwt. amounting to \$2,583,000 against 120,000,000lbs. raw, at \$1.65, \$1,980,000, showing a loss of revenue amounting to \$603,000, which add to increased price already stated, and together you have \$1,318,000 loss to the country 1,317,000. If the hon. the Finance Minister looks into this matter, he must see that that is too much Protection. I asked him to investigate the matter last winter, but he never took any steps to do so, or at least he has not replied. I asked him why he did not take disinterested advice, and recommended him to get the best information from the United States and from Europe on the subject. This is an important and serious question, and there is plenty of information to be had which will tend to clear the mind of the hon. gentleman. From any standpoint under this Protective Tariff you may take, we see a large loss to the revenue and to the consuming taxpayers of this country, and the Government might very justly amend the Tariff without injuring the refiners. If sugar must be refined in this country, under the present Tariff, the Government might very well excise the refiners' excessive profits without hurting them. They, the Government, has seized the bulk of the banks' circulation, which did not belong to them. The Tariff is their own child. Let us get the profit ourselves on the refining of sugar

as well as on the bank notes. I am sure they, the Government, will find sugar refining more profitable than grinding wheat at the Kingston Penitentiary. This reminds me of the remarks made by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Gault), about this prison, and I thought what a selfish, hard master Protection is; it wants all for itself. The hon. member would reduce the officers' salaries there. If he knew the long hours and arduous duty they have to perform there, he would not think of reducing their pay. They are not overpaid, and the prison is well managed—I think one of the best managed prisons in the world. With these remarks, I shall no longer detain the House.

MR. LONGLEY: I will not trouble the House with tiresome figures, as I think it has already had statistics to repletion, but will speak of the condition and circumstances of the country previous to the adoption of the National Policy. Everybody knows that, in respect to the Treasury, there had been alarming deficits extending over several years, and that the country had been brought into circumstances of great depression. This condition of things had been brought about, in the estimation of the people at large, through the obstinate adherence of the party in power to Free-trade notions, at the sacrifice of the industries of the country. Under some condition of things, this policy might have been well enough, but it proved ruinous when we had to compete with a powerful and remarkably enterprising neighbour right along our borders, wedded to a highly protective policy, and who had grown to greatness, in a very considerable degree, by the adoption of that policy many years ago. It was under such circumstances as these that the incoming Government was called upon to address itself to a readjustment of the Tariff, with the double purpose of improving our crippled finances and protecting our struggling industries. The hon. the Finance Minister, with his extensive knowledge of the affairs of the country, after the most painstaking calculation and enquiry, was able to submit to Parliament a fiscal policy which commanded itself to an overwhelming majority of the people's representatives, and thus was an entirely new departure taken.

We have had but a brief trial of this policy, but we have no reason to be dissatisfied with its fruits. A fair measure of success has been achieved in respect to the leading objects in view, namely, improvement of our industries and increase of revenue. It has been urged against the Tariff that it has not enabled us to free ourselves from the deficit legacy bequeathed to us by the late Government; but we can say in reply, that it is not so large by one-half as it would have been but for the adoption of the National Policy; and I may add, that in view of the very gratifying improvement in the receipts which has taken place since the first of January last, as compared with the corresponding period of last year, amounting, I believe, to about \$600,000, we may cherish the hope that ere we assemble here again in 1881, the last remnant of deficits will have disappeared. I am of the opinion that, instead of overestimating the beneficial results of the Tariff during the year it has been in operation, as our opponents allege, we have underestimated them; and that substantially much greater good has been accomplished, both financially and industrially, than most of us have yet dreamed of. Lost ground, in whatever way brought about, is seldom regained in a day, or a month, or a year; but our retrogression having been stayed a year ago, we have since that time experienced a gentle propulsion forward, and soon we shall begin to acquire a fair momentum towards prosperity and national success. From the time the National Policy was first propounded, in 1871, or thereabouts, I have been in hearty sympathy with it, and regretted that circumstances so long delayed its adoption; but the set time came at last, and I am sure that, from that hour, thousands of hearts have expanded with the thought that our country was our own, in a sense that it was not before, and that room had been made and means supplied for national development. Commercial intercourse between nations and peoples should undoubtedly be encouraged upon fair terms, and where mutual advantages might reasonably be expected to follow, but not where the advantages greatly preponderate to one side. But while we have not been able to admire the liberality or friendliness of our neighbours, we could, and we hope have, pro-

fited by their example. We need go no further than the United States to witness the virtue of Protection to home industries, and if the system of Protection has been good for them, why will it not be good for us. Our circumstances are surely not greatly dissimilar from theirs, and they have flourished and so may we. Some laud the system of Free-trade and rejoice in a large volume of imports; but I can imagine nothing more derogatory to national success than the spirit of dependence, begotten under such a system as that which had obtained in this country for years past. I also believe that it is as necessary that we should seek to restore the equilibrium between the exports and imports of the country, as that we should square the account between expenditure and income. It seems to me that we can only accomplish these desired results by promoting in every possible way the various industries of the country, and thus largely supplying our own wants. Our country is rich in natural resources, and we have facilities in abundance for manufacturing purposes. I am not aware that our opponents have shown a single instance where the policy which we have adopted has operated injuriously. On the other hand, we have shown where factory after factory, enterprise after enterprise, have started up, and are flourishing, with more to follow. Attempts have been made to show that agriculturists, instead of being benefited, have been injured, because the products of the soil have been lowered instead of enhanced in value; but, as we were told at the same time that the lumbermen, the fisherman, the mechanic, in a word, all consumers had to pay more for supplies, we failed entirely to appreciate an argument so lame and contradictory. Ten, fifteen, and twenty per cent. were named as the advance upon supplies, since the advent of the National Policy. Well, if that were true, it would seem to indicate better times, and we offer no objection to the acceptance of it in that way. We wish to be obliging. The propositions which we have been considering cannot, however, both be correct, for it follows as an inevitable conclusion that, if our manufacturers of all kinds are stimulated, and hundreds and thousands are drawn to these centres of active industry, thus largely increasing the number of the non-producing classes, the tillers of

the soil must reap the benefit of enhanced prices. And not only so, but a home market will be provided, and the costs and risks of transit to a distant market avoided. We were told a year ago that the adoption of a Protective policy would weaken the ties between the Mother Country and this Dominion, but we have seen no evidence as yet of such a calamity, nor have we the remotest expectation of the fulfilment of these gloomy predictions. On the contrary, we should experience no feeling of surprise at witnessing a very considerable modification of the fiscal policy of England herself, for she is scarcely holding her own in the world's competition, and with the tendency of the nations, in Europe as well as elsewhere, towards a system of Protection, the contest will become an unequal one, and her rigid notions of Free-trade will perforce undergo modifications. Twenty years ago England could sell her manufactured goods in the markets of the world, but that, we are sorry to say, is not the case to-day. During the last decade, the relative positions of England and other leading manufacturing nations have been greatly changed to her disadvantage, and if her position is now unpromising, an adherence to her present policy is likely to make it worse in ten years to come. Shut out from one-quarter or one-third of the markets, which she enjoyed in years gone by, by the sharpness of the competition waged with her by some of the highly-protected nations, who formerly purchased her goods in large supply, she will by-and-by recognise the moral of the story, and feel herself compelled to deal less liberally with her neighbours and more justly with herself. Much as is won from the soil of England, by the adoption of the highest system of cultivation, she comes far short of feeding her own people; and we may say that there, to-day, we find the best markets for our own surplus products. The time will come, and is not so distant as many imagine, when Canada alone will be able largely to supply what England may lack in the way of bread. I hope I may be pardoned if I turn the attention of the House to a subject of some importance, which, if it does not now command the ear of Parliament, as it should, will, I am assured, at no distant day, be

better received, and I hope be dealt with in a practical way. The Tariff has done something for us already, and bids fair to do much more; but our financial necessities are not likely to be met in this way alone. What we need now, to supplement the fiscal policy, auspiciously inaugurated, is the adoption of a fair, practical system of economic reform. I would not advocate sweeping and indiscriminate changes and reductions, as respects salaries and the number of officials, but doubtless scores of officials could be dispensed with altogether, and pretty general reductions effected, to the relief of the Treasury and the Civil Service, and the general administration of affairs remain substantially as efficient as they are now. One cares not to be too minute in one's enquiries into public abuses, but the vast number of doorkeepers, messengers, and employés of various kinds in and around the Parliament and Departmental Buildings, has long formed the subject of observation and comment. These public servants are doubtless faithful and true, and many of them capable, perchance, of filling better places, but they are at least one-third more in number than the Public Service demands. Then in respect to the expenditures of Parliament itself, in how many ways might the principle of economy be beneficially introduced. The reduction of the sum of \$200 upon the indemnity of members of Parliament, and a like sum, or a larger sum, in respect of Senators, would in itself effect a large annual saving of about \$56,600, to say nothing about the very considerable additional saving which could be effected by making corresponding reductions in the salaries of the officials of both Chambers. In view of the present strain upon our finances—a strain which is likely to be considerably increased in the near future—a vigorous effort should be made to effect a reduction of something like 20 per cent. all along the line and all down through the official ranks. I refrain from going further into particulars, owing to the delicacy of the subject, especially if pushed into what might be considered by some forbidden quarters; but I do not hesitate to affirm that, in general, officials are overpaid, and have very much better times than nine-tenths of the people, who are heavily taxed to pay them, and to provide the

sinews of war for the thousand and one purposes of the Government. In the advocacy of propositions such as these, it is difficult to make oneself fully understood without descending to particulars, and still more difficult, perhaps, to guard oneself from misrepresentation, but one must take one's chances for that. I will, therefore, in dismissing this branch of my subject, simply repeat that I would not willingly or knowingly advocate any scheme or plan which would work injustice to any class or classes in the Commonwealth, and it is only because I think that more of equality would be secured under the plan proposed than under the existing state of things that I have been tempted to moot or advocate it at all. I believe our expenditures could in various ways be curtailed to the extent of \$1,000,000 a year. During this debate a number of hon. members have represented the Lower Provinces as seriously infected with a spirit of discontent, largely growing out of Tariff exactions, but tinged with dissatisfaction with the fruits of Union. That there should be complaints made there as well as elsewhere, on the part of those who have always opposed the National Policy is quite natural, and the same may be said of those who have always opposed the Union; but that the number of either of these classes has recently been augmented is, I think, quite improbable. Our opponents are never tired of alleging that people are going in large numbers from the Maritime Provinces to the United States. Well, allowing this to be true in part, it is equally true that the people in those Provinces have been doing the same thing for the last thirty years, and during portions of that time in greater numbers than now, but most of them return at the end of each season, so that we do not permanently lose more than a small percentage of our people. There are even some advantages in this system, or practice, which nearly offset the evils attending it. New ideas and increased general information are thus imported back into the Provinces, temporarily and in limited degree deprived of their floating population, and in some instances temporary pecuniary profit is secured, although in general they return no better off than when they went away. Their taste for dress is usually visibly improved. In a few

cases their views of things become decidedly liberalised; in the main, however, they return improved in a variety of ways. This exodus will, however, cease before long, and, as soon as proper facilities for getting into the North-West are furnished. Then, too, the popularity of the Government has been assailed, and a great reaction is said to have taken place to the prejudice of the Government, and in favour of the Opposition, since the 18th of September, 1878, but these must be pure delusions on the part of these who talk thus, for neither in Parliament nor outside of it, do we witness any evidences of the truth of what is thus affirmed. One of these hon. gentlemen after ably advocating a favourite resolution which he moved, was voted down a few nights ago by a majority of eighty, and this is not an unusual vote on party divisions. But let us see how matters stand in the constituencies. We have had two elections in the leading constituencies in Nova Scotia since the General Election in 1878, and, although in both instances there were circumstances of a local or incidental nature of a very exceptional character, the seats were handsomely won in the interest of the Government. The same favourable results have been achieved in other of the Provinces, where constituencies have been opened, and in that way has the Government not only held its own, but some seats have been wrested from the Opposition. I submit, then, whether these facts should not shut the mouths of all who have ventured to affirm that changes unfavourable to the Administration have taken place since 1878, either in or out of Parliament. But what can you say about the Ontario elections of 1879, exclaim our irrepressible opponents. Well, when headed off in all other quarters, our opponents fly to this their solitary refuge, and although we may feel a little amazed, I do not know as we should begrudge to them the crumbs of comfort which they derive from this source. Still, Ontario is but a barren waste to them, though they search it o'er and o'er, and in reality furnishes them with no higher cheer than Cape Breton or Halifax; for in the former place it was not the National Policy which was on its trial, but Premier Mowat's Government, and

the people simply endorsed the Government; whereas, in respect to the elections in Nova Scotia, the changes were incessantly wrung against the National Policy. Ontario has had the best possible reason to be satisfied with the National Policy, and when again called upon to render her verdict upon that question, will probably give it, as emphatically as she did in 1878. The mistaken interference of the Dominion Cabinet in the contest furnishes just a shadow of foundation for the assumption referred to in this connection, and nothing more; and none know this better than those who put it forward so often. I have almost unbounded confidence in the ability and sagacity of the right hon. leader of the Administration; but I think he missed a figure there. He should have rested contented with his almost unexampled triumph of 1878, and been willing to allow his opponents to hold a piece of territory unopposed. I regret that the Government could not see its way clear to increase the duty on coal to 75c. per ton, as the small increase which would have raised the duty to that extent, would have been a source of relief both to a depressed industry and a depleted Treasury; still, in view of certain concessions, which may be hoped for in another direction, the Treasury may reap an equivalent in another form, and, if this is done, we shall have but little reason to complain. I also regret that, from necessity, the grants to various public objects of importance are greatly diminished, or cut off altogether; and this is all the more to be regretted from the fact that an impression extensively prevails in the Lower Provinces, that undue consideration is being extended to the middle and western parts of the Dominion. Another impression prevails, which is kindred to, and almost identical with, the one already referred to, namely: that the Maritime Provinces have, since the date of the Union, contributed more to the common fund than they have received from it; but all I will say about that is, that all who think thus had better post themselves, and not continue to cherish opinions which are known to be delusive. One of the most delicate questions to which the attention of the members from the Maritime Provinces has been invited, during the Session, has been connected

with the subject of the Fishery Award ; and the position of the Nova Scotia members has been, perhaps, peculiarly embarrassing, derived from the circumstance that, in the event of a distribution of the Award taking place, in common fairness, Nova Scotia's proportion would be greatly in excess of that of any of the other Provinces. The motion for getting control of more than \$2,000,000 was one not easily to be resisted, especially in view of the state of the Provincial Treasury ; but it was evident from the first, that there were constitutional objections to such a course, which could not well be overcome, not to mention considerations of other kinds, which rendered it a matter of doubtful policy for the Government to defer to the popular wish. If the money were distributed among the several claimants now, it is not improbable that in four years' time there would not be much to show for it ; and when the Terms of the Treaty had run out, with possible complications of a serious character surrounding us, growing out of the abrogation of the Treaty, we should find ourselves without the means of protecting and extending an interest of almost priceless value, not to the Provinces alone, but to the whole country. Our enterprising and somewhat aggressive neighbours across the border, have long looked with a covetous eye upon our fishing grounds, and although we flattered ourselves that, under the Washington Treaty, this bone of contention had been gotten rid of, we shall find at the end of four years more in our midst again. Among the many interesting and important questions demanding the attention of the Government and of Parliament, none can be regarded as so vast and absorbing as that involved in the project of opening up of the North-West. The subject presents itself to us in various aspects, but chiefly in respect to those which relate to matters of finance and colonisation. For a country with a population not greatly exceeding four millions to undertake the construction of public works, embracing a probable expenditure of from eighty to one hundred millions of dollars, would, at first thought, seem to be little short of sheer madness ; but careful reflection will present the matter to us in another light. The fact that there is in this vast region

to be thus opened up for speedy settlement enough land of the best quality to pay for the work twice over, is in itself reassuring ; but the way in which the land will be enhanced in value, and the means thus furnished for speedy settlement form additional considerations not easily overestimated. And when we add to these the probable increase of population likely to take place during the progress of the work, we shall scarcely consider the prospect a gloomy one, but on the contrary one full of glowing possibilities. With double our present population, and greatly increased resources, we may reasonably hope to do well enough in the way of meeting our liabilities, great as they will inevitably become. After the Great North-West is opened up, and the iron horse shall take his way from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we shall not be so very far behind and beneath our neighbours, and shall then compete with them upon equal terms in some respects, at least. This vast project seems at first sight to involve the taxing of the east for the benefit of the west, but we may fairly hope that it will not be so ; but that the sale of the lands will fully meet the outlay. It would seem as though we were now committed to the scheme, and that the true policy is to push the work on as rapidly as our means will allow, trusting to the results to carry us triumphantly through. I will here turn aside, for a moment, to notice a gratuitous assertion made the other night by the hon. member from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). In few words the statement was this : "That Sir Charles Tupper had been the greatest enemy Nova Scotia ever had." I do not know that the statement is worth noticing, but the hon. member might be advised that he will not add much to his own fame by thus wantonly traducing the name of one of the cleverest public men the country has ever produced ; whose position at this hour a much more brilliant man than his accuser well might covet. I am sure I need not enumerate the services which he has rendered to his native Province, before being called to a wider sphere of action. In connection with the legislation and the public works of the country will be found abundant evidences of his zeal and ability in the Public Service. Whatever diversity of

opinion may prevail in Nova Scotia in respect to the part he bore in promoting the Union of the Provinces, none have ever disputed his great industry and ability; and a vast majority of his fellow-countrymen have again and again emphatically endorsed his public conduct. True, he came to this Parliament alone in 1867, but before the end of the term the greater part of the members from Nova Scotia were acting in concert with him, and generally acknowledging him as their leader. Finally, with two-thirds of the Nova Scotia constituencies heartily supporting him to-day, having held his own constituency uninterruptedly for twenty-five years, neither his present comfort nor future prospects will be seriously affected by the missiles of any of his political enemies. Some might be uncharitable or critical enough to say that some of his enemies might have been easily converted into friends, but careless man that he was, he would not look after them. In respect to the prices of sugar—the refining business, now so satisfactorily established, and still to be greatly extended,—the tea trade, the cotton, woollen, and other manufactures, now prospering under the new Tariff, I will not occupy the time of the House by adding anything to what has been so well said about them all by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). I may be pardoned, however, if I advert to the part that the quality of the refined sugars now in use in Canada is much superior to what we got when we were dependent mainly upon the Americans for our supply, as has been clearly established by a number of samples tested by the Inland Revenue Department. Out of twenty-three samples analysed all were found to be pure. In conclusion, let me say that, while as a nation we may have great difficulties to surmount, we have great hope to cheer us on, and great expectations to fulfil. The energies and skill of our best statesmen will be, perchance, severely taxed, but a decade will not pass away before we shall witness such progress and development as will fill us all with glad surprise, and without distinction of party we shall all feel proud of our common country.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne): The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his

seat, has wandered over a variety of subjects, and told of the wonderful results that have been achieved under the National Policy in reference, I presume, to Nova Scotia. I thought, to-night, as I listened to the somewhat fulsome praise the hon. gentleman bestowed on the hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper), that he might have his eye upon a vacancy in another branch of this Legislature. If he has that in view, I am sure he will find, after the warm praise he has bestowed on the hon. member for Cumberland, that that hon. gentleman will be a supporter of his in any application he may make for that position. He has told us that the National Policy is popular, and that it has done a great deal for the Province of Nova Scotia. On the other hand I shall be able to show that it is not popular, and that in Nova Scotia its most uncompromising opponents are the men who voted for the Conservative candidate in 1878. The hon. gentleman tells us that the Dominion of Canada is somewhat similarly situated to the United States, being in possession of all the raw materials that enter into the manufacture of the goods required in this country. Take, for instance, the sugar refineries, the cotton mills and the woollen mills. We must go elsewhere for our raw sugar, for our cotton and our wools, while the people of the United States have all these within their own boundaries. A Protective Tariff has been more successful in the United States, because they have every variety of climate and soil, and virtual Free-trade with forty millions of people. The National Policy, as propounded in the resolution of the First Minister, prepared prior to the last General Election, was fully discussed in the Province of Nova Scotia; but no constituency was carried upon a Tariff such as we have now. We were assured, by telegrams from the hon. the First Minister, that no such thing as an increase of the Tariff was contemplated by the Conservative party on their return to power. One or two hon. gentlemen, representing Nova Scotia constituencies—the hon. member for Cumberland and one of the hon. members for Halifax—have stated that the Tariff is a benefit to Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Halifax said simply that old industries had been revived, and new ones had sprung up, under this Tariff; but the

hon. member for Cumberland goes further, he says: "that hundreds of thousands of persons have found employment in this country because of the introduction of the National Policy," and then he goes on to point to all the industries of the country as being in a much more flourishing condition than they were at the time of the introduction of the Tariff. Well, if this Tariff has found employment for thousands of people in the Dominion, it must be in some other place than Nova Scotia, for from the day hon. gentlemen came to the Treasury Benches, the people of Nova Scotia have been leaving it and finding homes elsewhere. Last year, over 1000 persons left by the Boston steamers for the United States from Halifax over the number returning to that Province by the same route, and over 500 more went from Yarmouth to the United States than returned; and every vessel, and every packet, that plies between the western ports of Nova Scotia and the United States, carried away large numbers of persons, searching for homes under the "Stars and Stripes." I find, from the Emigration Returns of the United States for last year, that over 4,000 persons from Nova Scotia settled in that country. In addition to that a large number of persons found their way to Manitoba and the Western States by rail. This year the number of persons leaving Nova Scotia is something enormous; something like 200 persons leave Halifax by every weekly steamer for the United States. This exodus is not only going on from the western, but from the middle and northern counties of the Province. The hon. member for Cumberland has also said that a variety of industries in Nova Scotia are prospering under this Tariff. I think I am in as good a position to speak of Nova Scotian interests as that hon. gentleman, being more intimate with the working of the Tariff and its effects upon those interests. In the first place, we are told that the shipping interest of the Province of Nova Scotia is in a more prosperous condition than it was a year ago. That statement is not correct. No better proof of this is required than to travel through the western counties of the Province, where a large amount of ship-building has been carried on, and observe the silent ship-yards from one end of the country to the other. If

the hon. gentleman wants further proof, I will refer him to the returns brought down by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in which I find, according to those returns, that the registered tonnage at the close of 1879 was less than it was in the year 1878, the first time that such a thing has occurred since Confederation. I find also that the increased tonnage registered in 1878 amounted to 100,000 tons, while in 1879, the year in which the hon. gentleman tells us the shipping was prosperous, the amount of registered tonnage had fallen off 26,000 tons, and only amounted to about 74,000 tons registered in that year. The Nova Scotian who will rise in his place and tell us that the shipping interests of Nova Scotia in 1879 were more prosperous than in 1878, shows a lamentable ignorance of the subject. A large number of our vessels, in 1879, were obliged to lay up in American ports because of the low rate, and, in many instances, the entire absence of any freights, which, of course, was not the result of the National Policy. I have always said that, so far as the ship-owning interest is concerned, the legislation of hon. gentlemen could not benefit it, but could increase or diminish the cost of shipping by the amount of taxation placed upon it. Prior to the Election, the Tories asserted that the only thing necessary to bring about a restoration of our languishing industries was the readjustment of the Tariff and their return to power. Not one of the Conservative promises made at that time have been fulfilled, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. The hon. the Minister of Finance might travel from one end of Nova Scotia to the other, and he would hear nothing but dissatisfaction with the Tariff expressed. If the hon. gentleman had visited that Province and placed himself under my care, I could have conducted him to country districts where he would have found that the most outspoken protest against this Tariff would have come from those that supported his election platform in 1878. It has been said that the coal industry has been largely benefitted by the Tariff. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley) said that as a result of the Tariff the electors of Cape Breton had expressed confidence in the present Administration; and my hon. friend behind me assured us that his opponent was also in

favour of an increased duty on coal. Every one knows that the politics of the county of Cape Breton are decided by the coal trade. They do not care about the effect of the Tariff upon other industries. If the Mackenzie Administration were in power to-day, and proposed to put \$1 a ton duty on coal, that county would support that Administration. From what those hon. gentlemen have said, it must have been a personal issue between the three candidates in that county. The hon. member for Cumberland has told us that the National Policy has largely benefitted the coal industry. By the Report of the Commissioner of Mines of Nova Scotia, I find that an increased quantity (50,000 tons) found its way to the Upper Provinces last year over that sent in 1878, and that the Tariff has kept 46,000 tons of coal from the United States market less than was sent to that county in 1878. Referring to the Trade and Navigation Returns, I find that, for the sake of diverting those 46,000 tons from a profitable channel of trade, the people of the country were called upon to pay over \$400,000 into the Treasury as a tax upon coal. But to still further prove the injurious effects of this Tariff upon that industry, I shall use as an authority Mr. Lithgow, the Nova Scotia Phipps, and quote from a letter written by that gentleman, which was published in one of the Halifax papers last year. Speaking of the Tariff that gentleman said :

“Sir, when I think of how the National Policy proposed to foster our mining interests, of how Mr. Tilley proposed to impose such duties as would give to home industry the home market, and then think of what it and he have done for our coal mines. I will better not write my feelings lest the Philistines rejoice. My conviction is the Cape Breton collieries are much worse off under the new than under the old Tariff.”

There is one thing certain—the Tariff has not benefitted the fishing interest of Nova Scotia. On the contrary, it has done much to injure it, and to-day there is a vast amount of suffering in consequence of its disastrous operations. Last year, it is true, there was a large catch of fish, but the markets were in such a state that fair prices could not be obtained. Hon. gentlemen opposite, to add to the misfortunes of this class of our people, enforced the Order in Council,

which affects the whole lobster-fishing industry, and has entailed much suffering in many sections of Nova Scotia. It has been stated that the West India trade has been largely improved by the readjusted duty on sugar. I contend that that trade would have been in no worse condition under the old Tariff than it is under the new. The Tariff has had the result of directing a very large quantity of raw sugar into Canada by Canadian ports. The gentlemen most interested in the trade, who are classed as strong Protectionists, are, however, carrying out the good Free-trade policy of buying sugars in the cheapest markets and shipping them in the cheapest way. Since the 1st October, 1879, the importers of Halifax have not sold above 300 hlds. to Montreal refiners. The sugar brought into that port now is sold to refiners in New York and Boston as heretofore. Since August 1st, 1879, there have been 316 clearances of vessels from Halifax and outports of Nova Scotia to the West India Islands. Ninety-five of those vessels were from outside of Halifax, and of all the sugar brought back only 300 hlds. found their way to the Redpath refinery. English, Norwegian and Swedish vessels, chartered by Redpath and Company, find their way up the St. Lawrence during the summer and to Halifax during the winter months, thus, depriving our own vessels of the trade we were promised under the National Policy. If the Government want to benefit Canadian shipowners, they should alter the Tariff to discriminate, not only in favour of Canadian ports, but extend that discrimination to sugar brought in Canadian bottoms. I pointed out the other night that it would be but right that machinery that cannot be manufactured in Canada should be allowed to come in under the same terms as machinery used in the manufacture of cottons and worsteds; and because I saw fit to do that, I was taunted by the hon. the Minister of Finance with being a convert to his particular views. I am not a convert, but I think if we are to have a Protective Tariff, the many should be protected and not the few. As Messrs. Redpath are making such large sums of money by reason of the Tariff, it is but fair that some portion of their profits should divert to Canadian shipowners. I

challenge the hon. gentlemen opposite to point to any manufacturing industries that have sprung up since the inauguration of the Tariff. I challenge them to point to the fulfilment of any of the promises they made prior to the Election. To-day, Nova Scotia is importing to the same extent as she did before, and the duty is largely increased. Take the imports in my own county, I find that for the six months ending September 30, 1878, the imports amounted to \$113,738, upon which duty to the amount of \$7,330.58 was paid; for a similar period, in 1879, the imports were only \$63,083, while the duties amounted to \$8,686.07. These last importations being under a Tariff which the Tories say is not increased, but simply readjusted. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Richey), took occasion, the other night, to point out to what extent the National Policy had benefitted the city he represents. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, with very few exceptions, the business men of Halifax are dissatisfied with the policy. In proof of this, I will quote from the proceedings of the last meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, when the Tariff was under discussion. First, let me make an extract from the Annual Report of the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax, signed by John Doull, a strong Conservative, and one of the leading business men of that city:

“Your Committee regret to report that the Tariff, as arranged last year, does not appear to have given the general satisfaction anticipated, but trust that the General Government will so modify the Tariff as to remove further dissatisfaction.”

These hopes were expressed prior to the delivery of the Budget Speech, so it is fair to presume that the changes made by the hon. the Finance Minister were not such as to allay this dissatisfaction. Mr. Adam Burns, of the firm of Burns and Murray, another strong Conservative—and to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite upon this point, I will refer to the opening portion of his speech, in which he said: “He did not criticise the Tariff in any spirit of hostility to the present Government, whom he looked upon as the persons, best suited to administer the affairs of this Dominion.” This hon. gentleman denounced “The Tariff, generally, as unnecessarily high, tending to im-

poverish the revenue, to stop healthy competition with outsiders, encourage smuggling, and offer a premium generally to dishonesty. He could say nothing in favour of the Tariff as it now was.” Mr. Wood, another merchant, said: “His business had been utterly ruined and in his ruin the poorer classes of the population suffered.” These are the views of two merchants on the subject, at a meeting composed of the supporters of both parties. The outspoken protest of those gentlemen is but a reflex of the protest coming from every man in the Province, Liberal or Conservative, when they speak what they believe and think in connection with this Tariff.

Mr. OGDEN: The hon. member for Shelburne has made a statement which I think it is my duty to correct. He stated that the Government had passed an Order in Council which seriously injured a very valuable industry in Nova Scotia—that is the lobster fishery—and that it had caused a great deal of suffering and starvation in the Province. I believe the Government were actuated by the best motives in passing that Order, and I believe that it has not caused any starvation or suffering. We read of suffering among the fishermen of Newfoundland where there is only a close season of one month. Certainly the Order in Council does not affect that Colony. In February, 1879, coming on the cars from Halifax to Ottawa to take my seat in this House, an hon. member came to me and very affectionately put his arm around my neck and said, he understood it was my intention to advocate a close season for the protection of lobsters; he also said that he had talked with men engaged in the business on both sides of politics in Halifax, who were all anxious that the close season should be over the whole coast from 1st August to 1st November or later, and requested me to go with him to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and get him to pass such an Order. I replied, that when we reached Ottawa I would consider the matter and talk to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about it; which I did. He said he would discuss the matter with the gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces who were interested. I told this hon. gentleman that the hon.

Mr. ROBERTSON.

the Minister wished to meet some hon. members from the Maritime Provinces in regard to this subject. "Well," said he, "when you go to him I want you to take me with you. This is a matter in regard to which I am independent. I defeated a Cabinet Minister and can be perfectly independent in regard to a movement of that kind, and I want you to take me with you." The next thing that the hon. gentleman knew, was an Order in Council making this close season as desired, which appeared in the *Canada Gazette*. The hon. gentleman I refer to is the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson), who has so many times spoken against the Order in Council, and which he wished to be so instrumental in framing. Had the hon. the Minister of Marine taken him into his confidence in the matter, there would have been no necessity for me to have come here to-night and let another pig out of the bag. The hon. gentleman was strongly in favour of this close season up to the time the Order in Council was passed, and for him to be charging the Government with injustice because he was not consulted, was in very bad taste.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne): I am in favour of a close season. I can also say that during the present Session I have not asked for any more lengthy period for the fishermen than the present one of four months. The present regulations have seriously affected the lobster fishermen on the south coast of Nova Scotia. I have asked this year that the Government, in justice to the fishermen, and especially to those of my own county, instead of having the months of April, May, June and July fixed for this object, should make the period May and June and September and October. My reason is, that in the month of April it is utterly impossible to carry on lobster-fishing; and even if the fishermen wished, there is no bait. I have it from the best authorities, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough, that the month of July is when the spawning of the fish begins. The result is that, under the present regulations, the fishermen have only the months of May and June. In connection with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ogden) has said about my first trip to Ottawa, and my views, I may say that I am favourable to a close season

that would protect the Fishery. I told him at Halifax—and the man that owns him, Isaac H. Mathers—that I would favour a close season that would equally protect the interests of the fishermen, the packers, and the Fishery. I did my best to obtain information upon this question, for the simple reason that I would like to see a close season that would protect the fishermen in their business. I made no application to the hon. gentleman, and he never asked me to accompany him to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for consultation with the Minister upon this subject.

MR. OGDEN: No, but you asked me to take you with me.

MR. ROBERTSON: The hon. gentleman did not ask me, but if he had I would have gone with him to the hon. Minister, because this is an industry in which my constituents are largely interested. But as I said before, I am prepared to go before any section of the people interested in that industry and defend my course. I simply ask for justice for that class of our fishing population.

AN HON. MEMBER having raised a point of order,

MR. SPEAKER decided that the hon. gentleman had no right to resume the discussion again on the general question.

MR. ANGLIN moved the adjournment of the Debate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have no objection, if it be understood that we close the Debate to-morrow. The Session is advancing and we should make progress with the business.

MR. MACKENZIE: We are all desirous of ending the Debate as soon as possible, but two or three hon. gentlemen on this side have not had an opportunity of speaking, and if the adjournment be now agreed to we shall assist the hon. the First Minister in terminating the Debate to-morrow.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have no objection to the proposal.

MR. KILLAM: I would like to know if the hon. the Minister of Finance is going to answer the question I put to him as to what rate of drawback he will allow on materials to be used in shipping in St. John.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I will answer that question another time.

Motion agreed to and Debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Twenty-five minutes after
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 9th April, 1889.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD in moving:

That for the rest of the Session, after to-day, Government business shall on Mondays have precedence over all other business after Routine Proceedings,

Said: The reason why I ask the House to select Monday is that on Wednesday we proceed with Public Bills and Orders, while on Monday there are simply Bills and Notices. I, therefore, ask the House to give us Monday, after to-day, for the rest of the Session.

MR. HAGGART: I would ask, as there is an important Private Bill, the Credit Valley Railway Bill, and all the parties interested are in town, that the Government might allow, if we do not get through with it in the first hour this evening, that it shall have precedence till we do, or give us time for it on Monday.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: With the unanimous consent of the House, Private Bills can come up on Monday, and those ready shall be taken.

MR. MACKENZIE: Is it proposed that the House should consent to an indefinite time to-night for this Bill? I understood that to-night we were to dispose of the Tariff question.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We will go on with the Tariff, and give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to move a reference to this Bill, and also an opportunity on Monday.

MR. BLAKE: It would be convenient if we could run through the Notices of Motion. There are a number which must be unopposed and undebatable; there is a large arrear, and they could be disposed of in half an hour; but I understand this Credit Valley Railway Bill may take a considerable time.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I quite agree with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that we should go through the Notices of Motion. There has not been an opportunity of working them out—of cleaning the stable, I may say.

MR. BLAKE: I do not think the stable is on this side of the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Perhaps not; I am quite willing to admit that we are a stable Government on this side.

MR. MACKENZIE: There are about thirty Public Bills and Orders in the hands of private members. The only time at which they can be taken up now will be Wednesday afternoon, and it would be much better for the Government to say which Bill they are willing to consider, and give some reasonable accommodation to the hon. members in charge of them. There are a number of Bills that the Government do not favour, and it is time the Government should declare its mind about them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think that on Wednesday we can commence to slaughter these.

MR. MACKENZIE: And we will do the slaughtering on the other days.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Ways and Means."—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

MR. ANGLIN: Before commencing my remarks, I have to ask the hon. the Finance Minister to inform me what the gross revenue receipts for March would be. I presume he has that information by this time.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I have not the information for March separately. I have it here for January, February and March altogether. The Customs receipts for these three months amount to \$3,524,534, or \$760,000 more than for the same period last year.

MR. ANGLIN: I ask for the gross revenue receipts from all sources.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I have not that.

MR. ANGLIN: Mr. Speaker, the duty which hon. members on this side of

the House have been called upon to discharge is not so pleasant and agreeable as hon. gentlemen on the other side appear to suppose. It would be much more pleasant, much more gratifying to us if we could agree with much of what has been said on the other side; if we could believe that the National Policy has produced the beneficial effects which they contend it has produced, we should only be too happy to join in their congratulations and expressions of thankfulness and delight. For although we have been repeatedly charged with being unpatriotic, I can hardly imagine that, on this side of the House, there is anyone capable of rejoicing in the miseries or misfortunes of any class of our people, or to delight in such misfortunes, because they afford a more speedy means of returning to power. Such charges have been made and insinuated; and yet I cannot imagine that those who indulged in those insinuations can be sincere, or can believe us capable of entertaining or conceiving ideas or wishes of so wicked a character. But other matter has found its way into the debate. Much personal and much that we conceived to be a gross misrepresentation of facts in regard to the state of the country. And not only that. Attacks have been made on hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who lately conducted the affairs of the country, and those who supported them; and we believe that in those attacks the conduct of the late Administration has been misrepresented, and facts grossly distorted. I must confess that I cannot charge the hon. the Minister of Finance with having done very much to provoke those personalities, but I do not think that in the half playful, half sarcastic remarks which the hon. member for Centre Huron made with respect to Sir Alexander T. Galt having much to do with the framing of the National Policy and controlling the financial policy of the Government, there was sufficient cause to excite the tempest of wrath which immediately followed. The hon. the Minister of Railways must, indeed, be held mainly responsible for having mingled personalities so largely with facts and arguments in this debate. I remember that the hon. the Minister of Finance, in his financial statement, complained that some one had sneered at his temperance principles, and some friend sitting near me at the time

believed the hon. gentleman had made that charge against myself. If he did so, I will only say that I have never sneered at the temperance principles of anybody, at any time of my life, or under any circumstances. I respect and admire the man who, if he is a victim of the frightful weakness of intemperance, will put such control over his passions as to take a pledge of total abstinence and observe it. I admire still more a man who, not feeling any necessity of that kind, and merely for the purpose of setting a good example to others, abstains from that which he may use with moderation and without injury to himself. I have always been an opponent of prohibition. I believe that a prohibitory law is the greatest possible injury that could be inflicted on the temperance cause, and I have stated that conviction whenever I have found it necessary. But I have never sneered at temperance principles, and certainly not at the temperance principles of the hon. the Minister of Finance, of whom I am always willing and ready to say that I believe him to be a consistent total abstainer, and, so far as I know, a consistent advocate of a prohibitory law, if not a very earnest worker in the cause of prohibition. I think the hon. Minister complained that attacks were made upon the National Policy with a view to "hunting" him down. I think that was the expression used. If that was intended for me, I beg to assure the hon. gentleman that I never was actuated by so mean and unworthy a motive. I have looked at the question entirely on public grounds, and have sought only to do what I thought was for the public interest. The mere fact of the hon. gentleman's becoming so unexpectedly an advocate of the National Policy did not influence my opinion in regard to it in the slightest degree. In assuming, if he did so, that I was actuated by such motives, he paid entirely too great a compliment to himself. I do not think that any hon. member on this side of the House is actuated in his opposition to the policy by feelings of political ill-will, or personal malice towards any hon. gentleman on the other side. We look at this question independently of party considerations. We pride ourselves on the fact that we were willing, in the cause of principle, to

make the enormous sacrifice that we did. Some of our friends taunted us with our folly in not having given way to public prejudice and public folly in this matter. Very many have said that if we had given way so far as to propose an additional $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 3 per cent. duty, for purposes of protection, the Liberal party might still have been in power, and might have continued in power for many years. Perhaps there were some amongst us who shared that opinion, but not one of us ever, either in public or in private, advocated such a course. We stood upon our principles; we took the consequences; and we are proud to stand here in the position we now hold as advocates of sound principles, and victims, if hon. gentleman opposite chose to say so, of adherence to principle. So much for the personal matters; as far as they relate to myself, I would ask the hon. gentleman and his friends, if they imagine that I am actuated by personal motives, to discard that idea at once. He and I have been repeatedly in opposition, frequently in conflict, but I have never yet permitted myself to entertain the slightest personal ill-feeling towards him; and the worst things I have ever said of him I have said in public and to his face. But the hon. the Minister of Railways, not satisfied with speaking of the National Policy and its results, chose to repeat his old assertions that the hon. member for Centre Huron was a King of Deficits—that he had rolled up deficits, while the previous Government had rolled up surpluses; and he again claimed that the Administration, in existence from 1867 to 1873, deserved credit for having, by some act of their own, by some policy of their own, rendered Canada the most prosperous country the world had ever seen. He spoke of the prosperity of the country during that period, as being absolutely unprecedented, and attributed it to the ability of himself and his colleagues. He claimed that they had secured to the people a great amount of content and happiness, and that the evidence of it all was to be found in the fact that they had rolled up a great surplus. I do not want to weary the House with many figures, for I think hon. members are wearied of figures by this time.

MR. PLUMB: Hear, hear; figures of speech.

MR. ANGLIN.

MR. ANGLIN: I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman who made that remark has, for once, expressed the feelings of the House. In quoting figures I will simply use round numbers, which I think will enable us to dispose of those extravagant claims of the hon. gentlemen to having made this a happy and contented country. It is well known that we began this Confederation, in 1867, at a time of considerable financial depression. Hon. gentlemen must remember that when we assembled here we found Mr. Rose, who had just assumed the portfolio of Finance, exceedingly embarrassed by the prospect before him. We found him determined, as much as possible, to cut down the expenditure. He repeatedly declared that it was of the utmost importance, in the first days of Confederation, that the expenditure should not exceed the income. The year before the passing of the British North America Act the public were assured that the expenditure would be \$11,500,000, or something in that neighbourhood, and the Government were bound to cut down the expenditure as much as possible, in order to fulfil the promises which had been made. They were obliged also to adopt an economical course for the purpose of meeting what were supposed to be the expectations of the representatives of the Lower Provinces, whose endeavours to deal with small things were believed to be exceedingly economical. In the first year of Confederation we had a 15 per cent. Tariff, and a very large number of articles upon our Free List. We found in that year that our receipts from all sources were \$13,687,000, and the expenditure was kept down to \$13,486,000. The next year we found the expenditure increased to a little over \$14,000,000 in round numbers. That did not exceed the revenue for the revenue had grown also, but not by reason of any increase of business or by any natural growth. It had grown because hon. gentlemen opposite, in the very first year of Confederation, had found it necessary to increase the taxation of the country. We had one Tariff passed in the winter of 1867, when we first met here. Then we adjourned, and when we met again, some months afterwards, it was found necessary to introduce another Tariff in which a total change was made in the mode of collect-

ing the duties upon sugar. Even in those days the sugar question was a source of much trouble. Under the first Tariff, sugars were distinguished as brown, Muscovado, and so on; and in the second, the Dutch Standard for estimating quality was introduced. In addition to the duties imposed on sugar and molasses it was resolved that a duty should be borne also by the packages. These paid an *ad valorem* duty of 15 per cent. which, in the case of molasses, was a very considerable addition to the duties. I think the duties on sugar were very considerably increased, and as a consequence of this and other changes, we had a somewhat larger revenue. It was \$14,570,000. It is worthy of notice that from that time hon. gentlemen were very diligent, year after year, in bringing their expenditure up to the revenue. That year they spent \$14,346,000. Next year the revenue was \$15,500,000, and their expenditure grew also. Still the revenue went on increasing, and the rate of taxation having been again increased, and became \$19,000,000 the next year, while the expenditure increased to \$17,500,000. They did not, however, yet reach the expenditure. So they continued in stern chase after their surpluses until they reached the famous year of 1873, when the expenditure suddenly jumped from \$19,174,000 to \$23,316,000. Where, in all this is the ground for the claim made by the hon. the Minister of Railways on behalf of his Government? Does he pretend to say that this increase of revenue was the result of anything done by the Government, except the imposition of additional taxation? In what was their policy shown to be a means promoting the welfare or the interests of the country? The tendency since Confederation has been in the direction of increased taxation. The first year after Confederation two Tariffs were brought down, and in 1870 another Tariff was submitted for the purpose of obtaining more revenue. In that year the demijohn and brandy bottle figured conspicuously in the Tariff, and were fully taxed. A duty of 5c. was also placed upon hops. Not satisfied with that, and still in want of money, they introduced a further provision that 5 per cent. must be placed upon all duties collected under all other rates of taxation. So a man paying \$100 duty

would have to pay an additional \$5 to make up the revenue required by hon. gentlemen opposite; and other changes were made for the purpose of increasing the Revenue. Yet to hear the hon. member for Cumberland speak one would suppose that the Government of which he was then a supporter and afterwards a member, were continually reducing the taxation. Once they abolished the duty on tea because it had been abolished in the United States. It had become a matter of absolute necessity that it should be abolished, in order to prevent an extraordinary amount of smuggling. For that the hon. the Minister of Railways has never ceased up to this day to claim an extraordinary amount of credit, as if, forsooth, the Government he belonged to had thereby, without its being necessary, conferred an extraordinary boon on the people of this country. There is another way of looking at all that. In those days the population of the four old Provinces was nearly as large as it is to-day. We had only a 15 per cent. Tariff, but that was nearly as productive as the high Tariff of to-day; and with all those additions made from time to time, with the increase on packages, and the 5 per cent., it did yield a very large amount. What had the hon. gentleman opposite to do with the increase of business which caused that large increase of Revenue? Had they then as much to pay as their successors? Why is it that any credit is to be given or claimed for the fact that a Government having a large revenue and, at the time, a comparatively small uncontrollable expenditure, happened to have a surplus? The expenditure was increased, from 1868 to 1873-4, from \$13,406,000 all the way to \$23,316,000, an increase of about \$10,000,000. For that increase they are responsible. For much of the increase they can fairly account, and the hon. the Finance Minister lately did so account for it. But you will probably remember that during the late Elections, and for two or three years before, the whole country was told, and very many people believed, that the late Government was responsible for this increased expenditure, from \$19,000,000 in 1872-3, to \$23,000,000 in 1873-4. Continually were the late Ministers denounced and condemned for their extraordinary extravagance, in having in-

creased the expenditure \$4,000,000 in one year. Nemesis does follow crime and overtake criminals. Last year it was gratifying to hon. members on this side of the House to find the hon. the Minister of Railways, when announcing his Railway policy, directly and openly, in some instances, impliedly in others, accept, approve, maintain and defend the policy of his predecessor precisely in those matters and things which he himself had for years most persistently, loudly and vehemently denounced. This year we find the hon. the Finance Minister compelled to play pretty much the same rôle—compelled, in vindicating his own conduct, to vindicate in the most conclusive and satisfactory way, to us at all events, the conduct of his predecessor, exonerating him from just those charges most loudly made, and for which he was most violently condemned—not by the present hon. Finance Minister himself—but by almost every one of the hon. gentlemen who sit around and behind him. Those hon. gentlemen repeatedly asserted that the Mackenzie Government was extravagant beyond all precedent, in having increased the expenditure by over \$4,000,000 in that year. I remember hearing the hon. the Finance Minister, after he had become a candidate for St. John, in 1878, make a speech in which he referred to this matter. He partially did justice to his predecessor; he admitted certain increases were inevitable, but he did this in such a way as to leave on many the impression that his predecessor might have been, could have been, and should have been more economical. There were many things, according to him, in which the expenditure might have been reduced. But here we have it fairly admitted that for 1873, if the arguments adopted by the hon. the Finance Minister, in his last speech, are to be applied to the facts as they should be, that for the bulk of this increase no Government is to be held blameable, some parties are to be held accountable; and for the accountability it would give very little trouble to prove that to the hon. gentleman himself and his colleagues it properly belongs. His statement was that the late Government made this extraordinary increase, and was of such a character that their successors could not reduce it. The increases were nearly all statutory—liabilities

fastened permanently on the Dominion; and no matter how much their successors determined to reduce them, they could not, unless they had chosen to break faith with the Provinces and with individuals, unless they could find a majority of the people to sustain them in that course. The increase arose, as the hon. the Finance Minister said, some months ago, from the augmentation of the Provincial Subsidies; the increase of Interest; the \$150,000 given New Brunswick for the abolition of her Export Duty, and other expenditures—all, put together, making the total increase of over \$4,000,000, which was caused by hon. gentlemen opposite and Parliament under their guidance, but for which, most unfairly and foully, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were declared responsible. Where is the extraordinary merit of having, in the years preceding 1874, a surplus? The revenue grew rapidly, and the country became for a time comparatively prosperous. A variety of causes contributed to this result. Good crops did a part; the people of the United States had to come into this country, for some years after their war, to buy up all the surplus products of our people, including manufactures, to replenish their shops and barns, and these enormous purchases contributed materially towards our prosperity. I do not know, if the hon. the Finance Minister settled down seriously and calmly to the discussion of this question, that he would claim credit to the late Conservative Government for having prolonged the American war, and so inflated prices in Canada for a few years. I might mention other causes of the increase of revenue. There is no doubt about the fact mentioned by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), lately, that during those years, smuggling went on extensively; a considerable quantity of goods that paid the highest duties here, finding their way into the United States. That has ceased entirely. Greater than all other causes was the extraordinary fact that the values or prices of the bulk of the commodities imported rose rapidly to a very extraordinary degree; the people having to pay much more for a bale of cotton or a ton of metal. Even though they imported but the same quantity of goods, the prices were so much higher, that the

revenue raised by an *ad valorem* duty necessarily became very much larger. Will the hon. the Minister of Railways presume to tell the House or country that to the policy of himself and associates, or to anything done or omitted by the Government, of which he was a member, was due that rise of prices, and, consequently, the fact that the revenue was swelled, and that they were able to lay by a little of it, notwithstanding their extraordinary efforts to make the expenditure overtake the revenue? Surely, even he would scarcely venture upon saying that, however, much he might insinuate it, because he never hesitates by implication, if not otherwise, to claim credit for himself and his associates for everything that has tended to put a single dollar into the pockets of the people of Canada, or to save them from expending a single cent. In regard to the deficits, that is a very important point that is seldom dwelt upon. It is a fact that the returns do not at all sustain the claims of the hon. member (Sir Charles Tupper), when he asserts that, during the Administration of himself and his associates in former years, the prosperity of Canada was so unbounded and unprecedented. How are we to judge of the prosperity of the country? Is it by its trade returns, and if so, is it by the amount of its imports or of its exports, or the amount of both combined? In this country we are told that we are not much of a manufacturing people. We have certainly hitherto not manufactured for exportation, except to a very small extent, and, therefore, it will scarcely be necessary, in a matter of this kind, to enquire how far our manufactures increased during these five years. I believe they did grow. I believe they have continued to grow for many years, and up to the present time; although there have been vicissitudes in this country as in other countries, and the people have had reason to complain of hard times occasionally, but take it all in all the manufactures of Canada grew under the 15 per cent. Tariff relatively as fast and even faster, I believe, than the manufactures of the United States. When we come to the manufactures of the United States the volume is much larger, and we sometimes forget to multiply everything Canadian by twelve, in order to have a fair comparison between the

manufactures of our country and those of the United States. For millions there, we have hundreds of thousands here; nevertheless, except in such articles as cannot be profitably manufactured in small communities, we have outrivalled and surpassed the people of the United States in the growth of our manufactures. Putting manufactures out of view for a moment, let us look at the imports and exports. I find, in adding up the figures that, during the five years of the Mackenzie Administration, the exports from Canada from the four old Provinces exceeded the exports for the first five years of the Administration, of the hon gentlemen on the other side of the House by no less a sum than \$33,000,000. Some years ago, when hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House talked of the United States, they alleged that the prosperity of that country was to be measured by the amount of its exports. Those exports were large, and although they carefully kept out of view that they consisted almost exclusively of agricultural production, and of animals and their products, yet they dwelt upon the amount of the exports as proof of the extraordinary prosperity of the United States. But the hon. the Finance Minister, in his opening speech on the Budget, was glad to announce to this House that, for the first time almost in the history of Canada, for many years at all events, the exports have been brought down within the limit of the imports. Now, if it is a proof of the beneficent policy of a Government, that its imports are reduced, let us see what the state of things is here. Here we have had a growth of population, which one would suppose ought necessarily to have led to a growth of imports: a growth of 10 per cent. or thereabouts. There is always a continuous growth of wealth in all new countries, which tends very much to affect the course of trade, notwithstanding seasons of severe depression. But if you compare the amount of imports entered for consumption for the first five years, during which the hon. gentlemen on the other side were in power, with the five years of the Mackenzie Administration, you will find that the imports of these years scarcely exceeded the imports of the other—having been, indeed, almost exactly the same. So that, if a decrease

of imports is proof of a wise policy, we can claim credit for having wisely controlled the commerce of this country during that period. It is strange also to remark in these returns, that while the exports grew under the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite, from \$57,000,000 to \$87,000,000, or only about 22 per cent., the imports grew from \$71,000,000 to \$121,000,000 in the same period. The hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper), is in a dilemma upon this point, but he does not mind dilemmas much; he rattles over them. He has frequently asserted that the increase of revenue during the first five years is conclusive evidence of an increase in the prosperity of this country, but the figures show that the increased revenue was almost entirely due to the extraordinary increase of imports. It will be found that during three years, 1871, 1872, and 1873, the imports were enormously in excess of the exports, and that when he alleges we were exceedingly prosperous there was merely a show of prosperity, and we were in reality fast incurring the debts which, a year or two afterwards, added so enormously to the distress which prevailed throughout this Dominion. It may be well to direct attention also to the amount expended on public works, and the amount expended on controllable expenditure during these same years. During the first and second years of Confederation, Sir John Rose made most strenuous efforts to keep the expenditures down, and they did not grow rapidly for some time. The expenditures on public works of any kind were for a great part of those years a mere bagatelle compared to expenditures twice made. During all those years the expenditures on public works, up to 1873-4, were so inconsiderable that the amount of interest that had to be paid by the Dominion was not materially increased. The amount of interest paid on the Public Debt, during the five years the hon. member for Lambton was Premier of this Dominion, exceeds the total amount of interest paid, during the five years of the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite, by about \$8,000,000. Where was that amount to be got? Could not, and should not, the Government, that had quite as large a Revenue for some years and had

so much less to pay, have had a surplus to show at the end of their term? What could they have done with the money? They expended the money, it is true, on various works, but the fact that, under such circumstances, it accumulated in their hands, is not much to their credit. During the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton, over \$25,000,000 were expended on Public Works, charge to Capital. Sometimes it is insinuated that a great deal of that expenditure might have been avoided; that, under the circumstances of the country, it was not only avoidable, but should have been avoided. But to a great deal of that expenditure the late Government found themselves committed. They found themselves committed to the task of carrying on the Pacific Railway as rapidly as the means of the country could afford, and also to the work of enlarging the canals which had been commenced under their predecessors. The hon. the Minister of Finance assumed that this item of growth of interest must be taken into account, but I never heard the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, that I can recollect, once admit that any credit should have been given to the Mackenzie Administration for this particular increase. What was called the controllable expenditure largely increased while hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, but it was largely reduced by their successors. When the Liberal Administration came into office in 1873, they had to be guided in their expenditure, to some extent, by the Estimates of their predecessors. They found that there was danger of a decrease in the Revenue; because the business of the country was decreasing. The hon. the Minister of Finance, who was then Minister of Finance also, in his Budget Speech of 1873, anticipated that in 1874 he would find it necessary to call for increased taxation. He hoped the receipts for 1873, under the Tariff as it then existed, would be sufficient to enable him to meet all the liabilities he had then incurred, but he did then plainly intimate to the House that in the year following he would find it necessary to propose an increase of taxation in order to meet this increase of expenditure. The Liberal party came into power, and they found that prediction likely to be

fulfilled. The depression had then actually commenced ; it was manifest in the amount of exports rather than in the amount of imports, and they found it necessary, in the first instance, to economise as much as possible. They did so effectually economise in that year that they kept the expenditure largely within the income. In that year they had a surplus of \$880,000. The hon. the Minister of Railways, in many of his speeches at that time, complained that they charged in that year to Revenue Account the expenditure upon Railways which should properly have been charged to Capital Account; and he said that this was done in order to make the case of himself and his colleagues appear as unfavourable as possible to the country—that it was done for a malicious purpose. We will agree with him for a moment. Besides that half million, the Liberal Government actually saved that year \$880,000. It was obvious, however, that many obligations, permanently imposed on the Dominion by hon. gentlemen opposite, must accrue subsequently, and that economise as they may, the Liberal Government could not hope to keep the expenditure within the Revenue as it then stood. They found it necessary, therefore, to propose an increase of taxation. Prince Edward Island had come in, and a very large expenditure was necessary there. It was entirely out of the question that the Intercolonial Railway should be allowed to remain unfinished, and many millions were required to finish that, as well as to carry out other obligations imposed on the country by hon. gentlemen opposite. An increase of taxation became, therefore, absolutely necessary. It was assumed that the imports which had then declined considerably had reached almost their lowest point, and the calculations of the Government were based upon the amount of imports of that year. The imports continued to decline. The depression all over the world continued to grow deeper. The hon. the Minister of Railways, I know, has again and again chosen to speak of that time and those circumstances, as if the Government of this country could by some process or other have controlled, if not the business of the world, at all events the business of Canada ; as if by some process they could have secured to the people of Canada

higher prices for their agricultural produce, for their ships and for their lumber. It was, according to him, entirely the fault of the Government that business had declined, and that the Revenue had fallen off. The hon. the Finance Minister's calculations were scouted, laughed at, mocked and reviled, because he had not anticipated that the prices of goods would fall to a point they had never reached in the memory of man. The first year after the change of Government, in 1875, believing that they had a fair revenue secured, the hon. gentleman, not only did proceed to carry out several works, chargeable to Revenue, which were bequeathed to them by their predecessors and which required a large amount of money to complete, but they also, for the first time, did justice to several counties in the Maritime Provinces and other parts of the Dominion. They undertook, on behalf of the fishermen, a considerable amount of public works, which were completed. They did, in that year, bring in a large Estimate, and make a large expenditure, but they kept the expenditure within bounds, and it was nearly a million dollars less than the Revenue. If the depression had not continued, if it could have been removed by any Act of Parliament, if the prices of commodities imported had not continued to decline, if the means of the people had not necessarily declined, because of the fall of prices of our staple articles of export, then, indeed, the calculations of the hon. the Finance Minister, in all probability, would have been realised. Pains were taken, some time ago, to ascertain what the decline in the prices of goods imported into this Dominion during those years was, and it was found that in 1875-6 there was a decline of 10 per cent., in 1876-7, they declined 15 per cent., and in 1877-8, 20 per cent., and it is calculated that, applying these figures to the actual imports, increasing their value by that amount, and then applying the rate of taxation, it would be found that the Revenue would have been ample to have met all the purposes of Government, and there would have been no deficit. Any one who chooses to push this enquiry farther, will find, moreover, that notwithstanding the decline in the purchasing power of the people, they were, because of the decrease in the price of these

articles, able to buy as much food and clothing, as much of the necessaries and luxuries of life as they were able to purchase in what are called better times. The measure of the prosperity of a country is to be found in the amount of comforts and luxuries the people are able to purchase. It will be found that, during these five years, the people of Canada were as comfortable and as happy, take them all in all, as they were during any period under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite. True, there was great commercial distress, and a great many people suffered great anxiety, trouble and annoyance in consequence. Then the business of many declined in consequence of the shrinkage in values. But, taking the masses of the people, there was no want of food or clothing. To-day we find that prices have advanced, and notwithstanding that, our imports are not as large as they were a few years ago. To-day, looking at the account imports, we find that the people are in a worse condition than they were two, three or four years ago. Much has been said about the deficit created during the Administration of the late Government. I think I have shown that, if the Revenue was not equal to the expenditure it was not the fault of the Government unless, indeed, it be a fault that they did not deliberately increase the rate of taxation. They preferred to wait for better times. Nobody imagined that the commercial depression would exist as long as it did. Everybody expected that that depression would have ceased some three or four years ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, assert that good harvests, high prices, and a revival of business should not have been expected until they were restored to power, and they make the blasphemous assertion that Providence is their ally, and works on their side. The hon. member for Cumberland asserted that our deficits amounted to \$8,000,000. How that was made up I never yet thoroughly understood. I find by looking at the Public Accounts, that in 1874 there was a surplus and not a deficit; and that in the year 1875, notwithstanding the large expenditures, there was a surplus and not a deficit, and that there were deficits only in three years, 1876, 1877 and 1878. The hon. member for Lambton replied to the hon. member's assertion on this

point, and I think admitted entirely too much. He admitted, although under protest, that the late Government were responsible for the deficit in the year just passed. When the late Government were charged with having increased the expenditure of 1873, it is true, they properly deemed their responsibility for what their predecessors had committed the country to; but for the Administration of that year, they were unquestionably responsible. They entered upon power some four months after the commencement of the financial year. They controlled the expenditure for eight months of that year, and they controlled it well and wisely, keeping it largely within the Estimates. Hon. gentlemen opposite controlled the expenditure of last year for a longer time. They entered into office in October; they controlled the expenditure of the country for about eight months and a-half, and they did not keep the expenditure within the Revenue, for we see that the expenditure exceeds the Revenue by \$1,960,000. We find that their expenditure exceeded the Estimate by \$880,000. There was, however, we are told, a mistake of \$200,000 in the calculation of interest, but, deducting this amount, their expenditure actually exceeded the Estimates by some \$560,000. Without taking into consideration the Revenue, for the Revenue might have fallen much short, and really did fall much short of what the late hon. Finance Minister calculated, I ask why did not the hon. gentleman keep the expenditure below the Estimates? What justification is there for that? They have exceeded the Estimates, and they seek to hold their predecessors responsible for that whole expenditure. I repudiate that responsibility. I say it is theirs, and not ours. If we take up the figures in the Public Accounts, beginning in the year 1873-4, we find that there was a surplus, instead of a deficit, of \$880,775; in the following year there was a surplus of \$905,000, making a total of \$1,824,419. The deficits for the three following years, taking no account of Sinking Fund, amount altogether to \$4,188,559. Subtracting, as we ought to do in all justice, the surpluses from the deficits, we find the total deficits amount to \$2,364,540, and not \$8,250,000, or thereabouts, as the hon. the Minister of Railways asserts.

If we take from that the \$500,000 which the hon. gentleman asserts ought to have been charged to Capital Account in 1874, we have a total deficit for the whole five years of \$1,864,540, or nearly \$100,000 less than the deficit the men now in office have incurred in one year. And they talk to us of being responsible for deficits; they who have resorted to taxation such as Canada never knew before; they who are grinding the masses to the dust by the weight of taxation. But let us look a little further. How stands the account for the current year? The hon. the Minister of Finance last year, when he knew exactly how much had been paid into the Revenue, in anticipation of the increase of duties, calculated that \$500,000 of what was paid as Customs duties ought fairly to be credited to the revenues of this current year, and that of the amount paid in excess as Excise duty, \$300,000, ought also to be credited to this current year; that makes \$800,000 altogether. He knew then, just as well as he knows now, how much had been paid in excess; but we now find him claiming that \$1,300,000 of that amount ought to be taken out of the Revenue of last year and transferred to the credit of this year. By jumbling figures and transferring items he tries to make it appear that, instead of there being a deficit of nearly \$2,000,000 this year, there is but a deficit of \$500,000. But \$500,000 added to \$1,300,000, he admits, will make \$1,800,000, and if we add to that \$300,000, which ought to be charged to Revenue, but which are charged to Capital, for surveying the lands of the North-West, there will be, according to his own showing, a deficit of \$2,000,000. I asked the hon. member, before I began, if he would be kind enough to give us an account of the amount he received from all sources of revenue for the month of March. This he was not prepared to give. As the whole receipts for eight months, to the 1st of March, from all sources, have been \$14,000,000, then for the remaining four months it would require an additional receipt of \$10,000,000 to make his Estimates harmonise with facts. I wonder if the hon. the Minister of Railways expects such an amount as that from all sources. I would like to believe, if I

could, that such a sum will be received; it would indeed be some evidence of a returning prosperity; it would be one of the many evidences we require, and give us a degree of confidence, that next year we might see Income and Expenditure equalised. The hon. gentleman told us, last year, that if there was one thing above another, that the people of this country had firmly resolved upon, and which they had enjoined upon their representatives in this House, it was that there should, henceforth, be no deficits. Why then has he allowed a deficit this year? Why has he not imposed additional taxation, and so made Income harmonise with Expenditure? He denounced his predecessors for having calculated upon an improvement in business which would make the Revenue equal to expenditure, and his denunciations were loud and thunder-like against us for having dared to roll up deficits year after year. But in this, too, the hon. the Minister of Finance is following the example of his illustrious predecessor in calculating upon, and depending upon, a possible improvement in the business of the country. I am not prepared to say that he is doing wrong. But from his own position, applying his own rules and principles to his conduct, we must say that he is acting most unwarrantably and unjustifiably. The deficit this year, by his own showing, is \$500,000, but it will be found to be in reality close upon \$2,000,000. Now there is another feature of these Estimates worthy of remark. The hon. the Minister of Finance proceeds to add to the expenditure of last year some \$1,500,000; he is not content with the expenditure which has already involved such a deficit. Some \$200,000 of this additional expenditure, he says, is mere matter of book-keeping. Take out that \$200,000, and we still have \$1,300,000 additional expenditure, to meet which, I suppose, he expects that the increase of duties will be sufficient.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The Estimates show no such thing.

MR. ANGLIN: The Estimates look very like it, if I can read the figures.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: You will have to look at the figures again.

MR. ANGLIN: Oh, I see. The hon. member for Centre Huron points out to me that the original Estimates of this

year do not exceed the original and Supplementary Estimates of last year by so large an amount, but there will be Supplementary Estimates this year also. We do not know how large they will be, it is true. But when they are brought down we shall have a fair idea of how this matter stands. Now, Sir, the new Tariff, the readjustment and the imposition of taxes, proposed by the hon. gentleman last year, and adopted by this House, has not realised the hon. gentleman's expectations in a pecuniary point of view. Not only is he found to acknowledge these great deficits, but his estimates of receipts were, in some respects, very much astray. Last year he estimated that the receipts from the coal duty would be some \$200,000. However, he has received a large amount, nearly \$300,000, in excess of what he estimated from that duty, which did not produce the effects on the coal trade that some expected. So with regard to breadstuffs, I think we have received \$200,000 on breadstuffs of all kinds.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: A great deal of that is made up of Indian corn and meal.

MR. ANGLIN: At all events it is largely in excess of what he estimated; it is some \$100,000 in excess of what he expected. Yet his receipts fall far below his estimate. We like to deal with facts, and to confine ourselves strictly within the limits of truth. Some would say that if you would vanquish a certain hon. gentleman you must fight him with his own weapons. I do not believe in that doctrine. I do not mean to act on any such principle. I prefer the simple ways of truth and justice and fair play, and, therefore, Sir, I must say that I do not blame the hon. the Finance Minister for having gone so far astray in his estimate. I know it is an exceedingly difficult thing in this country, when trade is changing all over the Dominion, to estimate the amount of imports and exports, or the amount of revenue to be derived from imports, and I am not disposed to say that he made a very serious mistake. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) said last year that, if our imports in this current year were as large as the imports of the previous year, the additional duties would have added nearly \$7,000,000 to the burdens of the people.

MR. ANGLIN.

The hon. the Finance Minister calculated that the increased duties would bring him \$2,250,000 increase of Revenue. They have not yielded so much. They have, however, in reality added much more to the burdens of the people; they have largely increased the cost of the prime necessities of life, but the greater part of the taxation thus imposed has gone not into the Treasury, but into the pockets of speculators and monopolists. The Tariff has not been productive of the effects anticipated by the hon. the Finance Minister not of such effects as the country were led to expect from it. We admitted last year that much would be done for certain industries by the Tariff, that it would do much for the sugar refineries, for the manufacturers of cheap cottons, that it might do much for those engaged in the manufacture of coarser woollens; but we said that the numbers thus to be benefited, assuming the most sanguine expectations to be realised, would be small as compared with the enormous burden to be imposed on the people. We said, moreover, with regard to some industries, that there was very little room for anything to be done by means of a Protective Tariff, because they had already a monopoly of our markets, and for many others it would be impossible to do anything to render their business more remunerative; but we objected, that it was unjust, that for the benefit of a small portion of the people, all the other people were to be heavily burdened, hampered and oppressed. Well, what has it done for these industries? We have had some discussion on the sugar question. I cannot help remarking that, while the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), insisted that the price of sugar has not been increased by the change in the Tariff, the hon. the Finance Minister did not so insist. The hon. member for Cardwell, it was evident, had carefully prepared the calculations respecting the prices of sugar in Canada and New York, which he submitted. He chose a period when prices were jumping, as it were, from point to point, and he selected a particular day, when the prices quoted in Montreal happened to be comparatively lower than the prices in New York; and he asked the House to conclude therefrom that the price of sugar is not dearer, but cheaper, because of the change of Tariff. The hon.

the Finance Minister went further than that last year. I remember with what exultation he announced to the House a decline in the price of sugar, which took place after the National Policy had gone into operation, and attributed that decline to the National Policy. The decline of prices in sugar was a decline in the markets of the whole world, and was entirely independent of anything we could do in Canada. The hon. member for Kingston, I remember, had circulars which he produced to that effect. Then came the astounding remark of the hon. the Minister of Railways: "That is a proof that our change of policy has influenced the markets of the world." And so far as I could judge, he spoke in solemn earnest. He said this with all the earnestness he can so well assume, and he was cheered to the echo by his friends and supporters. Many hon. gentlemen on the opposite side have assumed that the prices of the staple products of the civilised world can be affected by Canadian legislation, and that the prices have been affected, not only in our markets but in foreign markets, by the Tariff of last year. I do not know how many in this House believe anything so preposterous as that, but I am inclined to think there are not many in the country now who believe anything of the kind. The price of sugar is regulated by various causes, chiefly by the abundance or scarcity of supply, and before the time of this particular decline, sugar had frequently declined in price. The price about that time fluctuated. Sugar had frequently declined in price long before the National Policy had been thought of, and the first decline of last year was due to similar causes. But what we allege is that, whether the price in the markets of the world is high or low, the price to the people of Canada of refined sugar has been increased from $\frac{3}{4}$ c. to $1\frac{1}{4}$ c. a pound in all parts of the Dominion by the operation of the Tariff; and we assert that the additional money paid over the grocers' counters does not go into the Treasury, but into the pockets of the monopolists of Montreal. We assert, moreover, that not only do they receive in this way an extraordinary amount in addition to the reasonable profits of their business, but that they also receive a large additional amount because of the lower

rates of duties now paid for coarse sugars bought for the refinery. These are our allegations. I think some hon. gentleman has kept a record, week by week, or day by day, of the prices in New York and Montreal, and the facts I have referred to can be demonstrated by any one prepared to look at the matter intelligently and accept the truth. But the hon. the Minister of Finance this year did not exactly take that ground. If he had consulted any leading grocer in his own city of St. John, he would have told the hon. gentleman that, no matter how the Government figured, sugars bought in this country are higher to-day than they would be under the old Tariff. But the hon. gentleman took another course. He brought in a sample of No. 14, Dutch standard, and said: "Here is a raw sugar, good enough for any gentleman's table, and if the people do not want to pay the tax on refined sugar, all they have to do is to use this and avoid paying the tax." Perhaps the use of that sugar may be more economical than the use of our refined sugars, but I do not think that any Finance Minister, accused of overburdening the people with taxation, has a right to say to the people: "If you do not like to pay the tax use this quality and avoid taxation."

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Oh.

MR. ANGLIN: The hon. gentleman may laugh. He feels that, because he has a majority at his back, he can crush and grind the people at his pleasure. An old friend of the hon. Minister, a warm supporter of his at the last election, is owner of the Ashburton Mills, near St. John, at which he chiefly grinds corn into meal. He alleges that he was assured more than once by the hon. gentleman that, although a duty would be imposed on Indian meal, no duty would be imposed on Indian corn; and he was quite ready to go in for a little share of the plunder. Why not? He had as much right to a little share as the Redpaths to a big share. When this gentleman found a duty imposed on Indian corn, he became very indignant, and the story goes that he wrote several letters to the hon. Minister remonstrating and complaining, and finally he received an answer very much like that which was given to-day to the persons who complained about sugar. The hon. gentleman, so the rumour goes, replied: "If the

people of New Brunswick would only use peameal or barleymeal they need not pay a duty on cornmeal."

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I saw that stated in the newspapers of New Brunswick. There is not a word of truth in it. My answer to the gentleman was that he was in a better position than he was before, because there was a 12½ per cent. per barrel difference between corn and cornmeal. The simple truth the hon. gentleman says he adheres to is best.

MR. ANGLIN: I have stated this as a rumour, and I have given the hon. gentleman an opportunity of making a denial; but I ask him if he said anything in that letter about peameal or barleymeal.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Not a word. It is another of the fabrications of the enemy. If you can produce the letter you can answer the question yourself.

MR. ANGLIN: I am not in the gentleman's confidence, but I know he was very angry. Whether he misunderstood the letter or not I am not prepared to state, but I believe he so understood it. However, it sounded like the other remark the hon. gentleman made with reference to sugar, which shows that he little appreciates the rights of the people who do not choose to use that sugar, but want refined sugar. The people have a right to demand that the hon. gentleman should consult their wishes and inclinations. He is not their master, if he could only understand his position; he is their servant, to carry out their behests, and not their master to make them buy coarse sugar if they want refined.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I did not make that statement. I called the attention of the House to the fact that there was a sugar that paid half a cent. of duty less than it was under the old Tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that it was not a refined sugar, and I replied: No, but it was one that could be used on any gentleman's table in the country. That, and the sugar below it, is cheaper for the poor man to-day than it was a year ago.

MR. ANGLIN: It so happens that scarcely a tenth of that sugar is used in this country by the poor man.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Nearly

MR. ANGLIN.

all the tables of the country had that sugar last year.

MR. ANGLIN: The fact is that that sugar is not bought by the people and they do not want to buy it; and it is an act of tyranny on the part of the hon. gentleman to attempt to force the people to take what they do not want. We are told that while the price of sugar is not increased by the change, a very large increase has taken place in the amount of the trade. To hear the hon. the Minister of Railways, who on some occasions runs wild upon this as upon other matters, talk about the extraordinary amount of employment given to shippers, steamboats, carters, etc., by the transhipment of sugar from place to place, one would really suppose that until the National Policy came into operation, a grain of sugar had never come into Canada. Why, we used just as much sugar before the National Policy went into operation as we do now, and that policy, instead of being calculated to increase the consumption, is, because of the additional price, calculated to reduce it. If it did not come into Montreal in such large quantities, it came to other ports. The hon. the Minister of Finance talked of the growth of the West India trade, and said that four new vessels, designed for that trade, were on the stocks at Carleton. St. John, that we were doing a large business, and it was on the increase. If the hon. gentleman would look at his own returns, brought down a few days ago, he would see that the importations of sugar to St. John have fallen off 40 per cent., and that our trade to the West Indies has not improved in the slightest degree. An hon. member recently pointed out that, although in the months of February and March, of former years, a large number of vessels cleared from St. John to the West Indies, but one vessel cleared from St. John to the West Indies this year, in those months, and there was not a single vessel bound from the West Indies to St. John. So far from the sugar trade of that city having been increased, it has been almost annihilated. We find that a larger number of vessels laden with sugar, arrived at Halifax, from the West Indies, than for some years past. I moved for a return, which might have been brought down in a few days, and might have been useful for this

debate, but I was met with amendments, which so encumbered the motion, that I am afraid we will not get it down this Session. I wanted to ascertain how much of the 13,000,000lb. coming to the port of Halifax, was landed there, and went into the trade of the port, and how many sugar-carrying vessels came there simply as to a port of call. The newspapers have informed us of the fact, that a large quantity of the sugar which came to Halifax was sent in the same small vessels to Montreal. We heard the hon. the Minister of Railways, the other night, make one of his astounding assertions on that point. He said he had the assurance of the Harbour Master of Montreal that the increase of harbour dues on vessels laden with sugar and coal amounted, last season, to \$40,000. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), chose to inform us that the entire increase in harbour dues at Montreal was \$40,000, and as this is the more reasonable statement, I feel bound to accept it. No doubt the increase from vessels laden with coal and sugar was considerable, but it was nothing like what the hon. Minister wished us to suppose. But what has the sugar Tariff done for the carrying trade of the country? The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson), suggested that if the shipping trade of Canada were to derive any benefit, the Government should so arrange matters that the sugar and molasses should be brought here in Canadian bottoms, in order to be exempt from the duty as packages. Previously, a large portion of the West India trade was done through Canadian vessels; but now, Canadian shipowners are not even left to do the best they can in the contest for the trade of the world; they are considerably handicapped by the increased duties on ships' materials. I believe it is a fact, beyond question, that a considerable quantity of sugar was brought from the West Indies to Montreal last year in foreign bottoms. Looking at the sugar question in any way, I think you must come to the conclusion that the Tariff confers no real benefit on the ship owners; that it does nothing to add to the trade and commerce of the country, and that, under the pretence of affording employment to some 300 or 400 persons in Montreal, the peo-

ple of the whole Dominion are taxed at least \$1,000,000, probably \$1,500,000, a year for the benefit of a few monopolists. It seems incredible that any Government, having time to reflect on the effects of such a policy, could persist in it. A more heartless, cruel, blind, unjustifiable monopoly never existed in any part of the country. Never did any Tudor or Stuart, in the worst times of the English monarchy, create a more cruel and unjustifiable monopoly. Never were individuals so empowered to plunge their hands into the pockets of the people, rich and poor, drag from them so much of the juice of the sweat and labour of the people, and transfer it to their own. We are told that we ought to look at the fact that those monopolists grow rich, build fine houses, and spend their money lavishly, and that the people are all the better for that. The people would like much better to have that money to spend themselves, to add to their comforts, conveniences and luxuries, than to be compelled to contribute millions to a few monopolists, to whom the Government, no doubt, look for help and assistance when their day of trial shall come. We were told, and we admitted, that the cotton interest would be greatly benefited by this Tariff; and I find from the returns brought down by the hon. the Finance Minister that the anticipations of both parties in this respect have been largely realised. The importation of all the cheaper kinds, grey coarse cotton jeans and denims, has greatly declined. This is not entirely due to the fact that the market is now supplied by our manufacturers, but largely to the impoverishment of the people, who have to buy less of cottons, as well as of other necessaries of life. I have no doubt our factories have supplied a very large part of the demand for those articles. We all know that, last year, or the year before, the Hudon Cotton Factory, of Montreal, declared a dividend of 27 per cent. Was not that sufficient to encourage the creation and growth of factories to supply the demands of this country? Must the people be taxed in order that the owners of those factories shall realise larger dividends than 27 per cent.? It may be said that some factories do not pay so much, and that some pay hardly anything. But why should a factory at

Montreal pay 27 per cent., and another, 100 miles away, pay little or nothing? The only reason must be that one is well, and the other badly, managed. But is the House to be told that the country must be taxed to make up for the want of skill and ability on the part of the unsuccessful manufacturers, and to enable those who have made 27 per cent. dividends to increase them to 30, 40, or 50 per cent.? In all these factories how many hands have been employed? We have heard of the increase in the Hudon Factory, in the St. John Cotton Factory, and in some others; but nobody has yet condescended to tell us how many additional hands are employed in all the factories, or how much additional wages the operatives receive under the National Policy. Those cotton factories employ, at the most, a few hundred hands.

MR. GAULT: They employ 3,000, of whom 1,000 are additional hands, engaged within the last twelve months.

MR. ANGLIN: Exactly. I thought so. All the comparisons made by these hon. gentlemen lie within the last twelve months.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Why not?

MR. ANGLIN: Because for six months before the last twelve the Conservative party was in power, and the country was withering under their Government—business being almost ruined.

MR. GAULT: There would not have been a factory in operation to-day but for the National Policy.

MR. ANGLIN: I believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gault) is a large shareholder in the Hudon Cotton Factory; but he was not content with the 27 per cent. dividend—he wanted more.

MR. MACKENZIE: How much does he get now?

MR. ANGLIN: The Montreal Sugar Refinery, which is not a new establishment, but an old one resuscitated, employs 300 hands, and the cotton factories 1,000 more hands, let us admit, and for that are all the people of the country, and particularly the poorer classes, who chiefly use the cheaper cottons—who hardly ever enjoy the luxury of linens—to be heavily taxed in order that those gentlemen, who divide large dividends among themselves, may be able to make them still larger?

MR. GAULT: I would like to inform

MR. ANGLIN.

the hon. gentleman that cotton is cheaper to-day than twelve months ago.

MR. ANGLIN: What is the duty on cottons? I have consulted many importers in the city in which I live, and they tell me that the duty ranges from 30 to 40 per cent. on the poorer kinds, which pay a higher duty than the better qualities. A very poor sort pays 60 per cent., and those inferior descriptions are still imported in very large quantities. If the owners of those mills could produce enough for the wants of the country, and supply the market at a reasonable price, not a single yard would be imported—nobody would import and pay high duties on cotton that could be bought more cheaply in Canada, and thus incur a loss. The fact that some millions of yards of cottons of this poorer class, not to speak of prints, are imported, is proof conclusive that the owners of those factories charge all they can for the cottons they produce. With regard to the manufacture of coarse woollens, we do not find that any additional number of operatives is employed. Nor have I heard of any new woollen mills, or of the enlargement of any of the old. I think there are very few more now than a year ago, and few more hands employed; and, therefore, the effect of the Tariff is not so much to increase production and employment in this branch, as to put additional profits into the pockets of those who own and manage those mills, by enabling them to charge higher prices. Can there be any doubt that higher prices are charged? Look at the mode in which woollens are dealt with under the Tariff. The light broad cloths come in at a comparatively low duty, while the heavy cloths, used chiefly by the working classes, labourers and mariners, are taxed from 40 to 60 per cent. I speak from the examination of actual invoices; and in one case, which may be an extraordinary one, I was assured that a quantity of heavy material, intended to make sacks for the poorest girls—stuff filled chiefly with shoddy, and bought at 1s. 8d. sterling in Great Britain—paid, in St. John, 80 per cent. duty.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is grinding the poor.

MR. ANGLIN: It is. The whole Tariff is framed to assist the rich and

grind the poor; to help the monopolists to grow richer, and increase the burdens of the masses. This abominable Tariff imposes 30, 40 and 50 per cent. on those woollens, to which must be added the importer's profits on the amount he pays as duty. It is the capitalists and not the working classes who have benefitted by the duties on sugar, cottons and woollens. The coal trade was also to have benefitted from the 50c. per ton imposed, and Nova Scotia coal was to have found its way as far as Toronto and Hamilton. The fact that another 10c. is to be imposed on bituminous coal is a confession that the Tariff has failed to give the markets of this country to the coal owners of Nova Scotia; and coal has been dearer than it should have been. We may be told that it was cheaper last summer than ever before. I paid less for it in St. John, N.B., but the 50c. per ton was included in the price I paid, making the article that much dearer. The member for Cumberland insisted it would be cheaper under the present Tariff, because there would be a much larger output. But the people of the United States, for some reason, furnished our markets with their anthracite coal at a low price, notwithstanding the duty, and the Nova Scotia coal did not go beyond Montreal in any considerable quantity. Having heard of the vast quantity of Nova Scotia coal that went up the St. Lawrence, notwithstanding the failure in the Cape Breton output, I was astonished, on looking at the Trade Returns, to find that the total quantity of bituminous coal sent by the United States to the Province of Quebec, last year, was only 37,000 tons; and that, if any larger quantity of Nova Scotia coal was sold in that Province, it must have displaced English coal. The pretence that the port of Montreal may be supplied with cheaper shipping, on account of the carriage to it of larger quantities of that coal by Nova Scotia vessels, is, therefore, one of the delusions which hon. gentlemen opposite love to spread. The small vessels that carry coal from Nova Scotia up the St. Lawrence, are not, as a rule, of the class employed in the grain trade. But the vessels that come out from Great Britain often bring coal as ballast, very cheaply, at rates just sufficient to pay port charges, and they can take cargoes back at lower rates than would be other-

wise possible; and so the commerce of Montreal, instead of being benefitted by the National Policy, has, in this direction, been greatly damaged. What about all the other industries of the country? How far have they been benefitted? How many will say they have derived any material advantage from that policy? The whole amount of our manufactures, exclusive of those to which I have referred, is not very considerable. The people were told, during the late political agitation, that our consumption of manufactures was so great that, if we could make all our own goods ourselves, large home industries and markets would be built up. New towns and villages were to spring up everywhere; new factories were to be reared on every stream, and our farmers were to have a great home market. Let us see how the Tariff affected farm produce. I have no doubt many believed, from having been so often told it, that, in the first place, it was very grievous that our farm products should be so heavily taxed in the United States, while there was no taxation on United States farm produce in Canada. But more than that, which was merely sentimental, they were led to believe that the imposition of duties would increase the price of flour and barley, and other agricultural products. A few evenings ago, an hon. gentleman, who professes to have a special regard for the farmers' interests, contended that the additional price obtainable for wheat was due to the National Policy, and not to the scarcity of wheat in Europe. He did not proceed to explain why the price of barley was lower; why the policy increased the price of wheat and diminished the price of barley? But I think the farmers of Ontario, who know that their surplus wheat all finds its way to the English, and their barley to the American, market, have learned by this time that the imposition of 15 cents per bushel upon American barley, that never came into the country, has not added to the price of barley in this country. If I am correctly informed, the price of the six million bushels of barley, sold by Ontario to the United States, was, on an average, 25 cents per bushel less this year than last year. The people in Great Britain and Europe have not yet learned to live upon barleymeal; and so the people of

Ontario have to depend upon the American brewer for the sale of their barley. The hon. member from Annapolis (Mr. Longley), spoke to us last evening about the price of agricultural products as being higher now. He did not assert positively, that this is due to the National Policy, but he would like to know what else caused it. Last year he talked feelingly about the cheese raised in Annapolis, and said the people would like to get a higher price for their cheese. I would ask him if he ever knew the price of cheese to be so low as it was all last summer? I think the best cheese was quoted at 6¼ cents in the Montreal market. Hon. gentlemen asserted last year, and the year before, that by an Act of Parliament, they could increase the price of cheese all over the world, and if they did not believe it themselves, unfortunately they caused a large number of the people of Canada to think so. Butter was never so low in the memory of man, in this country, as it was during the last year, in those months when the farmer had most to sell. Then, when the farmers had parted with nearly all they had to dispose of, and the people of England were able to use a little more butter, the price of butter rose, and thus we see that prices are regulated by the law of supply and demand, and not by legislative enactment. Now, let us talk a little about wool. The Annapolis valley is not remarkable for its production of wool, but Ontario produces a great deal. Wool was not meddled with last year, it was left just where it was, on the Free List, but that must have been because the hon. gentleman believed it was sufficiently protected. Some rather calumnious cities say it was left without Protection because there was nothing more to be gained from the farmers, and much was to be gained, perhaps, from the woollen manufacturers, and they wanted the price of wool kept down. Wool was neglected, and the price fell and continued to fall until a few months ago, when, owing again to the same laws of supply and demand, the price of wool suddenly rose. I heard hon. gentlemen on the other side deliberately assert that the price of wool had been enhanced by the operation of the National Policy, because the National Policy had created a great home demand, and this home demand had led to an advance in the price. The facts, how-

ever, that this home-grown wool is not used in the country at all, but is nearly all exported; but even if it had been used in the local market, and not exported, this would not have enhanced its price by 1c. per pound. Where and how have the farmers been benefitted? A kind Providence—not for the purpose of aiding the Tories in their struggle for the retention of power, but out of His beneficent regard for the welfare of the human family—blessed this country, last year, with an abundant harvest. Because of this abundant harvest, and of the failure of the harvest in Europe, we had not only a large quantity of wheat to sell, but we were able to get a high price for what we sold; but in everything for which we depended on the local market, the price declined. As compared with the price in former years, the amount lost by the farmers in Ontario, on the sale of their butter, cheese and wool, is something enormous. This is one of the reasons why we hear, to-day, complaints about the falling off in business in Ontario, which some attribute to the state of the roads. The true reason is that the farmers in Ontario have not received as much money this year for all their produce as people imagined they had received. But where was the promised home market? There is not a city or town in this country to-day, where the home market is as good as it was two years ago. In what city are there so many people to consume the products of the farm as there were two years ago? The home market has been as great a delusion as all the rest of the benefits that were promised by the hon. gentlemen on the other side. If prices have advanced in some articles it is solely because of a foreign demand. It is simply impossible that the farmers could have any considerable enlargement of the home market by reason of the increase in the manufactures of the country. It has been frequently demonstrated that if everything we import was manufactured in this country, the number of additional hands to be employed would not be as large as the population of an ordinary second class city. Hundreds, nay thousands, of our people have left this country, and the home market is consequently smaller to-day than it was many years ago. There has

been a considerable increase in the exportation of live stock at, perhaps, remunerative prices. It is a business which should be encouraged as much as possible, but it is a business to the future increase of which the National Policy presents serious obstacles. In the Lower Provinces, too, we have entered into that business. I have made it my business to make some enquiries respecting that business, and I was surprised to find that a considerable number of cattle were obtained in the Lower Provinces for shipment. Let me tell you why. In former years the butchers of St. John found it exceedingly difficult to supply the market of that city with meat of a proper quality. They bought up, not only all the prime beef cattle they could find in that Province, but they went largely into Nova Scotia and bought up all the cattle the county of Cumberland had to spare, and all the cattle Annapolis and Cornwall had to spare. They also went into Prince Edward Island and bought all the cattle and sheep they could find, and, after all that, they frequently had to go into Ontario and buy cattle, and sometimes they were even forced to go into the United States for beef. So large was the consumption of beef in St. John, in our better days, that all the cattle we could find in the Lower Provinces were barely sufficient for our market. To-day the demand has fallen so much that some thousands of heads of cattle have been shipped this season from the Lower Provinces. I made particular enquiries amongst the butchers in our market, and found that there was a very considerable diminution in the amount of the sales of beef and mutton in that city.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

CREDIT VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY
BILL.—[Bill 53.]

(Mr. Haggart)

BILL RECOMMITTED.

Order for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on the said Bill, read.

MR. MACKENZIE: I desire to ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works, as Chairman of the Railway Committee, if he thinks it consistent with public practice that a Bill like this, which is a compromise Bill, agreed upon before a

Sub-Committee, and afterwards brought before the General Railway Committee, and universally agreed to, should again be brought up to undergo complete and radical changes in Committee of the Whole. It is a thing I never saw done, and I think it an exceedingly objectionable practice. I ask my hon. friend to say whether, as Chairman of the Committee, he is disposed to support such a proceeding as that.

MR. HAGGART: There are no radical changes to be made in this Bill. The changes proposed are merely verbal.

MR. MACDONELL (North Lanark): I think, as said by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), that the changing of the Bill, after it has been reported to the House by the Committee on Railways, is a very bad practice. I believe the proper practice would be to discuss the Bill as reported, and without amendment.

MR. LANGEVIN: My attention was called to-day to these amendments to the Credit Valley Railway Bill, and I was asked how I felt in regard to them. My answer was, that the proper course would be to move the reference of the Bill back to the Railway Committee for reconsideration. With reference to the amendment, regarding the control of the Northern Railway Company, it will be remembered that the Committee insisted very strongly on these words: "Under the control of the Northern Railway Company;" for this reason: We heard evidence before that Committee—especially the evidence of a distinguished American engineer, who said that it was the general and universal practice of the United States, that wherever the trains of another company came through the yard of another company, from that moment those trains were necessarily under the control of the second company. That being the case, we, as a Committee, and it appeared the Committee were unanimous, thought that practice should be followed. I would, therefore, ask my hon. friend either not to insist on these amendments, or move that the Bill be recommitted for amendment.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I concur with everything said by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. It seems to me that the only way of amending the Bill is to relegate it back to the Committee.

MR. BOULTBEE: A point was taken in the Committee of so great importance that I should like for one, and I think other hon. members would also like, to have an expression of opinion from the Government on the subject. It seemed to myself, and other hon. members of the Committee, that it was rather dangerous legislation, on the application of a company chartered by the Provincial Parliament, to legislate against railways like the Grand Trunk, Great Western, and Northern Railways, under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and in favour of one not under its jurisdiction, because the result would apparently be this: The Credit Valley road, or any road similarly constituted, could come to this House and ask for legislation, such as this, affecting other roads under our jurisdiction; and it would be found, perhaps, within the next twelve months, that every one of these roads would be coming to this House for some kind of legislation or to make some alteration of what we have done. Then it was thought, and I think myself, that the Credit Valley might say: "You cannot legislate affecting us, because we are not under your jurisdiction." If that be the case then it must be unfair that we should pass legislation affecting the interests of those roads under Dominion jurisdiction. This road refused, in Committee, to allow a clause to be inserted bringing it under the jurisdiction of this House. If they would consent to the insertion of that clause then we might pass this legislation.

MR. MACDOUGALL: The point raised by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, was considered in the Committee, and, I think, decided against him; and I fancy it will not require very much argument to satisfy this House that it has authority to deal with the question involved in this Bill. I think the House can be speedily seized of the whole matter. If they will compare the Bill before us with the amendments proposed, they will see there is nothing in these amendments that need be referred back to the Railway Committee. It may be demonstrated, when we come to that stage, that the alterations are necessary, in order to make the Bill more clear, and to avoid difficulty hereafter. It will, perhaps, be well to explain to this House, briefly, the object of this Bill. This is a

Bill to enable a Railway extending from Toronto to St. Thomas, through the western part of Canada, to make its eastern terminus in the harbour of Toronto Bay. It is a local railway, chartered by the Local Legislature, heavily bonussed by Township, Town, and County Councils. It was inaugurated for the purpose of supplying an additional, and, as regards existing railways, an independent means of access by rail from the west. At St. Thomas it will unite with the Canada Southern. The people of Toronto, as a great commercial centre, are interested in this road, and they have given \$350,000 towards its construction, upon the express condition that it shall be an independent line. The people of Toronto were anxious to secure another line of railway, because the existing lines have established rates at such a point as to cause great disadvantage to the trade of Toronto. Now, as we approach the waters of the bay at Toronto, what do we find? We find the Northern Railway, in conjunction with the Grand Trunk, in possession of a piece of public land, part of the Ordnance Land of the Dominion, which blocks the way. They hold possession of this land without having paid anything for it. The Ordnance Officers who had charge of the Ordnance Lands at that time, protested against it, and they continued to protest until these lands, by an Act of the Imperial Parliament, came under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Government. They have remained in possession down to this time. Although they laid off a strip 100 feet wide, which is ample to provide for seven tracks, the moment they found the Credit Valley was about to apply to the Dominion Government for a license to occupy a small portion of this strip of public lands, they proceeded, by process of the Court of Chancery, to prevent them. They also appeared before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, for two days, with their lawyers and engineers, and argued at great length, and with great vigour, to persuade the Committee that no such permission should be given. But a license from the Crown was given to the Credit Valley Company; and upon that Company attempting to act upon their license, the Northern and Grand Trunk interfered again, and invoked the aid of

the Court of Chancery. The Court, taking into consideration the long occupancy of the other lines, and the apparent acquiescence of the Government, decided that the Credit Valley had no right to run over the land in question; as far as I understand the rules and doctrines of the Court of Chancery, they did perfectly right. No remedy was left but to come to this Parliament and ask its interference, for the purpose of cutting the Gordian knot, which prevented this Railway from getting access into the city. Practically, it was a physical impossibility to carry this line into the city of Toronto, without passing through a portion of the property so taken up by these railways. It was contended, on behalf of the Credit Valley Railway, that it would be proper to apply to Parliament, to exercise its jurisdiction and assist this important railway enterprise to reach the waters of the bay, and facilitate the commerce of the country. The Railway Committee has, by reporting this Bill, recognised that right and the power of Parliament to do what I have stated. The Committee has interfered, to the slightest extent that it was possible to interfere, with the lines and property of existing companies, to secure the object desired. But we find the Northern Railway managers have taken this Bill out of the hands of the Committee as well as the petitioners. This is not the Bill referred to the Committee. It is a Bill prepared by the Northern Railway manager and his legal advisers. I am surprised to find so much sympathy for the Northern Railway expressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I am sure his personal friends and fellow-citizens of Toronto will not sympathise much with the position he takes in this matter. This Bill is prepared by the Northern Railway Company, with all sorts of restrictions and limitations, by which they will obtain control of the Credit Valley Company's traffic. While we compel the Northern Railway to give the Credit Valley the use of a few rods of its track within the city of Toronto, for which the Credit Valley is to pay adequate compensation, we are made to say that this shall be for a particular kind of traffic only—legitimate traffic. I ask, what is legitimate traffic? I deny that there is any illegitimate traffic. Everything you

can put in a railway car, if destined for Toronto or Montreal, ought to be allowed to pass freely over the line. They have no right, on the grounds of public policy, to restrain or interfere with any traffic whatever which, coming from the east or the west, may pass over this Railway. I appeal to the members of this House, and to the members of the Committee, to come to the aid of this struggle for freedom, because this Credit Valley Railway will be a link in the chain between the cities of the east and the Railway system of the Great West. When the link between Ottawa and Toronto is completed, you will have an independent pair of rails from Halifax to the Detroit River, putting an end to the control of railway traffic at Toronto by the Northern and Grand Trunk. This line, with the Credit Valley and its connections, will give us another Grand Trunk from east to west of the old Provinces of the Dominion, and yet we are asked to give the Northern Railway the power to choke this traffic at Toronto by putting a rope round the neck of the Credit Valley at that point. Amendments must be made in this Bill. Some of its provisions are perfectly absurd. The Railway Committee, with all its wisdom, have allowed a provision by which the Company, not the property of the Company, but the Company may be leased or sold. If the Bill passes as it has been reported, I fear the Company will be sold. I trust the House will go into Committee on the Bill and hear the arguments in favour of amendments.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) has shown a great deal of interest in this Bill, and has thought proper to lecture me for the course I pursued with reference to the Bill. I never was the paid counsel of either company, and I was never in the position of being paid for services rendered to either, but merely had to enforce the claims of the nation against the Company.

MR. MACDOUGALL: Since the hon. gentleman has chosen to make a reflection it may be that he thinks he has done some injustice for which he wishes to make amends.

MR. MACKENZIE: I did not do anything unjust; but whenever I do, I will be the first to acknowledge it. This Bill was

prepared by the sub-Committee. I have as much confidence in the hon. members of that Committee as I have in the hon. member for Halton. I had no time to look at the effect that the amendments proposed would have on the Bill. The Committee represents, practically, more than the half of the House, and the Chairman of the Committee refused changes made by interested parties in this case. I do not know whether the Northern Railway are prepared to assent to these changes. It has come before us as a Compromise Bill agreed to by both companies before a sub-Committee; and we cannot at the instance of one of the parties, properly undertake to interfere again, after having adjudicated between the parties in a judicial sense. The hon. gentleman is eloquent; but he wastes his eloquence; no one denies that the Railway should be allowed to come into the city. There are cases where the control in a similar sense has been given to what I may call the superior company. When the Canada Southern wanted to obtain access to the bridge at Niagara the Great Western resisted that claim, and the matter came before the Committee if the Privy Council; an order was made that access should be given to the bridge, but that did not take the control out of the hands of the Great Western Company. In order to preserve order in a railway yard, and for the avoidance of accidents, one company or other must have the control of the track in that particular place. How can it be shown that the Credit Valley Company is the one to control the track though obligated to the other Company, and the other Company being the proprietor of the line? I have not had time to consider those amendments, and some of them, no doubt, require to be considered by legal gentlemen, to know the precise weight of the language used. That cannot be done here. Sometimes, as the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) has pointed out in this case, grammatical inaccuracies will creep into the construction of Bills. We had an amusing instance of this the other night. When the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue brought forward his Bill, there was one clause which we discovered was not grammatically constructed: it provided that every license should be open at all times to the public, and that the

Revenue Officer should be allowed to enter occasionally to see if everything was right inside. Of course it was never intended that the party himself, who took out a license, should be open at all hours; and if, in the present instance of the Credit Valley Railway Bill, the word "Company" should be left out, a matter of that sort may be corrected; but to endeavour to effect a radical change in the Bill, at the instance of one of the parties to a compromise, is a most extraordinary proceeding.

MR. MACDOUGALL: I will promise to make no radical change.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: The Credit Valley Railway Company applied to this Parliament, by a petition, for power to run into Toronto. On being referred to a Committee, all parties seemed to acknowledge that they should have the right to enter into Toronto. A distinguished engineer from the United States showed distinctly that running powers should be given, not only over the Northern, but over the Grand Trunk Railway. The Committee then felt that the Northern Railway Company should be dealt with; they felt it wrong to force a line over the Grand Trunk. The matter was referred to a sub-Committee; we heard evidence, and it was understood that all parties had come to an arrangement, this Bill being the result of the compromise. The Bill gives power to the Credit Valley Railway of running over the tracks of another railway entering Toronto. The engineer referred to said it would be absolutely necessary that, for the protection of life and property, this portion of the track should be under the control of the Northern Railway Company.

MR. MACDOUGALL: No one proposes to alter that.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: It is not proposed to alter that. What then?

MR. MACDOUGALL: It is to be run under the regulations of the Northern Railway Company.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: The promoters of this Bill seek, by Act of Parliament, to compel the Northern Railway to submit to such terms as the Credit Valley Railway Company, in connection with other railways to be built, may impose in reference to the traffic to be sent over the Northern line. The Northern

Railway Company should have some voice. However, the Credit Valley Company finally consented, with the Northern Company, to certain terms on that point. It was discussed before the sub-Committee, and I understood that the Credit Valley Company had abandoned that point, and the Bill was agreed to by the parties.

MR. MACDOUGALL: No, no.

SIR RICHARD. J. CARTWRIGHT: I think if they did not agree, they ought to have agreed. I am satisfied this House would not give them the powers they ask for. It is proposed to make a change in the second clause of the Bill. I am not prepared to say how material that proposed change is. This is a matter that requires to be looked into, as a matter of evidence before the Committee. I do not wish the House to adopt the changes, because they have not been considered properly. I do not see how anything of the sort can be done without a reference back to the Committee.

MR. CASEY: I think the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) is inclined to push the rules of practice of Parliament to an extreme extent. The question is, whether the Bill should be modified in any considerable degree as it has come from the Committee of Railways. It would be extreme to hold that it should not. In fact, I believe that the average attendance in the Committee of the Whole House is not larger than the attendance at the Committee of Railways when so interesting a Bill as this comes up. Therefore, in point of numbers we are quite as competent to discuss the matter here as before the Committee. It is true that a Bill was sent to a sub-Committee, but this Bill is considerably modified from that one. The question is, whether the proposed amendments are such as should properly be considered in Committee of the Whole, or whether they require the Bill to be re-committed. I do not think we could properly discuss that in regard to the junction of the railways here, but I do not think there is any difficulty in the way of our discussing the other points. The question is, whether we should accept the dictum of the Committee. Looking at all the points involved, I do not think there is any valid reason why we should not go into Committee on the Bill.

MR. OLIVER: I think the Chairman of the Railway Committee has stated that the proposed amendments must be considered in the Railway Committee. It would be better for the promoters of the Bill to have it referred to the Committee forthwith, so that it may be considered as soon as possible. I, therefore move in amendment, that this Bill, No. 53, and the amendments proposed thereto, be referred to the Railway Committee, forthwith.

MR. LANGEVIN: Notice has been given of the amendments, but they have not yet been read before the House. If the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), would add to his motion, that the Committee of the Whole be instructed to consider those amendments, I would then move to discharge the order, and re-commit the Bill to the Railway Committee, with instructions to consider the amendments submitted to the House. The Committee has given a great deal of time to the consideration of this measure. We thought it was a Compromise Bill, but there appears to be now some difficulty about it. The Bill can be re-committed, and the Committee will report it back as soon as possible.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: It appears to me, it would be better to make the reference at once, because some conclusion may be arrived at by the parties interested.

MR. BOULTBEE: I think if the Credit Valley is allowed to make amendments, the other Railway ought to be allowed the same privilege.

MR. OLIVER: The Northern Railway Company are perfectly satisfied with the Bill now before the House, but those representing the Credit Valley Railway did not agree to it when before the Committee. There is not the slightest danger of the Northern Railway desiring any new amendments.

MR. HAGGART: I move that the Order be discharged, and the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, with instructions to consider the amendments.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it would be improper to refer the Bill back with instructions to consider the amendments. It must be referred back generally or not at all. I think it is contrary

to Parliamentary practice, that when a Bill has been considered before the Railway Committee, and especially in the manner in which this Bill has been considered, for the Committee of the Whole to consider a lot of amendments such as has been proposed to this measure. Those amendments involve questions of facts upon which evidence should be taken, and it would not be proper to test the sense of the House upon them in the manner proposed.

MR. MACKENZIE: It we give instructions to the Committee to consider those amendments they cannot consider anything else, and we could not give a Committee of the Whole House the power those gentlemen expect. In my opinion it is absolutely foolish to press the motion as it stands.

Motion (*Mr. Haggart*) agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.—(*Sir Samuel L. Tilley.*)

MR. ANGLIN: My attention has been called to the fact that, in adding up the amount of the deficit for the last and current year, I improperly included in the amount the sum of \$300,000 placed in the Estimates for the year commencing the 1st July next, to cover the cost of surveying lands in the North-West. That deducted from the amount I made the deficit to be, would leave the deficit for the two years \$3,700,000. I find, also, that I omitted, when comparing the amounts of imports and exports for the two periods of five years each, to direct attention to the fact that from the winter of 1867 to the time we met here, in 1868, there was a duty of 25c. a barrel on flour, which might, more from the mode of keeping accounts than anything else, have apparently affected the amount of imports and exports. Then, again, in 1870, duties were imposed on flour and grain, and I presume the same effect must have been produced by the mode of keeping the accounts. This would, apparently, decrease the imports and exports in those particular years to some extent, but to what extent I am not prepared to say. Before recess, I was considering the effect of the Tariff on the farming interests of the country. To the

statement I made in regard to the reduction in the price of farm produce, I might have added, that the price of hay is lower than it has been for many years, and that, taking it all in all, the intelligent farmer has little to thank the hon. gentleman opposite for, in respect of the National Policy. It was stated that the price of rye has been higher during the past season than in some previous seasons; but, in fair play and justice, it ought to have been added, that the price of rye in Chicago was sometimes actually higher than it was in Toronto. At all events, it would be very easy to demonstrate that the imposition of the duty has not, in the slightest degree, tended to increase the price of rye. I have spoken of cattle feeding, and the exportation of cattle, as a growing trade, and one which ought to be encouraged; but that trade is seriously discouraged by the National Policy, because it almost prohibits the farmers of Ontario and other parts of the Dominion from buying cattle in the United States for the purposes of feeding, and it imposes a duty of 7½c. on corn, which is necessary for the feeding of the cattle. The United States shippers are exporting more cattle than we are. The farmers have the advantage of having a free market in which to buy their animals for purposes of feeding, and they are able to buy their grain at cheaper rates than our farmers. More than that, I am informed and believe, that the freight for cattle from Boston has been on an average \$5 a head less than the freight from Halifax, although the sea voyage from the latter port is shorter than from Boston. Then all the goods which the farmer buys have been increased in price; and although he may not be absolutely compelled to pay more for his sugar, he has the consolation of knowing that 1 cent per pound of the duty he does pay does not go into the Treasury but into the pockets of the monopolists. I should, perhaps, have spoken of the tea trade when I spoke of sugar. We were told that under the present Tariff an important direct trade with China and Japan would be created, but this promise also is unfulfilled, and the only effect of the change is to harass the grocers of all the Provinces, and somewhat increase the price of tea without increasing the Revenue.

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

On the whole quantity of tea imported into the Dominion, the amount of duty paid, as compared with the amount paid under the old Tariff, shows a reduction of just one-half of one per cent.

MR. DOMVILLE: No.

MR. ANGLIN: My accuracy can be easily tested by an honest use of arithmetic. If we consider that some millions of pounds of tea are now imported nominally from China and Japan, that these only pay the lower rates of duty, while the consumers have to pay to the importers something very near the 10 per cent. differential duty, it will be found that although the Treasury loses one-half of one per cent. on all the tea imported, the public pay quite as much as before on black teas, and more on green teas. The average duty on green teas, bought in the United States, was over 7 cents per pound. I think the hon. the Finance Minister will find that we do not gain anything on tea, by reason of the change of duties. What effect has this Tariff had on the general trade of the country? An hon. gentleman, speaking here one or two evenings ago, pointed to the fact that the price of bank stocks are, to-day, somewhat higher than they were a short time ago. Immediately before the fall of the late Government and the accession of the present, the stock of the Bank of Montreal stood at 171. What is it to-day? The price has been very much lower than it is to-day. Scarcely had the present Ministers warmed their seats before the price of bank stocks began to tumble. One of their promises was that, after they were returned to office, bank stocks would advance immediately. The hon. Premier, addressing a public meeting in Ottawa, some months after his return to power, had the courage to assert that the prices of bank stocks had advanced as a consequence of their victory, when in reality they had tumbled down, so that at that moment they were worth many millions less than when Mr. Mackenzie's Government fell. Montreal Bank stock now varies from 140 to 141, there being to-day a decrease in the value of the whole stock, since this Government was formed, of \$3,600,000. Other stocks have fallen in like proportion, and three banks have failed since the late Government was defeated. We are asked: Was

the failure caused by the National Policy? We answer: If all the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite had been fulfilled, or had any foundation in reason, common sense, or truth, those banks would not have failed, and stocks would not have declined. We do say that the accession of the present Government to office, has had a material influence in bringing about this disastrous state of things. If we enquire how this Tariff affects the business of importers, we find, from one end of the country to the other, one uniform complaint with regard to it. I think the hon. the Minister of Finance says, that even the importers, of late, have become reconciled to the National Policy. I would like to know in what town or city they are reconciled to it. In St. John I have heard nothing but complaints. One reason is, that it requires a great deal more capital than formerly to carry on business to the old extent, the duties being so much higher, and having to be paid in cash the moment the merchant wants his goods. That cash he often finds it hard to procure, even at large interest; thus, in proportion to his stock and sales, he requires a much larger capital than formerly. The increased price of the goods, in consequence of the higher duties, contributes much to the diminution of his sales. The hon. the Minister of Finance delights in the fact that importations have been greatly reduced. Now the import trade is a valuable one. Importers all over the country complain loudly that they are embarrassed by the additional burdens, in the first place, and by being compelled to use a large capital for no larger amount of business. Besides, the Tariff is so framed as to be as vexatious as possible to every importer. Nothing could exceed the trouble and annoyance it is calculated to produce to this interest. In a letter I received from St. John since I came to Ottawa, a complaint, often made, is renewed: that the importer of a bale of cotton was treated by the Customs authorities as if something was wrong. The ordinary entry was rejected and the ordinary oath proffered by a most respectable house was deemed insufficient, because some of the officers chose to think there was something doubtful in the transaction; so the whole bale had to be measured piece by piece to see

what duty ought to be paid. The question as to the way in which the goods should be rated is raised continually. We heard, last year, that persons were brought from various parts of the country, and some from the United States, and engaged in the rough work of framing a Tariff under the supervision of the hon. the Minister of Finance; also, that a gentleman of high standing in the community was brought in to assist in the work of revision; and we thought we had a complete Tariff after going through the form of passing the law. But after all one of their Board had to be appointed to say how the law should be interpreted, and what regulations should be framed, and to their most extraordinary regulations the trade was compelled to submit; so that an importer now hardly knows how his entry ought to be made out, and under what rating he should put certain classes of goods. The hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson), last evening, read some extracts from a report made to the Board of Trade, Halifax, presided over by a most respectable importer, brother, I think, of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDonald). That report condemned the Tariff in strong language, in which the President warmly concurred. Mr. Burns, one of the most respectable merchants of Halifax, a strong supporter and admirer of the hon. the Minister of Railways—a man thoroughly attached, as a rule, to the party now in power—one of the mildest of men—denounced the Tariff as infamous, calling it a diabolical Tariff. The whole trading community, if they spoke their honest feelings, would join in that expression. It is a Tariff which not only oppresses the poor and favours the wealthy, but imposes on the traders all the trouble and annoyance possible. With regard to the effect of the Tariff on imports from the United States and Great Britain, the hon. the Finance Minister asserts that it is more favourable to British than American trade. He, last year, made the very indiscreet declaration, that this Tariff was framed for the purpose of excluding American merchants and of bringing the Americans to their senses with regard to trade matters. He said it would favour British trade. What has been the result? During the last year a great revolution has taken place in the

trade of Great Britain and the United States, which the hon. gentleman could not have anticipated, but which has entirely favoured his theory. We were told two or three years ago that, because the Americans were able to send into Canada large quantities of cotton and other goods, that was a proof of the prosperity of that country and of the success of Protection, and a proof that under Protection manufacturers could, in time, produce goods at a cheaper rate than under Free-trade; that thus the Americans were becoming the rivals of the British manufacturers, whose goods they were driving out of the markets of the world. Some of us, on this side, ventured to say that, instead of that being a proof of the prosperity of the manufactures of the Republic, it was a proof of their distressed condition; that there was a worse market for their goods at home; that labour had become cheap, and that they were compelled, in many instances, to sell to raise money. What has since happened, thoroughly proves the entire inaccuracy of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the entire accuracy of our views of the situation. Prosperity has returned to the United States—not suddenly, as some suppose; because, for three or four years past, they have been exporting enormous quantities of their produce to Europe, and importing considerably less—because they could not afford to buy more, being comparatively poor then, and largely indebted. But, in the course of time, they succeeded in paying off a great deal of their indebtedness, and accumulating some capital, and suddenly, when everything was ripe for a change, a change took place, and we heard of a return of great prosperity to the United States. That prosperity of nearly 50,000,000 of people, consuming more of the necessaries and luxuries of life, than any other people on the face of the globe, reacted in Great Britain, and we find the entire course of trade in some articles changed. The Americans, instead of exporting cotton goods largely, as before, to compete with those of Great Britain, began to import enormous quantities. The price of iron, previously so low, suddenly rose, because with prosperity came a demand for new railroads, for the repairing of old roads, and other improvements. The price of woollens

went up in the United States. To those ready to jump to conclusions, and say that because sugar and flour are cheaper we pay no additional duty, it would seem that, because those changes followed the National Policy, they were an effect of it. But, notwithstanding the operation of all those causes and the National Policy, we find that British trade with Canada has been very much more seriously affected by the Tariff than the trade of the United States. The hon. the Finance Minister contends that you must combine free and dutiable goods in making this calculation. Well, under the present Tariff, we do not admit cereals as we formerly did—they are no longer taken into account as part of our imports—they go through in bond, and out of the country, and to that extent the reduction in imports from the United States is merely a matter of account-keeping. I think that every Canadian, who regards the character of this country before the world, must have felt ashamed when he read that a gentleman, commissioned by the Government, deputed to appear before the assembled representatives of the Boards of Trade of Great Britain and Ireland, at Belfast, in describing the character of our trade, included among the imports the cereals that passed through the country from the United States to Europe. He could not have made that statement through error or mistake. It reflects neither credit nor honour on Canada that such a statement was made. It was pointed out by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), more than once, that we receive from the United States large quantities of raw materials, not the product of the Republic—including nearly all the wool used by the manufacturers of this country; large quantities of hides and of many other articles which merely pass through the United States to Canada, because that is the most convenient way of importing them from the countries in which they are produced. But when we come to look at our trade with Great Britain, we find she supplied us with nearly all the woollens we imported, and we find they are burthened more heavily than any other importations. The duties on these are increased to 25, 50 or even 70 per cent.; therefore, we succeed in excluding, to a great extent, woollen im-

portations from Great Britain. Cottons are also heavily burthened. We would have continued to receive them in large quantities from Great Britain but for the National Policy. But the coarse cottons formerly received, partly from the United States and partly from Great Britain, are excluded to a great extent by the operation of this policy. So, all the imports of iron, steel, tin, and those articles imported from Great Britain, which came in either free or at low rates of duty, have all been heavily taxed. If we turn to the United States, we find that none of the great staples received from that country are taxed so heavily. The average duty on British goods has increased $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., while on those imported from the United States, the average has increased only 1 per cent. If we take the whole goods now imported, both free and dutiable, we will still find that the average rate imposed on importations from Great Britain is higher than the average rate on importations from the United States. We are told that this has produced no feeling of irritation in Great Britain. Because the hon. the Finance Minister was able to effect a good loan there when money was a drug in the market, he concludes that the people of Great Britain do not feel indignant at a policy calculated to exclude their manufactures from our markets. Last summer the hon. the Finance Minister proceeded on a semi-royal tour through the Dominion, to ascertain how this wonderful Tariff of his was working, and learn if any material changes were required in it. This, we were told, was a wonderful act of policy on his part. He was, in this way, to learn more than any other Finance Minister ever knew. He himself gave us, when he made his last speech, an account of his progress through Ontario, which resembled very much what we saw in newspapers at the time. He said that, in London, he visited nineteen factories in one day. It was in the month of December, and you can fancy what any hon. gentleman, no matter how acute he might be and however ready to be crammed, could ascertain of the condition of nineteen factories in one short winter's day, travelling from one to the other, rushing into a factory, shaking hands with the principle proprietors,

and one or two others, and exclaiming: How do you do? How do you like the Tariff? Is it working well? I am in a great hurry; show me as quickly as you can what you are doing. We are told that in many instances the workmen are suddenly transferred from one room to another, so as to make the numbers appear larger; it was a great opportunity for the proprietors to advertise themselves, and many availed themselves of it. It would be a very extraordinary thing if these gentlemen, instead of saying that they were doing a prosperous business, that they had no difficulties to encounter, should have said: Well, Sir, instead of being as well off as people generally suppose, we find ourselves in great difficulties, we are not selling our goods as well as formerly. We have to pay more duty on this, and more duty on that, and we do not like your policy. There were some, it seems, who had grievances and who stated them. The hon. gentleman told us that in one place he went to a factory and found the owner had gone away. Some one questioned the proprietor about this, and he answered: O, well, he was a Liberal, and he did not want to be there and to be forced to acknowledge he was doing so well, and he thought he would keep out of the way. We heard of many other instances, however, in which the hon. the Finance Minister took care to pass by on the other side of the street, and so to avoid factories that were not in a flourishing condition, or in which he knew he would not be welcomed. The hon. gentleman tells us that one large manufacturer of agricultural implements told him that he was paying at the present time some \$6,000 or \$7,000 in additional duties upon his raw material, and yet he asserts that that man is prospering under the Tariff. Why? Because he makes such large sales that, although it costs him so much more for his material, and owing to the competition from the United States, he cannot obtain higher prices for his implements, nevertheless his profits are on the whole greater than before. These must seem extraordinary statements when we remember that before this Tariff was adopted agricultural implements were not imported into Ontario except for patterns, and the manufacturers had the whole trade of the country to themselves. How

Mr. ANGLIN.

the increase was to be accounted for, and why this particular manufacturer was able to sell so many more than before, I think would be a subject for an enquiry that would not lead to results very satisfactory for the hon. gentleman opposite. But the newspapers said the hon. gentleman did not visit all the factories in those towns, and that some he carefully shunned, acting under the instructions of the gentlemen who accompanied him on his rounds. I do not remember that it was reported to us that he ever conversed with the workingmen, or made any enquiries of them as to their position under the National Policy. The hon. gentleman, however, did tell us that in one place, where the proprietor was a Liberal, the workingmen wanted to give him a cheer, and did give him a cheer. How much or how little information that conveys to us I am not prepared to say. He got his cheer, and, let me say, he wanted a cheer from the workingmen badly. That is the only one I heard of his getting. In another place, the manufacturer informed him that he was compelled to pay higher wages to his workmen, and why? The hon. gentleman was kind enough, or indiscreet enough, to tell us. This manufacturer did not say: "I pay higher wages to my workmen because I get a higher price for my goods and can afford to pay higher wages; but I must pay higher wages, because if I do not my workmen will go to the United States, where their labour is now in demand." So where there has been any increase of wages, it, is due, not to the National Policy, but to the fact that wages are higher in the United States than they have been. He told us of a case in Almonte where, while visiting one of the mills, an increase of 10 per cent. in the wages was announced. I happen to know a little about that case. I had the pleasure last year of paying a visit to Almonte, and of visiting this same woollen factory of which Mr. Rosamond is the proprietor. That factory seemed to be managed with great skill and ability. Mr. Rosamond conducted me over the establishment, and permitted me to witness the various operations which were going on. I can quite understand that the hon. Minister would feel a deep interest in visiting a factory of this kind, but what he could learn there that

would assist him in framing a Tariff was more than I discovered during my visit. Some weeks after my visit to Almonte, I was speaking to the hon. gentleman who represented the district at that time, and whose loss, I am sure, we all deeply deplore. I asked him how my friends at Almonte were getting on. "Oh!" he said, "I forgot to tell you; a week or two after you were up there the workmen in the woollen factories were informed that they must work each an hour a day more or submit to a reduction of 10 per cent. on their wages." And that reduction was made—not while Mr. Mackenzie was in power, not while those terrible Grits were ruining the country, but a month after the National Policy had gone into operation. We heard during the summer that business was actually suspended in all the woollen mills throughout the country, for two whole months. People did say that the suspension was for the purpose of enabling the proprietors to work off their surplus stock, and they alleged themselves, it was to enable them to clean their machinery and put it in order; but whatever the cause, the workmen in these establishments were for two whole months on the streets without wages and without employment, while the National Policy was in full force. The story is that, when the hon. gentleman was visiting that establishment in Almonte, the men were assembled, and on a door was written in large letters: "An increase of 10 per cent. will be made in the wages in this mill after the 1st of December." This only brought the wages up to the point they had been at during the time of the Mackenzie Administration. A gentleman told me that to this day only part of the men had received that increase of wages, and that never, in his recollection, was the village of Almonte in such a distressed condition as it is at this very day. The hon. gentleman then took us down to Montreal. He spoke of a large additional number of men being employed there. He talked of the sugar refinery; he talked of the Hudon factory, but we did not hear much about his visit to Montreal. He was challenged with not having visited his own poor city of St. John, and after that he did go to St. John, and he went through some of the factories there. His own account of those visits, even taking it as it stands,

was rather a lugubrious account of a city once flourishing. He admits that the door and sash factories were not doing a large business. He says that was because of the fire. This seems to be his mode of accounting for everything that has gone wrong in St. John for some years past. But he did not venture to say they were doing as much business to-day as they did before the fire. When I said a few words with regard to St. John, on a former evening, the hon. the Minister of Finance misapprehended what I said. I endeavoured to point out that I was not comparing the present state of things in St. John with what existed immediately after the fire, but with the state of the city before the fire took place. The hon. gentleman, however, seemed to say that I was comparing the state of things at present with the state of things when there was a great rush of business of some kinds, immediately after the fire. If St. John were a prosperous city to-day, its door and sash factories should be doing almost as much business as they did four or five years ago. He did not visit the Colebrook rolling-mill and nail factory, about which something has been said, from time to time, in this House. The Colebrook nail factory was in existence twenty-five years ago, and then doing a prosperous business. Fifteen years ago, the Colebrook rolling-mills were established, and they continued to do a prosperous business. Under the management of a gentleman, now a member of this House, these mills were enlarged, and did a larger business. That gentleman himself told me that the amount of wages paid in the rolling-mills and nail factory amounted to \$12,000 a month, they used up some 4,000 or 5,000 tons of iron in a year, and some 6,000 or 7,000 tons of coal, and they did, ostensibly, a flourishing business. The rolling-mills were in operation the day the National Policy came into force, and so was the nail factory. Both those factories are silent to-day. Nothing has been done in them for some time past. It may be said the work done in those establishments is done somewhere else. That is not the case. The hon. Minister did visit a comparatively small rolling-mill belonging to Mr. Harris, and a still smaller establishment owned by Mr. Chesley, and both stated that they were then fully employed.

But the rolling-mill of Mr. Harris was in operation while the Colebrook mills were in existence. Mr. Chesley's mill or factory is a small one, and I hope it will be successful; but putting all together there is not in that class of business one-half the business done in the city of St. John that was done before the fire. There was another rolling-mill back on what we call the Shore, where a large business was done for some years, and I think it was in operation when the National Policy became law, but it has been idle for some time. We had a safe factory doing a large business for some years, but it is to-day idle. We have machinists' shops, that formerly did a large business, which are now comparatively idle and have only a few men employed. The hon. gentleman went to the establishment of Messrs. Fleming and Son, and there he was met with complaints that the duty on the raw material was so large, that it interfered very much, indeed, with their business, and even there, much less business is done than was done in years gone by. So, if you go from establishment to establishment, you find the same result. He went to Mr. Moore's nail factory, and, I believe, he did not like all that was told him there. The horse-shoe nail manufacturers also made numerous complaints. He visited our carriage factory, and was told that the number of hands employed was not half of the number employed the year previous, and yet the stock was accumulating. He visited another, and was shown where ten fires were going a year before, and only two were going then. He told us much of the success of Mr. Levi Young's nut and bolt factory. Now I come to Mr. Young, who is a very enterprising man, a man who has had a great many difficulties to encounter, and who is of a very sanguine disposition. That gentleman started, a great many years ago, a nut and bolt factory, and the factory he had in operation then was very much larger than the factory in existence to-day. The hon. the Minister of Finance told us that gentleman had six months' orders in advance, and that the company he has formed are about to build a larger factory. I am told that he has induced some persons to take stock in the company, and that a larger establishment is

to go up. But with regard to the six months' orders in advance, those orders, it is said, have been received almost entirely through the instrumentality of the hon. the Finance Minister himself, for railway and other work. I do not complain of that gentleman receiving a share of the Government work, but of the misleading statement of the hon. Finance Minister. Knowing Mr. Young, and how sanguine he is, I said to the hon. Finance Minister, whom I met opposite Mr. Young's establishment: "If you find the hum anywhere you will find it here." He seemed to misunderstand my meaning, for he replied: "I do not know about that;" and I returned: "I do not mean that you will find it all through St. John, but you will find the hum here if you find it anywhere in the city." The hon. gentleman visited some boot and shoe factories, and subsequently, at a meeting held at Fredericton, he stated that he found the boot and shoe business in St. John in a very flourishing and prosperous condition. Now, how much good could the boot and shoe trade of St. John owe directly to the hon. gentleman's policy? I looked into the returns when the hon. gentleman repeated that statement here, and I found that the whole quantity of boots and shoes imported into the Province of New Brunswick, in 1879, amounted to a few dollars over \$20,000. If the National Policy excluded every boot and shoe formerly imported from Great Britain, France, and the United States, it would afford but little additional employment to the boot-makers of St. John. Just at the time he arrived in the city, the winter trade had brought about a temporary revival in this business. Some of the establishments were running full time, but if he had enquired he would have found that, during the summer and fall, they had been running on half, and two-thirds, or three-quarters time, and he would have found that in none of them was employed the number of hands employed four or five years ago. If he had questioned the workmen he would have found that they were only earning from 50 to 75 per cent. of the wages they were earning five years ago. Some of the establishments he visited closed down a few weeks afterwards. I think he will recollect that a very particular friend of

his own told him that the boot and shoe trade was suffering, because the market was flooded with bankrupt stocks from Montreal, and not because of a competition with Americans. I received from many of the workmen in the establishments he visited, information that the hon. gentleman had gone in and out without condescending to speak to them, or to ask them how they were getting on. He would not have ignored them, if he expected them to say to him: "We are very much obliged to you and delighted with the National Policy. Since it was adopted we have had ample employment and we are not merely earning as good, but better wages than before." If he thought that they would have replied in that strain, he would not have passed them by. But he never once asked them what they thought of the National Policy. An establishment the hon. gentleman did not visit, was that of Mr. Adam Young. For years and years Mr. Adam Young employed from thirty to forty men, at high wages, manufacturing stoves and castings of various kinds. Mr. Young told me, just before I left St. John, that he had had to suspend operations for two or three months, and he added, that he never felt so humbled as when, a few days previously, he saw one of the men who had worked for him, earning \$2.50 to \$3 a day, working as a scavenger at 50c. a day. The hon. gentleman might have visited a new industry established in the city of St. John. In order to save a number of the poorest of the poor from actual starvation, the corporation of the city employed them this winter to break stones, at rates that enabled them to earn about \$2.50 a week. The hon. gentleman might have heard the click of their hammers as he passed, and he might have congratulated himself upon having found the "hum" at last. Such was the condition of St. John when he visited it. Worse was its condition a very short time afterwards. The hon. gentleman, it has been said, did not visit the shipyards. Shipbuilding is one of the great industries of St. John, and here I desire to say, with reference to the attack that has been made upon the character of the vessels registered in New Brunswick, that a more foul calumny on a great interest was never uttered. There was a time last fall when there was

not a vessel of any size on the stocks in the St. John district. The hon. gentleman referred to a fleet of vessels coming to St. John this fall, and he seemed to regard it as a sign of returning prosperity. It was a fortunate accident for the city of St. John. Longshoremen were suffering because they had had very little employment during the fall. Hundreds were on the verge of starvation, when a large number of vessels, unable to obtain grain freights at New York, came to St. John, shipped lumber at low freights, and thereby afforded employment to many of our men for a few weeks. A large amount of good was done in this way; but will the hon. member pretend to say that the coming down of those ships from New York, in consequence of the blockade in the grain trade, was due to the National Policy? But let me return. There was a dearth of grain in Europe. We had large crops on this continent, and we forwarded a large amount of grain to Europe. That stimulated the rates of freight. It also, to a slight extent, stimulated the shipbuilding trade in St. John, and a few vessels were on the stocks when the hon. gentleman visited the city. Had he visited the yards and spoken to the artisans employed in them, he would have found that where, in the past, they had been paid from \$1.50 to \$2.25 a day, they were then paid from 75c. to 90c. a day, and in one yard they were compelled to take a part of their pay in orders upon a store. That is the report I heard, and I am afraid matters are not in a very much better condition in that respect yet. I do not think that anyone hearing my statement will believe that the National Policy has done much, at all events, for St. John. There were not employed in skilled labour, in St. John, two-thirds as many then as were employed two years before and down to the time of the fire, and scarcely one-half the wages paid formerly have been paid during the last year. I am sorry that very much the same state of things exists in other parts of the Dominion. We had a statement of Mr. Everett, the chairman of an association of mechanics and manufacturers, laid before us last year, showing what number of skilled labourers were employed in St. John. The hon. the Minister of Finance attacked the hon. member

for Queen's for presuming to analyse the statements put forward, because he, forsooth, had meddled in the affairs of St. John, and showed that a very large number were men employed in the lumber mills. I wish we had a few men like the hon. member for Queen's to help to build up our city. He has a large interest in the city of St. John, and, apart from that, as a member of this House, he had a right to enquire into the statements of the hon. gentleman. I met that same Mr. Everett, and spoke to him on this subject, last fall. I said: "Mr. Tilley (he then was) has used your name in the House of Commons in connection with some figures. Will you be kind enough to give me the number of skilled labourers employed in the city to day, so that I may judge how the National Policy is working?" He promised he would, and after pressing him one day for this information he said: "You may, in a rough way, say, let me see—you say Mr. Tilley said they were reduced one-half in 1878—well, you may state that the number has again been reduced one-half. I employed last year just twice as many men as I employ now. I am doing as well as anyone else in the foundry business, but I have been compelled to reduce my men's wages 25 per cent. within a week. I told them if they could do better anywhere else, they could go. I would, of course, be sorry to part with them, but what could I do? However, they would not leave; there was then little employment in the United States, so they were compelled to remain." This, Sir, is the wonderful prosperity conferred upon us by the National Policy. As the result of those enquiries, those visits to factories and cities and towns, what have we got? Great things. We expected, when a Finance Minister condescended in person to go and make such enquiries, that great results must follow. Well, we have before the House resolutions to amend the resolutions of last year. What do they amount to? We have the duty on artificial flowers and feathers changed, the duties on books increased, 10c. added to the duty on coal, a few articles added to the Free List, the meaning of some passages in the resolutions of last year defined, and that is about all. The hon. gentleman referred with

great gusto to a new factory erected in St. John; but he should have told us the result of his visits to the leading factories. Had he found them in a flourishing condition, in a great state of prosperity? The hon. gentleman presents the position of an odd few in roseate hues, and quoted an editorial puff about a new furniture factory. Why did he not tell us how he found the old, long-established furniture factories doing? Were these flourishing or depressed? Of course, it is exceedingly delicate—

An Hon. MEMBER: You have not shown any great delicacy to-night.

MR. ANGLIN: Exceedingly delicate to make statements publicly about firms that are in a depressed condition. Why does he not call upon the hon. member for Toronto to state how many additional men he has been able to employ in furniture making, and what higher rate of wages he can afford to pay since the Tariff came into operation. He has visited the factories, and now he comes the down and proposes that a certain class of mattresses should take rank with some other kind; and he has proposed the imposition of a tax upon wool not used to any extent in Canada, but grown in Canada, and exported; and he has made a few unimportant changes, all in the direction of greater protection. He has also made a few changes to render the work of the Collectors of Customs more easy. He has provided that gloves made of cloth shall be regarded as gloves. He does not touch the great questions which chiefly interest the importers of dry goods; but he provides that demijohns, containing vinegar, shall be subject to duty. Such are the wonderful changes resulting from those important visits to the factories. I think, Sir, the despondent people of Cape Breton, and many others who imagined that their grievances would find redress during this Session, will be disappointed. Let us see what effect on the various classes of this country this National Policy has had. In Cape Breton we find that the miners are heavily taxed, the output of coal being very much smaller than formerly, and the wages less. There is a great amount of suffering there. We are asked to look at the late elections there as evidence of their approval of the National Policy. Those who so argue

seem to forget that anybody has ever heard of what has transpired in that county. There are a great many men who are popular independently of their political proclivities, and the popularity of the candidate has very much to do with the result of nearly every election. Sometimes, too, there are influences that hon. gentlemen do not care to discuss which operate in these elections; but this can truly be said of all the elections that have taken place in every county since 1878, with one or two exceptions, in which the hon. gentlemen opposite were successful. They were also successful after the Pacific Scandal was exposed. The county that was not carried away from its attachment to the Tory party by that scandal, could not, we may well suppose, be carried away from them by the National Policy. At the Cape Breton election we know that such Protection was promised to the coal interest as would force Nova Scotian coal into the markets of the Upper Provinces, and it was plainly stated that if Mr. McKay were elected no such increase of duty need be expected. We know, moreover, what influence was exercised in most constituencies by the Government: that three or four years of the time of the present Parliament are yet to run. While they are willing to point to those elections, they deny that the result of the Ontario Elections is any evidence of a change of opinion in that Province. Mr. Mowat, at the late elections, protested that it was wrong to introduce any such issue into what should have been a local contest, to be fought out on local questions. That was the proper ground; but he was unable to hold that ground. The National Policy was forced into the contest, and the people then gave their decision immediately against it. But the subject is not confined to the miners of Cape Breton. The Government has been compelled to send food to keep the fishermen from starving. We have heard of a petition, sent from Richmond and other counties of Nova Scotia, signed by a large number there, showing that the people in that district also are suffering from want of food. If a fair calculation were made of the additional duty imposed, it would be found that the fishermen of Guysborough paid, in such increased duty, more than the cost of the provisions now doled out to them to keep them from

starving. What is the report from Halifax? We hear a most harassing tale of suffering, bordering on starvation, from the fishing districts, and of the city. It is stated that, as many as 100 to 150 houses are empty in Water street, once a busy quarter. Let us go from city to city. In my own city of St. John, stores and dwellings are unoccupied. On Prince William street, once the chief business street of the city, half the stores are unoccupied; and those that are let pay rent which scarcely covers interest on the cost of the buildings. In every corner bankrupt and forced sales are announced from month to month. Everywhere we turn we find the same story of desolation and suffering. Look at the harbour. Formerly it was crowded with vessels from all parts of the world, but for month after month, last summer, scarcely a square-rigged vessel was to be seen. Our mills are shut down and idle, and shopkeepers and merchants complain bitterly of the dullness of business. True the fire has done much to impoverish the people, but it is not because of the fire, that the city is in its present condition—desolate, dull and despairing. The returns show that the imports into New Brunswick are scarcely half what they were fourteen years ago; and if we make ever so liberal an allowance for flour and other articles that formerly appeared in the returns, and now do not so appear, our imports are not two-thirds what they were some years ago. Formerly, St. John was the centre of distribution for the whole Province, and for a great part of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, but she has now lost much of the trade even of her own Province. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was right, though his mode of expression was strange, when he said that the decline of business in St. John is owing to a change in its geographical position. Should better times come and business improve, St. John will do better than she is doing now but it will never again become the great centre of distribution that it was a few years ago. Our manufacturers, also, have found competition with the upper Provinces too much for them, on account of the larger capital and larger income received by the Montreal manufacturers combined. But how does Montreal stand? We have been told of the addi-

tional number of men in employment, but this increase is, after all, but small, and it is only in part owing to the National Policy. The sugar factory undoubtedly employs a larger number of hands; the rubber factory employs a few more; but take it all in all, it will be found that wherever there is additional employment it is an increase on the amount of employment afforded a few months ago, and not upon the amount of employment of two or three years ago. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Ryan) said, that the Grand Trunk built a large number of locomotives in Montreal this year, and that formerly locomotives were imported. Does the hon. gentleman not know that, some years ago, the Grand Trunk got nearly all its locomotives built at the Kingston locomotive works, which then employed 300 hands, and which now employ only eighty or ninety? Moreover, that Railway is now enjoying a period of prosperity, the demand for grain in Europe raising freights and keeping up a pressure of business. But the Tariff imposes only an additional duty of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on locomotives, and it puts $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the materials which enter into their construction. Several members of Parliament went to Montreal a few weeks ago. In driving from the Mile End station, they noticed that almost every other shop and house they passed was closed, or to let, and they were told that in some streets there were eighty or ninety houses unoccupied.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Was it not a fast day?

MR. ANGLIN: Oh, no; the places were unoccupied. A gentleman we spoke to told us that all over the city things were as bad, if not worse. I have seen it stated, and I have no doubt accurately, that the assessed value of real estate in Montreal is considerably lower this year than it was last, and much lower than it was a few years ago. We hear from Hamilton, that there are about 570 houses untenanted. The hon. member who asserted that Hamilton was more prosperous than ever, had to admit that fact. He stated that the unoccupied houses were small boxes, and he said that their being empty could be accounted for in part, at least, by the fact that a great many mansions with

modern improvements have been built, of late. The hon. gentleman would have us imagine that the mechanics, who formerly occupied the little boxes, suddenly became able to occupy those mansions. If that was really the case, it would be delightful. In Toronto there are a great many unoccupied places; and when we come to Ottawa, to the seat of Government, a city that ought to be the centre of life of this whole country, what do we find? We find 750 houses unoccupied, a large number of stores closed, and the whole city in a state of desolation. It has been said that the number of workmen who visited the Buildings this year demanding employment, was not so large as the number who came here two or three years ago, when the late Government was in power. To this a satisfactory answer may easily be made. The truth is, that Ottawa has managed to get rid of these poor people. They have been forced or induced to leave the city, and, perhaps, that in part accounts for the large number of unoccupied houses. "They have made a solitude, and they call it peace." So we may go from city to city, and town to town, and everywhere we find that the National Policy, except in a few favoured spots, and in the estimation of a few favoured individuals, has been a deplorable failure. We find that wages have not advanced in accordance with the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite. We find everywhere trouble and distress. The question then arises: How is this state of things to be remedied? We have only the responsibility of presenting the case of the people. More than that is beyond our power. Hon. gentlemen opposite, who have the responsibility of controlling Parliament and serving the country, prove themselves utterly callous and indifferent to the welfare of the nation. They have behind them a majority to sustain them on any question that may be raised. They feel perfectly safe for three or four years, and I suppose they think that if any of them seek re-election, even after that time has elapsed, they will find the people as gullible as before. They rest upon monopolies; they are begirt with rings; they have prejudice and ignorance sustaining and surrounding them; and they feel perfectly safe for the present, and, perhaps, for the future. We

MR. ANGLIN.

present the case of the people. Having done that, we have discharged our duty, and the only thing left for us is to supplicate a Divine and Gracious Providence, a Providence merciful as well as just, that He will not continue to punish this people much longer for their folly, but that, in His mercy, He will do what we are powerless to do—save the people and save the country.

MR. GAULT: As the hon. gentleman has taken the trouble to mention the financial condition of Montreal, I beg to say that that city to-day is on a sounder basis than ever, its revenue being more than equal to its indebtedness—last year the excess of income over expenditure being \$556,000. If any other city in the Dominion can show an equally satisfactory position, I am willing to admit that the hon. gentleman is right in his conclusion. The hon. gentleman was very careful not to omit an allusion to the cotton factories in that city. I can inform him that, in those establishments, to-day, 3,000 hands are employed, and the competition among the nine factories in operation is sufficient to keep down prices. In July, 1879, the price of cotton in New York was 6c., while in Montreal, during the same month, it was 7c.; in 1880, the price was 8c. in the former and 7½c. in the latter city. That should be sufficient to show that the price has been reduced, owing to the number of mills in operation. About fifty-three woollen factories are in operation in the Dominion. It is certainly a fact that, had not the National Policy come into existence, not one of those woollen factories would to-day be in operation. It certainly must be an advantage to the farmer to have a home market for his wool. It was well known that the value of wool had increased. In Montreal, three silk factories—one of which weaves ribbons and other articles for ladies' dresses; another, which both winds silk and weaves; and a third, which only winds silk—have been brought into operation by the National Policy. A sewing machine factory which employs 400 hands, and which, before another year shall have passed, will have doubled its capacity, and a manufactory of plated goods, employing 3,500 hands, and which also owes its existence to the National Policy, are also in operation. There is also

a manufactory of fancy woollen goods, employing 7,500 hands. A factory is about to be started in that city for the manufacture of pins, and its proprietor has gone to London to engage a number of men. As to the import trade in Montreal, it is to my knowledge that one house has done a larger business this year than ever before, having worked day and night for the past six weeks. Some very large importers in Montreal have told me lately that this has been the best year they have had since 1874. I know the hardware men and the leather merchants are now doing a very large business in Montreal. I also know that business in Toronto has been exceedingly good, the merchants there being quite as largely occupied as in Montreal. I saw in the papers, a day or two ago, that over a thousand tons of paper had been sold to a Chicago house by a Montreal manufactory. This indicates that the National Policy has been beneficial to all parts alike. Previous to the introduction of the new policy, we had a very large number of warehouses vacant. The circular of the late Finance Minister, calling in all the moneys of the Government then in the banks, made a sad day of trouble, the saddest we have ever known in Montreal. It was a financial Waterloo for disaster and failures. But, I am happy to say, that state of things has passed away. To-day, the banks are doing a good business; industries of every kind are advancing. I can say the same thing with regard to the operations of the Grand Trunk Railway, which employs, to-day, a very large number of men at Point St. Charles. It is to my knowledge, that the nail factories and the rolling-mills are all doing a large business, their hands being fully employed. Redpath's sugar refinery has certainly been actively engaged, and has made a large amount of money, less, however, in consequence of the National Policy than of the increase in the value of sugar. We have reason to be proud of that establishment. Mr. Redpath deserves well of his country, for he has given the magnificent sum of \$50,000 towards McGill College. Had it not been for the National Policy, the number of men employed to-day in Montreal would not, I believe, have equalled half the number that are actually employed.

MR. MILLS: Mr. Speaker, Hon.

gentlemen opposite have undertaken to show that their policy of commercial restriction was not put in issue at the Ontario elections in June last. One hon. member undertakes to prove that it could not have been the issue, because he regards it as a foolish, an irrelevant one. He says the Reformers under Mr. Mowat refused to accept it as such, that they insisted upon being judged by their past record in the Provincial Legislature. I agree with the hon. member for Hamilton in calling it an irrelevant, if not a foolish issue; I go further, and say that, on the part of the Local Opposition, it was a most dishonest one. But this does not disprove the fact, that so far as it was in the power of the leaders of the Tory party to make it the issue, it was so made. In the Provincial Legislature resolutions were formulated upon the subject by the Opposition. It was the issue upon which they took their stand, and at every nomination of which we have any report, the programme laid down in those resolutions was faithfully adhered to. I have no doubt but the local leaders of the Tory party acted under instructions from the Premier here as the generalissimo of the party. The resolutions proposed in the Legislature at Toronto were dictated from here. The attack was made all along the line upon the same plan. Let us, Sir, glance at some of the facts. On the 28th of May last the hon. member for Niagara spoke at Grimsby on behalf of the Tory candidate, and demanded his return as of right, on account of the eminent services rendered to the country at Ottawa by the adoption of this fraud and folly, miscalled a National Policy. A day or two later, the hon. member, who is lavish of his oratorical and poetical services, spoke at Hamilton, and both he and the members for that city confidently put forward this policy of commercial restriction as the issue. At that time hon. gentlemen opposite did not regard the issue as a foolish one. They had as much confidence in its power as the Chinaman has in the sound of his gong as he marches to the battlefield. It was only after the leader of the Government here found his Ontario contingent routed that the gifted young gentleman from Hamilton discovered the issue presented by his friends to be a foolish, an irrelevant one. The hon. member for

Toronto West and the hon. member for Toronto East also declared this to be the issue. The hon. member for Toronto East, at the nomination of Mr. Morris, said that one great reason why he opposed the Mowat Government was that it was opposed to the National Policy. The seconder of Mr. Morris's nomination said: "The National Policy would give an impetus to manufactures. It would give work to the unemployed, and would keep our money in our own country. For this reason it was necessary that Mr. Morris should be returned." Mr. Morris, in his speech at the nomination, is reported to have said:

"There were two parties in this country—one of them opposed to our National interests and the other friendly to them, and one of these parties was represented by the Governments of Mr. Mowat and Mr. Mackenzie. The supporters of the present Government in Ontario believe that this Province is the citadel of the Dominion, and they think that if they can hold it, the National Policy can be overthrown. The issue in all these contests was so pronounced, that it was clear beyond all peradventure that the battle must necessarily be fought on the same line that it was fought on the 17th of September."

Mr. Morris, the second in command, then made the National Policy the issue, and upon it he was elected. About thirty others were elected upon this same foolish, irrelevant issue. What is the opinion of the hon. member for Hamilton of their case? Does he hold that they are sitting in the Provincial Legislature under false pretences? Does he think that as they failed to secure a majority in the country, they should go over to their opponents, and follow Mr. Mowat? The hon. member reviles us who were elected in opposition to this misnamed elixir of National prosperity, because we refuse to betray our trust and support it. It is true, Sir, that while the Tory party elected thirty candidates for the Local Legislature upon this issue, they had more than fifty defeated upon it, and the hon. member is quite ready to sacrifice these thirty survivors in order to conceal his own humiliation, and to escape from the embarrassing position in which he finds himself placed, by offering himself as an unnecessary sacrifice when he felt confident of success. The hon. member's efforts were rewarded by defeat, instead of victory, and he

MR. MILLS.

refuses to make the sacrifice promised. He insists upon the electors of Hamilton resting content with the sacrifice of the doves of the party, and letting the unblemished he-goat still remain in the Government fold at Ottawa. But, Sir, gentlemen on the Treasury Benches were not idle spectators of that contest. The hon. the Minister of Finance and the hon. the Minister of Railways, citizens of other Provinces, foreigners to Ontario in all that concerns her local affairs, joined in the fray. The right hon. gentleman, the Premier of Canada, on the 3rd of June last, when addressing the electors of Toronto, in the Tory Coliseum, where he and his friends contended with imaginary beasts, after the manner of Don Quixote, told them how Mr. Mowat had improperly altered the Election Law; how he had used the patronage of the Local Government to help his friends; and the right hon. gentleman warned the friends of commercial restriction, whether they were Reformers or Tories, that the power of the Local Government would be used in thwarting and defeating this restrictive prosperity policy. What issue did the Premier present to the country in that speech, and what verdict did the electors of Ontario render? Was it the one which he hoped for or expected? We all know that it was not. The hon. the Minister of Finance was one of the chief warriors in that contest. It is true he belongs to another Province; but he was not present simply as a soldier of fortune. He knew the fight was being carried on by his friends and allies with weapons from his armory. The thunder that was everywhere heard from the battle-line of his party was his thunder. He eulogised his pet policy, and his own public services. He spoke of the great blessings they would confer upon the people. He spoke of the great honor they had, through the Sovereign, conferred upon himself. The hon. the Minister of Finance, in short, said: "Gentleman look at me. I have been made a shining knight. My Sovereign has honoured me with these marks of Her confidence because of the eminent services which I have rendered to my country. Do honour to yourselves by listening to our words of wisdom, and by acting upon them. I ask these favours, not on my own account, but on yours. We are strong in our superior wisdom and states-

manship. Speaking for myself, I may say that like the friends of young Mr. Weller, I am emblazoned on bosom and breeches with public honours. You can add nothing to my glory; but, gentlemen, you can add to your own prosperity by upholding with your votes the great National fabric which my colleagues and myself have reared for your protection." Such was in effect the language of the hon. the Minister of Finance. It is too late for the hon. member for Hamilton to repudiate the issue which brought him here, and which, had he kept his word, would have sent him away—the issue, which was dishonestly, and, as the results proved, foolishly raised in June last. Whatever may be the rule in the court in which the hon. member practices, it is a fact that in the political arena a party and its platform stand and fall together. It is true too that a matter may be put in issue without issue being joined. In this case, those who made the so-called National Policy their instrument of warfare, cannot say it was not involved in the struggle when those who fought with it fell. How is it in England? Lord Beaconsfield is seeking to make the elections turn, not upon the wisdom of the policy he pursued, and is still pursuing, but upon vague forebodings of impending calamities, which he professes he alone is able to avert. He has misrepresnted the policy of the great majority of the Home Rulers in Ireland, and of the Reformers in England and Scotland. Upon that battle field he has marshalled his forces. Thither he has striven to draw his opponents. He has failed. My ardent desire was that he might fail. But whether in that field few or many fight; whether he won, or whether he lost, so far as he is concerned and so far as his party are concerned, the issue which he submitted is the one upon which the electors of the United Kingdom have passed judgment for him and for them. So, too, was it at the last Ontario Elections with the Conservative party and their pet policy or policy for pets.

Mr. McCALLUM: What has the Local Legislature or Local Government to do with the National Policy or with the collection of the revenues of the Dominion?

Mr. MILLS: The hon. gentleman should put the question to his leader.

Upon it they took their stand, and fought, and were defeated. The hon. member for Hamilton says the issue of the National Policy was never raised in that city. The reports of the political meetings of the period are conclusive against him. He says that he has by his speech effectually buried the statement; and that, if we, on this side, have a spark of manliness or honour left, we will not drag it from its grave after he has, in so handsome a manner, performed its funeral obsequies. Although, Sir, the language of the hon. member was worthy the funeral of Buck Fanshaw, he must not be either surprised or disappointed if we are not awed into silence by his threatened maledictions. Nothing that we can do can give the hon. member for Hamilton a worse opinion of us than the one he has expressed. He has accused us of "malignity," of "atrocious falsehoods," of "degrading the country in the interests of party," with being "overshadowed with gloom at the revival of prosperity." A distinguished lawyer once said, ironically, of an able but irritable Judge, that his excessive politeness atoned for his ignorance of law. I shall not speak ironically of the hon. member. I cannot say that his excessive politeness atones for his want of information. His memory is treacherous. His statement as to the actual condition of Hamilton is as wide of the mark as his account of the issues at the last election, or of the condition of the country under our régime. It is true that his errors of fact and his inconsequential arguments are not atoned for by his great respect for those who may differ from him. After the hon. member has shown his profound regard for the amenities of parliamentary discussion, by pronouncing the Reform members of this House a dishonest, dishonourable, vindictive, treacherous pack, he asks us if we have a spark of honour or patriotism left, to say nothing further, but good of this prosperity-producing policy. Why did the hon. member for Hamilton make this appeal to us? Is it because of the fair, the generous manner in which he has spoken of us, he feels that any appeal from him is entitled to special consideration from the Reform members? Or is it because the hon. member has mistaken the place? There may be places where very inaccurate statements, made in

a very loud voice, may count for something; this House, however, is not one of them. As to what was said at the June elections in Hamilton, it is unfortunate for the hon. member that facts as they appear in the press are wholly against him. The hon. member, his colleague, Mr. Adam Brown, Mr. Murray, the member for Niagara, and the hon. the Minister of Railways, all spoke in favour of a restrictive Tariff in the Local contest. I have already shown that the Premier and his embroidered colleague did the same thing. Sir, had the press made no record of the course taken by the hon. member, we should not have been left in the dark as to the course taken by him. We know him too well not to know that he would be the last of the flock to deviate from the path in which his old, wary, experienced, and not over-scrupulous shepherd had so plainly indicated that it was the duty of all his sheep to walk. The hon. gentleman began his speech as the youthful member, the white-headed boy of the House. I do not think he was at all happy in the part he played. Members are usually prepossessed in favour of young men, especially when youth is accompanied by diffidence, and the part played modestly is played well. But while the hon. member came into the arena of discussion as a youth, he did not bring with him those qualities which win a high regard for one so young. He wandered too far from the ground with which he is familiar. He halloed too loudly. He substituted abuse for argument. He called us hard names, in his own dialect. He filled his speech with sound and fury when we had a right to expect calm discussion. He accuse us with being without eyes, because we do not see that the blush of dawn which he says appeared on the 17th September, 1878, has already ushered in the full day; of being without ears to hear the hum of industry and the songs of rejoicing which additional fiscal burdens have called into life. The hon. member misstates and misrepresents the state of the country under the late Administration. He misstates and misrepresents the state of the country at the present time. No one who took the trouble to compare the condition of this country from 1873 to 1878, with the condition of the adjoining Republic, could fail

to be convinced that the depression of the trade was very much greater there than here. Although the people of Canada were as prosperous as any in the world, yet hon. gentlemen opposite laboured most sedulously to depreciate the condition of the country, to promote the interests and to improve the prospects of the leaders of the Tory party. They told the people that we were responsible for the misfortunes that flowed from the droughts of spring and the rains of summer. There was no market for our lumber abroad, during one year we had a short harvest, and we were denounced because of the poverty of those with whom we trade and for the changes of the seasons. We were also told that our negligence, our incapacity, were depopulating the country. After the elections were won by persistent misrepresentations, it is proposed that the advantage shall be retained by means equally dishonest. I decline to assist in the success of such a policy. Hon. gentlemen have shown that if to cry down the country were necessary to their success, they were ready to make themselves heard. They decried the country persistently. They acted upon the maxim that it is

“Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven.”

I purpose to give some facts by which the hon. member for Hamilton, and other hon. members equally candid, will profit. I trust, Sir, when they describe to others and picture to themselves the people fleeing from the country, like Pilgrim from the city of Destruction, they will recollect these facts, which will prove a most effectual antidote for ravings of this kind. I find by the immigration returns of the United States, that the number of persons who left this country to settle in that is as follows:—

For 1868-9....30,921	For 1874-5....23,949
“ 1869-70....53,340	“ 1875-6....22,379
“ 1870-1....47,082	“ 1876-7....22,039
“ 1871-2....40,288	“ 1877-8....21,474
“ 1872-3....37,569	“ 1878-9....31,156
“ 1873-4....30,596	qr. of 1879-80....12,324

For those years which we were in power the emigration from the country was yearly 24,000. For the five years previous, under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite, the emigration from the country was, in round numbers, 42,000 a year.

When the First Minister and his followers proposed to retain our population in the country by a system of exorbitant and unjust taxation; when they spoke of “our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of employment denied them at home,” had they looked to see what the facts were? I ask them how is it that under your Administration the country lost 18,000 a year more of its population than under ours? How is it that the moment you return to power the expatriated class was increased by 10,000, and now, when your remedy has full play, the excess promises to reach more than 40,000 for the year? We said that in so far as any distress existed, what you proposed to do would aggravate, but could not relieve it. Time has vindicated our opinions; it has condemned yours. The wisdom of your fiscal policy is the wisdom of the necromancer. It has raised you to a footing of equality with the Rain Doctors of Natal. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches cried out against us for the loss of our population, when we were losing less than 22,000 a year, and they call upon us to be silent when the numbers are swelling beyond 60,000. Why has this wailing ceased, and the eyes become dry? Hon. gentlemen have sighed and sobbed themselves into repose, and they can now bear a larger loss without the same heartrending distress. But if this is to be taken as a test of the prosperity of the country, from year to year, it is wholly against the conduct of public affairs by hon. gentlemen and in favour of the late Administration. Is it, Sir, reasonable to suppose that with this state of things it has been better for Hamilton, just as it was worse for the country—that as the country became distressed Hamilton prospered? I have said enough to show that the pugnacious young member for Hamilton is neither a safe guide nor a reliable witness. The *Hamilton Times*, an enterprising, well-informed and most reliable journal, says that there are now 528 vacant dwellings in the city as against 327 in 1878. It is true the hon. member denies this. But his denial was very peculiar. He said he did not believe the *Times*. He went on to give the reasons for so many houses being vacant, and he admitted he did not know anything about the matter.

The *Times* says the actual population of the city is less now than in 1878. It points not only to the increased number of vacant houses, but to the diminished number of names in the city directory. What is the answer of the hon. member and his friends? Why, that trade has revived; that there has been a large influx of skilled labourers; that all are employed. But the testimony of the Department of Immigration is against him on these points. The new arrivals are not mechanics and artisans; the Department during the year has discouraged and dissuaded them from coming to the country. It is true, Sir, that people were told—"you will not require a foreign market. We will find you a market at home. We will cause towns and villages to spring up. The smoke ascending from the workshops and factories will be in sight of every farm house in the land. The waste places will be turned into wheat fields and the wheat fields into gardens." This good time has not yet begun to appear; and the empty shops, the untenanted dwellings, the lengthened lists of insolvents, the increased and increasing emigration all testify against the assertions of the hon. member for Hamilton. The hon. gentleman told us about a hub and spoke factory recently started in the city. I am informed that it is not a new establishment. It existed before, a few miles away from the city. It was transferred to Hamilton as a more convenient place for shipment. Its existence is in no way connected with the present Tariff. He says this establishment pays \$15,000 yearly for wages and \$20,000 for oak blocks. These sums, with a fair allowance for wear and tear and dividends upon capital, would necessitate sales of \$50,000 or more a year. This establishment is but one of many, and alleged the production of this one is of nearly twice the value of the entire imports of hubs and spokes into the country under the old Tariff. Does the hon. gentleman then think that he can convince the House that this industry was greatly hurt by foreign competition before and that it is greatly helped by taxation now, the more especially as the importation of waggons and carriages has been augmented? The hon. member told us about an American emigration agent at Hamilton, who remained there

while we were in power, but who has since closed his office and retired. Well, Sir, if such are the facts, they admit of easy explanation. It is clear this agency was not closed because Canadians have ceased to cross the border. The stream of emigration has swollen to enormous proportions. The agency is no longer necessary. The Government of Canada has undertaken to get rid of a population who, because they had been deceived, were likely to prove troublesome. They have conducted this business with a success that has not usually attended their public undertakings. Had the hon. gentleman been anxious to know why the office was closed, he would, no doubt, have been told that the Ministry whom he supports are carrying forward the work of expatriation with an energy, a zeal, that renders local agents from the United States wholly unnecessary. I was amused, Sir, by the line of argument pursued upon this subject by the hon. member for Cardwell. The hon. member was compelled to vindicate the conduct of the late Administration from the attacks which he and others had been in the habit of making. The hon. member admitted that emigration from Canada to the United States still goes forward. He admits that the causes which operated in 1878 still operate. He refers to facts which I had the honour to bring to the attention of the House four years ago. But for Ministers the defence of the hon. member is no defence—it is the severest condemnation. They said that this emigration from Canada was due to Ministerial incapacity, Ministerial neglect. No matter what might be the motive of the emigrant for going, the Government was unfit for its work that could not present a stronger one for remaining. When we then asked the hon. gentlemen who are now on the Treasury Benches to present their panacea, that we might discuss it, they declined to do so. They said "we shall not disclose our policy until we are entrusted with the administration of the affairs of the country. But when we are entrusted, we shall not be 'flies-on-the-wheel,' but statesmen discharging the high duties of statesmanship." Well, Sir, the opportunity has come, and what do we find? That emigration to the United States has increased, enormously increased. The hon. member for Cardwell

comes forward, and pronounces a glowing eulogy upon the United States. He points out its rapid progress. He declares, with such an attractive land, stretching away to the south and the west of us, that his friends can do nothing to keep Canadians at home; that we are a migratory population, incapable of local attachments, impoverishing the lands which we cultivate, and when they are no longer productive we are ready, like a swarm of locusts, to move onward to exhaust some other locality. And this, Sir, is the confession of this parent Government, that obtained power by false pretensions, and now admit that what they promised they cannot perform, and that we have no right to expect such impossible tasks from them. This, Sir, is the confession of men who said we had taken our people into captivity to strangers; that we had made them hewers of wood and drawers of water to their neighbours; and the right hon. gentleman was to be to the people something more than Moses, Joshua, and Nehemiah combined. Now, Sir, all is changed. While the hon. member for Cardwell admits the inability, the incapacity of the Government to prevent emigration to the United States, he has quite overlooked the fact that the emigration which averaged, during our five years of office, 24,000, averaged during the five preceding years 42,000; that on the return of the Tories to power, the emigration from this country was increased by upwards of 10,000, and this year it promises to exceed the emigration for the last three years of our Administration put together. The tremendous excess of this year is no doubt in part due to the unwearied diligence of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, to that broad cosmopolitan spirit which has recently characterised his administrative efforts, and which he, on a memorable occasion, with so much diffidence laboured to conceal. But other causes have been at work. It would be easy to point them out. It is now unnecessary. The simple statement of the facts carries on its face the censure of Ministers. This one is as notorious as it is indisputable, that what they regarded and what they declared to be an evil within the remedial powers of Parliament, and for the existence of which the Government ought to be held responsible, existed and now exists

under their *regime* to a much greater extent than under ours. Before, Sir, I examine the subject of the Tariff, I propose to notice some of the statements which the hon. the Minister of Railway and Canals addressed to the House. The hon. gentleman assumed an attitude of defiance; but he was not inviting any one on this side of the House to a dialectical combat with himself. He invited us to a contest with two or more of his colleagues. He pronounced a glowing eulogy upon the hon. the Minister of Finance for having called in Sir A. T. Galt to help him over his difficulties. He told us it was a highly commendable thing to do; that he envied the hon. the Finance Minister because he was thus able to vindicate his position before the country. Now, we all know what this means. We know that the hon. gentleman aimed a blow at the financial capacity of his colleague. The defence of the hon. the Minister of Railways must have been more offensive to the hon. the Finance Minister than anything said from this side of the House. On this side, we have no special interest in the fortunes of the Tory party, but we cannot fail to notice the struggles between contending Chieftains that are carried on before us. The hon. the First Minister, assuming that the party were unable or incapable of choosing a successor, named three years ago, at Kingston, the hon. member for Cumberland as the warrior to come. He predicted there his own early political death. He promised soon to join the band of heroes who, in bygone years, had fought long and fiercely against responsible Government, against municipal Government, against disestablishment, and who were beaten, who had laid down their weapons and put off their antiquated armour forever. Herod and Pilot are again friends. The hon. member for Cumberland has been disappointed. The promise, as he understood it, has not been kept. The hon. the Minister of Finance who, during the days of party adversity, retired to his own Province with his leader here out of health, and the work of the party mainly devolving upon the hon. member for Cumberland, comes back into office and is interposed between the hon. the Minister of Railways and the reversion promised him. We are not surprised that the hon. the Minis-

ter of Railways avenges himself upon the leader who has disappointed him, and the colleague who has supplanted him. He drags ostentatiously before the House the subject of the Pacific Scandal. He eulogises that act. He commends to the grateful consideration of the country all who had any part in the matter. I give the hon. member credit for sense, and I say that no one who is not wanting in sense and sensibility would, as a matter of conviction, defend that transaction. While I give the hon. gentleman credit for sense, I do not give him credit for sincerity. He does not defend it because he thinks it defensible. Why then does he parade this transaction before the House? Why, but to worry and annoy some of his colleagues; why, but to remind them and their supporters and the party that he is the man with the clean slate, under whom the party can begin a new record, and take a new departure. The hon. Minister said:

“Sir, the hon. gentleman forgets that the people of the country have not forgotten that after seven years of the most successful Administration that ever crowned the efforts of any Government in this country, my hon. friend, the leader of the Government, went to the people of Canada and obtained the support of the country, returned supported by a good working majority to enable him still to carry on the administration of public affairs. He forgets that it is known to himself, and every other intelligent man in Canada, that the party which had thus been beaten in their struggle for power, trampled on the principles they had maintained in Opposition, and by the most corrupt procedure succeeded in drawing together a coalition, which they had long denounced, and gaining sufficient strength to seize power, and having seized power, sprung the midnight attack upon the people of Canada, without notice that any such thing was intended, at a time when great excitement was created with reference to a matter which, when it came to be properly understood, was regarded by the people as covering with no obliquity the parties connected with it. After the people had had five years' discussion of that matter, which had been thus suddenly sprung upon them, and enabled hon. gentlemen opposite to snatch a hasty verdict from the country before the subject was properly understood; when it was found that the very man who was author of that attempt, by the most corrupt procedure had succeeded in creating this public excitement, shrank from the challenge to come forward and under his oath state what he believed, the people sent back his right hon. friend and colleagues to power by an overwhelming majority.”

We all know that what the hon. gentle-

MR. MILLS.

man desired was to stimulate his party to make the promised change. He knows what the facts are. He knows that the \$393,000 which Sir Hugh Allan says he paid, were paid to obtain a charter, accompanied with a subsidy of \$30,000,000 in money and a grant of 50,000,000 acres of land. That which he expected to receive was to come from the public; that which he gave or paid was not given or paid to the public. So far the hon. gentleman has denied all knowledge of the transaction. He has laboured to keep himself aloof. He has shown no anxiety to share in this transaction, for which he praises some of his colleagues. Why does the hon. gentleman show so much anxiety to avoid any share of the glory which he thinks it sheds on all concerned in it. The hon. member for Selkirk informed us how anxious the hon. the Minister of Railways was to be First Minister. We know that he is not indifferent to public honour. He is not without ambition. He does not wear his honours like Duncan. Why then does he insist upon his colleagues proclaiming the glory of a transaction in which he is so anxious to be considered as having no share? The reason is all too plain. It is to remind some of them of his advantage. His defence is not intended to please but to disturb. Why else should the hon. gentleman try to provoke discussion upon a settled question—one upon which the public verdict was given when the question was before the country? The hon. the Minister of Railways will find that the subject of the railway itself is still before the country, that the people are becoming awake to the perils of the enterprise, and that the interests of to-day are more than sufficient to occupy his attention. The hon. member for Cumberland alluded to a letter which I received from Sir A. T. Galt which related to certain extracts which I read from the Budget speeches of that gentleman, but which were not well reported at the time. He said:

“When the late Minister of the Interior undertook to quote his language as supporting their policy he was met by a bold disavowal of the truth of the statement the hon. gentleman had made in the House. The hon. member cannot have forgotten the fact that he sat here trembling for three days with a letter in his pocket, but never mustered sufficient courage or candour to read it, although it contained a refutation of the sentiments put into Sir Alexander Galt's mouth.”

Sir, I have not forgotten the facts, nor have I forgotten the impression I long since formed of the hon. gentleman, that he is, intellectually incapable of accurately stating the facts in any case. The statement which I have just read is one of those proverbial Tupperisms which are wholly at variance with the facts. In that debate I had spoken at some length. When I read extracts from the Budget speeches of 1862 and 1866, and when the hon. member himself called out that Sir Alexander Galt had since changed his views, I reminded him that Sir Alexander Galt had since reiterated in Parliament the same opinion, and that he was, at all events, no higher authority upon the one side than upon the other, if it could be shown by the advocates of a Protective policy that he agreed with them. The letter to which the hon. gentleman refers did not prove that I erred far in this particular, for while it showed that Sir Alexander Galt wished to break away from the very definite opinions which he had expressed, he declined to commit himself to a policy of Protection, as the hon. the Minister of Railways, and the Hon. T. N. Gibbs, sought to make it appear. I told Sir Alexander Galt, if the House permitted me, that I would, upon a fitting opportunity, read the letter. In that discussion a large number spoke after I had received the letter. The very night when the discussion, was continued until morning dawn I waited until the opportunity came, and the present hon. Minister of Customs objected. So, too, did the Hon. Mr. Holton, who informed me that Sir Alexander Galt told him he had written me, and he replied to Sir Alexander Galt that he should object to the letter being read; that if he wanted to be heard on the floor of Parliament he must come in by the suffrages of the people. Had the letter sought simply to correct any mistake, I would have asked the indulgence of the House to have read it at once, but it did not do so. It stated the author's views of public policy, in opposition to that of the Government, and it also showed that the hon. gentleman had, at least in part, forgotten what he had before said on the subject, and I would have been unjust to myself and to the Government to have read that letter without a word of comment upon it. I replied to that letter, and sent both it

and my reply to the newspapers. Both appeared in the Reform papers, but Sir Alexander Galt's letter alone appeared in the newspapers that supported our opponents. If it is any comfort to the hon. member for Cumberland to know the fact, I can assure him that whether sitting or standing I did not tremble for three days or one day or one moment. I was content to state the facts, and there was nothing in them to give me any anxiety or to cause me any fear. It is rather a noticeable feature of this discussion that the hon. member for Cardwell has become the expositor and commentator of the speeches of the hon. the Minister of Railways, and one cannot well help noticing the striking similarity of the exposition to the text. The hon. member for Cardwell has long enjoyed the credit of cramming the hon. Minister for these annual exhibitions, and the performances of the two hon. gentlemen go a long way to establish the rumour. Agreement in truth is compatible with independent investigation, but a consensus of error implies prior understanding. The hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals said in criticising the speech of my hon. friend from Centre Huron, that :

"The hon. gentlemen has ventured to talk of the increased cost of the Government of the country, brought about by the Administration of the present leader of the Government during the time he was in power before. He forgot to tell the House that while the largest and most lavish expenditure of the Government which preceded his advent to office was \$22,800,000, he, himself, after the professions of his party to economise, brought down as his first estimate a proposed expenditure of between twenty-six and twenty-seven millions of dollars. There is the proposal of 1874 on the Statute book. There is the proof that this gentleman, who now charges my hon. friend the Minister of Finance with wild extravagance, because his estimate is twenty four millions, out of which there is one million of interest additional, and \$600,000 of sinking fund additional, came down here in 1874 with an estimate of \$26,163,000."

It was a puzzle to me, as I am sure it was to many others, to know how the hon. gentleman obtained an amount so wide of the truth. The speech of the hon. member for Cardwell solved the problem. He was not quite satisfied with the manner in which the hon. the Minister of Railways acquitted himself. He appealed to the law and to the testimony. He came down to the

House armed with two volumes of the Statutes, and read to the House the sums total mentioned in the Supply Bills for two years—the Supply Bills from which are omitted all that part of the estimates which are a permanent charge upon the revenues of the country, but in which are included the contemplated expenditure upon capital account. We seldom have such an exhibition of superior fitness for the work to that shown by the hon. Minister and mentor in the case in question. These are the gentlemen who sit in judgment upon the hon. member for Centre Huron, and who delight to exhibit the dependent helplessness of the present Minister of Finance. These gentlemen owe it to themselves and to the House, to show that the mistake arose from ignorance of the subject and not from bad faith. The hon. member for Cardwell showed his sincerity by coming armed with the Statutes of 1875 and 1876, and the hon. the Minister of Railways seems to have taken the Estimates of 1873 from a similar source. The hon. the Minister of Railways has tried hard to explain away the untenable position which he took in reference to the effect of the coal duties. The hon. gentleman said :

“Does the hon. gentleman know the whole duty on flour and coal in New Brunswick would not be 3c. per annum per head on the population? And the same might be said of Nova Scotia. Did he not know that the duty on coal lowered the price in St. John.

“MR. MACKENZIE: How?

“SIR CHARLES TUPPER: If the hon. gentlemen have not mastered that question they have not commenced the study of the question. If you give a mine a market that will enable it to work to a capacity of 100,000 tons, it can sell that coal cheaper, at a larger profit and a smaller price, than if it had but a market for half that amount. (Hear, hear.) The sale of coal from the Maritime Provinces has largely increased during the past year. The duty of 50c. would have accomplished the object of giving to the mines of Nova Scotia the markets of Ontario, and, so far as the city of Toronto and Hamilton was concerned, the coal was sold profitably there, but everybody knows that while there was a duty of 50c. the price of coal during the past year fell to an abnormally low amount, and therefore the Tariff had not as much effect as it otherwise would, and as it will have when the increased prosperity in the United States causes a rise in prices.”

Why does the hon. member say that St. John got her coal cheaper? Because he says the duty secured a larger market; the Nova Scotia miners sold more coal in

Canada, because the duty kept English and American coal out, and, selling more, they were enabled to sell it at a lower price. Unfortunately for this hon. gentleman's theory, it is at variance with the facts. The output of Nova Scotia coal last year was not greater, but less than the year before, and his reason for the reduction of the price of coal in St. John is left without a fact to support it. But a case like this does not in the least disconcert the hon. the Minister of Railways. He is a political economist who differs from all the world, and who is ready to charge everyone who may dissent from his opinions with ignorance, with not having mastered the rudiments of his science. The hon. member admits that the price of coal had fallen in the United States, and that the improvement of the price there would advance the price here. So it has come to this, that after all the confident promises of the hon. gentleman to secure good prices and a ready market for every Canadian product, he is compelled to admit that we had our price of coal in Canada regulated by the price in the United States, and that, were it not for this tax, the people of Canada would have got cheaper coal. The hon. gentleman had, a few moments before, pointed out what he regarded as the humiliating position of England, in consequence of her Free-trade policy; that Lord Derby had told the people that there was nothing for them but to emigrate; that Lord Salisbury had replied to a deputation of sugar refiners, that “England could bring no pressure to bear upon France or America, because they had nothing to offer.” He intimated that he and his colleagues were possessed of more sagacity than Cobden and Peel. He was going to retain the power of coercing the United States. He was going to protect the people of Canada against the calamity of getting too much for their money; and after soaring over all Western Europe and North America to exhibit the superior wisdom of the course taken, he suddenly terminated this tremendous flight by assuring us that our neighbours—whose superior wisdom he commended, whose system of exclusion he pronounced the perfection of wisdom, which we ought to copy, whose system of exclusion he pronounced unneighbourly, and which he promised to punish by a system of retalia-

tion, should he reach the Treasury Benches—have not been very prosperous for sometime. The hon. gentleman assures us that their commercial health is improving, and that we must depend upon their improvement for our own; so that now when the hon. member is in the Government he has shrunk from being the master of Providence to the condition of a helpless “fly-on-the-wheel,” revolving with it but utterly powerless to control its revolutions. The hon. member for Cardwell here also pursues the hon. the Minister of Railways, amplifies, revises, and explains his statements. He says it is quite true that last year the output of coal is less than it was the year before, but that in British Columbia it was greater; so that in the whole of Canada it was a few thousand tons more than it was the previous year; and for this slight increase the National Policy receives due credit. But let me ask, in what way could the National Policy help coal-mining in British Columbia? Those mines supply the coal to the steamers upon the Pacific coast. In so far as coal may be required for domestic purposes, duty or no duty, the mines of Vancouver must furnish it. The quantity of coal consumed from year to year depends wholly upon the demand for the year. With the Nova Scotia mines it is quite different. They have competitors in England and the United States; so that if the National Policy had any influence anywhere upon the output of coal it must have been in Nova Scotia, and the output there is less than the year before. The hon. the Minister of Railways must, therefore, find some other reason for the reduction of the price of coal at St. John than the one he has given, for the output is less, and if it had been greater it would not have shown that anyone did a larger business than before. The argument that the percentage of gain may be reduced as the quantity is increased does not apply to aggregate quantities, for the increased quantity may be due to the fact that more may be engaged in the business. The hon. gentleman said of the late Minister of Finance that:

“From the hour he was clothed with power to deal with the financial interests of Canada, Canada, step by step, steadily sank in public estimation, until he was hurled from power by an indignant public. I have said that he should regard with consideration the difficulties which

surrounded the task of any man who was not called, as he was, into power when there was an overflowing Treasury, and the country was prosperous, but who took office when the prosperity of the country had sunk, step by step, under the hon. gentlemen opposite, until we were objects of pity to many and of contempt to some.”

Now, in so far as the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways relates to the conduct of my hon. friend as a member of the late Government I shall say nothing. He is fully equal to the task of defending himself. I quote the hon. Minister's words for another purpose. I deny the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways. It is at variance with the facts in almost every particular. It is true that the hon. member for Cumberland, and others on that side, zealously, unscrupulously and unintermittingly laboured to damage the credit of the country abroad and to sink it in public estimation. They made a few dissatisfied, but did they succeed in lowering the public credit? No; not for an hour. All the noise and clamour of the hon. member had no more effect upon the credit of the country than the whistling of the mariner has upon the wind. He says when they were expelled from office, they left behind them an overflowing Treasury, and that the country was prosperous. He has often said this before. Let me remind him that in this, as in many other matters, he is not consistent with himself. What was the burden of the hon. gentleman's complaint against us at the last election? Upon what platform does he now stand? He complained that our importations were too great and ought to be diminished, and that we had taken no steps to check them; that we were permitting our consumers to buy abroad when they ought to be compelled to buy at home. The Government have dealt with the fiscal policy of the country from this standpoint, and they have deliberately set to work to diminish our foreign trade and to cut down our importations. This is the principle upon which hon. gentlemen now are proceeding, and if it is sound, the policy of hon. gentlemen when in office before was essentially unsound. Then the hon. the Minister of Finance said there was no inflation, that the increase of imports was a normal, a healthy increase, which was to go on increas-

ing from year to year, and upon which the Government could confidently rely to meet the growing burdens of the country. Well, Sir, if the welfare of the country requires that Parliament should legislate so as to equalise the value of the imports and exports as they appear in the Trade and Navigation Returns, then Canada was never so badly off, was never so badly served, as it was from 1872 to 1874 inclusive. What are the facts? From the establishment of the Union to the close of last year, our imports have exceeded in value our exports by \$259,977,295, our imports being \$1,173,092,314 and, our exports \$913,115,019. Many gentlemen opposite believe we have gone in debt to the extent of the difference. They regard it as an evil, and they have set themselves to repair the mischief, and to prevent its recurrence. Let me direct the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways to that saturnine age to which he so frequently refers—to that period when Canada was made by him and his colleagues a garden of Hesperides, when the people knew no want, when there was neither mildew nor blight, and when the power and wisdom of the Government to bless were greater than the power of Providence to punish. Under the Mosaic Code, which the hon. member for South Leeds would like to see us adhere to, every member of the Government would suffer death for the arrogant impiety of his pretensions. But this by the way. The amount entered for consumption for the three years which I have named was, for 1872, \$107,709,116; for 1873, \$127,514,594; for 1874, \$127,404,169; making a total for the three years of \$362,627,879. The excess of imports for consumption over Canadian exports for the same period was, for 1872, \$41,534,989; for 1873, \$47,627,269; for 1874, \$49,475,750; making a total excess for these years of \$138,638,008. If the views of the Government at the present time are sound, these were not years of good fortune but of folly. I have no doubt but these years were years of inflation. I have no doubt but the hon. gentleman collected taxes upon goods which were imported beyond the actual requirements of the market. I have no doubt but that the goods in these years imported, were

not consumed until subsequent years, and that the revenues collected upon them belonged to succeeding years. If the hon. gentleman is right, they collected Customs duties upon \$139,000,000 worth of goods for which the country was in debt. If he is right, the period to which he refers was one in which the people had not only spent all their income, but had consumed a large portion of their capital, and yet he would have us regard these years as years of unexampled prosperity. What would be thought of a man who mortgaged his estate for a considerable sum, and who counted the money he so raised a part of his income? He would be regarded as a fitter subject for St. Luke's than for Parliament. But I do not agree with the hon. Minister in his censure of the former fiscal policy of himself and his colleagues. I do not go with him in the way upon which he argues the country should now travel. Taking a number of years together, what is purchased is paid for, and the elements of which these payments are composed are easily calculated. The causes which have hitherto influenced the volume of our imports vary at different periods, besides the spirit of speculation at a period of inflation, I shall presently point out; but before doing so, let me advert to some considerations which the hon. the Minister of Railways had overlooked. The last three years we were in office our Customs revenue averaged about \$12,700,000, while during the three years to which I have already referred it averaged \$13,500,000, under a somewhat lower Tariff. If, during these years, goods were bought on credit, and in excess of the requirements of the market, the revenue collected upon them should be credited to the years in which they were consumed. Since large importations are regarded as an evil, and large exportations a good, let us look at the exportations. During our régime the export of Canadian productions ranged from \$68,000,000 to \$79,000,000 a year. During the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite it varied from \$53,000,000 to \$80,000,000. But the average value of the exports while we were in office was \$71,000,000, and during the period when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office it was \$7,000,000 less. If we look at the moneyed institutions of the country, we

have similar evidences of the growing wealth of the country under our Administration; so, then, it is not true that the country was wealthy and prosperous under Tory rule, or that it was impoverished and ruined while Reformers were in office. I do not subscribe to the policy of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, that commerce can be wisely controlled by fiscal legislation. Nor do I subscribe to the opinion that our mercantile indebtedness is measured by the apparent difference between the values of the imports and exports of the country. No theory could be more absurd. Every cargo of exports that may be lost at sea, or which in any way fails to reach a foreign market, and for which nothing is received in return, swells the exports, but adds nothing to the imports, and yet no one would feel the country was helped by such an adjustment of our foreign commercial transactions. Now, I do not say that the great disparity between the two sides is adjusted by the gains on the exports sold in a foreign market. Our mercantile marine earn large sums in the carrying trade of the world. A part of this goes to increase the available capital of the country, a part is consumed in the purchase of domestic products, and a part is consumed in the use of goods brought from abroad. But there are other elements in the adjustment of our mercantile accounts. We have, since Confederation, increased our public debt by about \$91,000,000, or, leaving out of view the debts of the Provinces, which have been assumed, about \$74,000,000. A part of this sum has been paid out abroad to purchase material for Government works, and a part as wages earned, which have gone to pay for tea, sugar, and other groceries, for dry goods, and imported articles, and by so much as is so paid you may diminish the import side of the National Commerce. Then, too, you have important enterprises undertaken by private corporations. See how many miles of railway have been built by private companies, in nearly all the Provinces, since July, 1867. I speak without doing more than to hastily glance at these expenditures, but from this hasty examination I find that the Provinces and the Municipalities have contributed upwards of \$21,000,000, and foreign capitalists eighty, or it may be a

a hundred millions more. Now, this money, like that borrowed by the Government, has been at once, or after being earned as wages, sent abroad to purchase material for the road or articles of consumption for the labourer; so that we have in these ways an addition made to the purchasing power of perhaps \$15,000,000 a year. I say, then, we have no reason to believe that there has been over-importation of late years, or that this country is now largely indebted for goods of foreign manufacture. I do not think that there was any impending calamity in the foreign business relations of her merchants that required Government interference. Nor will I say that the purchasing power of the country would be diminished very much if Government loans were to cease, and gigantic enterprises were for a time discontinued. The men who now labor and earn wages on these works could do as much on new homesteads, or in labouring on land for others. But some works have made great and substantial additions to the wealth of the country. Let me name the Canada Southern Railway as an instance. I think that I am much within the mark when I say that it has added 25 per cent. to the value of the land for five miles on each side along the entire length of the road; and in all discussions of the balance of trade, considerations of this kind are wholly overlooked. But there are many expenditures without such a result. Private companies spend their money at times on profitless enterprises, but mistakes of that kind need not particularly concern us here. In these, if there should be loss, that loss will fall, not upon this country, but upon the wealthy capitalists abroad who have in these undertakings made unwise investments of their money. But when money is spent by the Government in profitless enterprises, the case is wholly different. The faith of the country is pledged for the repayment, and the loss upon the investment falls upon the country. Since the Union began we have paid as interest upon our indebtedness the sum of \$69,844,350 and we have paid for the management of the debt \$3,155,163 more. That is in round numbers \$73,000,000. At the present time the interest and the cost of management amount annually to \$7,500,000—a larger sum than our an-

nual average expenditure on capital account. What then is the obvious inference from these facts? Is it not this, that the sum which we now are obliged to pay as interest upon our Public Debt would, were we out of debt, build the public works required by the country without the necessity of effecting loans. We would not forever be paying interest upon the price of a "dead horse." I have indicated rather than discussed what our financial aim should be. Since 1867 we have doubled our Public Debt. Since then our neighbours have paid off 30 per cent. of their debt. The interest upon our debt is as large in proportion to our numbers as theirs, and in proportion to our wealth, much larger. The advantage of which we boasted at the time of Confederation is gone. The traditional policy of the United States has been from the beginning to keep out of debt, and, if by war, debt is incurred, to get out as soon as possible. They have never incurred any debt during a period of peace. To their traditional policy they have most faithfully adhered.

MR. PLUMB: Let me ask the hon. member what about the eighty or ninety millions of debt incurred on behalf of the Union Pacific Railway?

MR. MILLS: Whatever the sum, it was not an expenditure by the Government, but a loan to the company, for the payment of which the company are responsible to Congress.

MR. PLUMB: The company have never paid a dollar of interest yet.

MR. MILLS: This in no way affects the accuracy of my statement. This policy has prevented public extravagance. It has favoured economy in the conduct of public affairs. It has prevented the Government from engaging in visionary, expensive and profitless enterprises. Our present position establishes to my mind, beyond all question, how salutary such a line of conduct would have been since Confederation to us. Ever since this Union was formed, we have been drawing too largely upon the future. We have incurred great burdens which we are seeking to shift from our own shoulders to the shoulders of those who cannot punish us for our dishonesty, who will never meet us who will not come into the world before

we have left it, and whose only means of protecting themselves against our misconduct will be to repudiate what we have done on their behalf. I agree with the Re-Sidney Smith, that those who are rotting in the church-yards have no right to control those who are sitting in the pews. While we are masters of the public ship and keep on deck and at the helm we may direct its course; and when we are no longer able to stay there we are at liberty to leave any amount of good advice; but we have no right to give commands and to impose obligations. The hon. the Minister of Finance requires for the Public Service a tax of \$30 annually from every family in Canada. But he has devised a system of taxation which takes not far from \$45 per family from the people. Capitalise the first of these sums and what have you got? Why, a central Government which requires the interest on \$600,000,000 to support it. Look at the wealth of the country as shown by your last Census returns and then at this sum, and tell me what chance there is for rapid improvement with this tremendous burden upon the shoulders of the country—a burden that is mainly born of the statesmanship of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am, Sir, in favour of economy, and the first important step in the way to economy is to give up your scheme for a forced loan, keep away from the London money market, and put an end to expenditures upon profitless enterprises. At present the tax which the people pay, which never finds its way into the public Treasury, represents a capitalised sum of not far from \$300,000,000. This is the value of the property which you have in effect seized, and have said to the owners "we want 5 per cent. on this sum to go towards aiding certain industrial pursuits," and you assume that there is no discouragement in all this. The injury is certain, the benefit is very uncertain. A single new appliance neutralises the Protection which you attempt to give, and when this is not done, the aid you give takes away the stimulus to improvement, and in the end does more harm to the recipient than good. Let me, Sir, ask the attention of the House to a few facts which I have gleaned from the *Scientific American*. There were, in the State of Massachusetts, boots and shoes:

Year.	Factories.	Hands.	Value of Work.
1865..	201	52,821	\$39,870,581
1875..		48,900	59,762,865
1878..	1,500	51,280	102,000,000

Now, we have within thirteen years such improvement in the appliances of labour that each man in 1878 did as much work as three and one-half men did in 1865. Let me take the cotton manufactories of Massachusetts in 1865, and in 1875. For these years the facts may be thus tabulated :

	Hands.	Yards.	Yard per Hand.
1865..	24,151	175,875,000	7,355
1875..	60,170	874,780,000	11,213

Here is an improvement equal to 55 per cent. and which would require a customs tax of that amount to overcome. Then there is a still more marked progress in the production of woollens. In the same two years the number of persons employed, and the value of the product was as follows :—

	Hands.	Value.
1865.....	18,753.....	\$45,008,141
1875.....	19,030.....	90,208,280

Here the production per yard was increased by 96½ per cent. Now, altogether, apart from the inherent viciousness of the system, a Government is in this day of invention utterly unequal to the task of affording general Protection, so rapid has been the progress of late years, that the waste of capital by discovery and invention is often as great as by ordinary wear. The inventions of genius set your Protective Tariffs at defiance, and you must adjust them year by year to counteract what, from the Protective point of view, are their injurious effects. I want to see all classes of our population stand upon a footing of perfect equality in the struggle for life. I want to see the country prosper. I want to see our waste lands occupied: but to this end we can only successfully succeed by getting out of debt and greatly reducing the cost of governing the country. These considerations clearly show that financial and fiscal reforms are the necessities of the hour.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: It is with some regret that I cast myself on the indulgence of the House at this late hour, but I think that the hon. Finance Minister would feel himself slighted if I paid no attention to his

address before the close of this debate. He was good enough to express regret that I was not present when, a few nights ago, he devoted himself at some length to a review of my remarks. He could not have regretted my absence more than I did myself. But, if he had been specially desirous of making those observations in my presence, he could have taken up the Estimates, and deferred this discussion. It is pleasant for me to know, however, that in my case the lines applied—

“Though lost to sight,
To memory dear.”

And, though not here in person, the hon. gentleman took occasion to review everything I said tolerably exhaustively. It would be very difficult to form a correct opinion of all he did say from the reports I have seen, as many links of his argument seem to have been omitted. I, therefore, shall confine myself rather to dealing with two or three prominent assertions which I judge, from the context, he must have made, than attempt to follow him in minute detail through all the complicated figures he addressed to the House. If I understand correctly his remarks—and, if not, I shall be obliged for correction—he took four positions. First, he declared that the portion of the expenditure which he estimates will be required for 1880-1, for which he is properly responsible, is less than that of any year since 1873, and especially is less than the portion of expenditure for 1875-6, for which we, or the late Government, were responsible. Is that a correct statement of the hon. gentleman's remarks?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes, taking into account the additions necessary, the increase of the interest on the Debt and Sinking Fund, and the extra Subsidies paid. These three items, with the expenditure on the Pacific and Intercolonial Railways, and the Prince Edward Island Railway—expenditures in 1873-4—and the proportion expended subsequently, if deducted, showed a smaller Estimate for 1881 than was spent since 1873-4.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: That was what I understood the hon. gentleman stated—that the estimate of the expenditure, for which he holds himself responsible, now represents a smaller sum

than has been expended since 1873. Next, he committed himself to the proposition that the increase of \$11,000,000 in the expenditure since Confederation is easily accounted for, and that the present Government, including himself as Finance Minister, are nowise blameworthy for that great increase.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : I spoke of the increase of the debt. I spoke of 1873, when I said that the estimated expenditure for the future was \$60,000,000 : \$10,000,000 for the Intercolonial, \$10,000,000 for the Canals, \$10,000,000 for other Public Works, and \$30,000,000 for the Pacific Railway ; and I said that hon. gentlemen opposite had increased that amount by \$55,000,000 between 1873-4 and the end of last year.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT : The hon. gentleman does not comprehend my position. I referred to the annual increase since 1868. There has been an increase since Confederation of \$11,000,000—from an annual expenditure of \$13,500,000 to \$24,500,000 ; for that the Finance Minister explicitly denied responsibility, and the context, in the report, shows this representation of his remarks is correct—he claimed that he and the Government were not blameable in the matter.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : I did not say who were blameable or unblameable. I said it was very much to be regretted that the hon. gentleman was not in his place ; it is exceedingly difficult for him to understand my meaning from brief reports. What I said was this : It having been stated the expenditure increased from \$13,500,000 in 1867 to \$24,000,000 in 1878-9, I proceeded to explain this increase and how far the expenditures were absolutely necessary, or many of them, while there might be some question as to others. The necessary outlays were for engagements under Confederation.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT : What I had said was, that I believed and yet believe, that the hon. the Finance Minister and colleagues were blameable to an enormous extent for the addition of \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000 since Confederation. The hon. gentleman has been merely quibbling in this matter.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : I call the hon. gentleman to order ; there has been no quibbling in my explanations.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT

I see the hon. gentleman repeated his previous statement, that the late Government were largely responsible for heavy additions to the country's engagements. I give that statement a most explicit denial, and shall prove the contrary. He assumed the late Government were responsible for the expenditure of 1874-5, and in so doing ignored three most material facts :—First, that a large portion of this expenditure was caused by the enormous additional interest incurred for works undertaken by the Government that preceded ours, of which the present hon. Finance Minister was a member ; next, that when we took office, we found the whole of the Government Railways in the Maritime Provinces, had been so mismanaged—had run down to such an extent—that during the whole term of the Mackenzie Government, a large sum was required annually to put them in a proper condition ; and hon. gentlemen who remember the extraordinary revelations made of the corruption and malfeasance which distinguished the Administration which preceded ours—who recollect the evidence in the case of the Crown *vs.* Howes, a brother-in-law of a member of that Government ; and the facts in the case of Fraser, Reynolds and Company, will be at no loss to understand how those railroads had deteriorated, and why the Mackenzie Government had to expend \$300,000 to \$400,000 a year, for several years, to put them in a barely decent condition. Last of all the hon. gentleman ignored or forgot that, during 1875, 1876 and 1877, an enormous annual expenditure had to be incurred for the completion of that vast mass of Minor Public Works, chargeable to Income, which the present Finance Minister and colleagues had most improperly, most foolishly, most extravagantly, inflicted on the country at a time when the commonest perception of the position of the country should have forbidden them to go out of office leaving a single one of those obligations undischarged. The hon. gentleman is reported to have said that, if you deduct those items of expenditure which he mentioned, and compare the remainder of the expenditure for 1881 with that for 1874-5, there is a balance of \$700,000 in his favour. Now, of the outlay for 1874-5, \$1,116,000 was incurred for Minor Public

Works which had been put under contract in the time of the Government to which hon. gentleman belonged; deduct this and you convert his imaginary surplus of \$700,000 into a real deficit of \$416,000, for 1881, as compared with 1874-5. In 1876, a further sum of \$1,106,787 was required to complete this enormous mass of Public Works, which should be deducted from the ordinary annual expenditure by us, for that year. Nor was it till 1877 that we finally got rid of this branch of expenditure, at a further cost of \$587,000, for works which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues left us as a legacy. This is of moment, because some attention, in the House and elsewhere, has been attracted by the fact that, during 1875 and 1876, our expenditure was larger than that of our last two years. The reason is this: When we entered office, we found the late Government had left behind them an indebtedness in Public Works, chargeable to Income, over and above the whole expenditure of 1874, amounting to the sum of \$2,810,000, which we had to meet, for works properly chargeable to them, put under contract by them—and this in addition to the ordinary expenses of the Government for 1875, 1876, 1877. I may add, that it was largely owing to that error of judgment that there were deficits to any considerable extent during the years 1876 and 1877. Now I come to my second proposition, which is, that these hon. gentlemen, and particularly the hon. the Minister of Finance, were largely blameable, because the expenditure of this country, under their Administration, rose, in the space of something like six years, from \$13,500,000 to nearly \$23,500,000, being an addition of nearly \$10,000,000 a year to our annual expenditure. That hon. gentleman, as his own Budget Speech in 1873 shows, left behind him a great mass of engagements amounting, according to his own statement, to \$60,000,000 to be added to our Capital Account, involving an addition for interest alone, according to his own statement in that same speech, of \$3,367,000, wholly independent of a great variety of other expenditures for which he and he only was responsible. Now, I will take a very simple test for showing how the difference between the expenditure of 1873 and the estimated expenditure for 1881 is made up. I will

call the attention of the House to the items which compose that difference; I will show the House when and by whom these were incurred, and I will leave it then to the House to say whether or not I am correct in saying that the added expenditure was mainly the hon. gentleman's, and that a very large part of it was unnecessary and blameworthy. Our annual expenditure in 1873 amounted, in round numbers, to \$19,174,000. For 1881, the hon. gentleman estimates, according to his first estimate, which I will take on the present occasion, the sum of \$25,070,000, leaving out, however, a sum of \$300,000 which he charges, in my judgment, improperly to Capital Account, which, if included, would make \$25,300,000. First, I will take the difference between his annual expenditure in 1873, and his estimated expenditure in 1881, which is \$5,832,000. That difference is made up in the first place by the difference between the interest on the Sinking Fund of \$3,265,000, by a difference on the expenditure for the Indians of \$586,000; for Mounted Police, \$290,000; for Provincial Debt and Subsidies, \$820,000; cost of the admission of Prince Edward Island, \$820,000; cost of certain increases in the Post Office Department, \$300,000; cost of certain Statutory increases, \$358,000; and the difference between the sum then demanded or spent, and the sum now demanded for the Civil Service of \$150,000, which sums, together, make up a total of \$6,931,000. Now, I ask by whom were these expenditures incurred, and when were they incurred? Without one exception the sum required for Interest and Sinking Fund, was caused by the necessity laid upon the late Government of providing funds for carrying out the engagements to which that hon. gentleman himself, and his colleagues had committed this country, irremediably before we came into office. It was caused in the second place by the necessity of providing for the extinguishment of the Indian title and the maintenance of the Mounted Police which was created by that hon. gentleman, by Statute passed in 1873, to which force we did not add, to the best of my recollection, one single man or one single officer more than were provided for by the Order in Council, passed by the hon. gentleman's colleagues before they went out of office.

Not even himself will deny that he, and he alone, is responsible for the assumption of the Provincial Debts, and for the Terms on which Prince Edward Island was admitted into the Union. Nor can he deny that he is responsible for the additional expenditure required for the maintenance of our railway system. Now, I state that for several of these things which I will more particularly enumerate a little later on, I hold the hon. gentleman himself, in a very special sense responsible, because he was Finance Minister at the time they were incurred, and, because, had he exercised common prudence there would not have been the slightest occasion for the difficulties with which I had to contend, and with which he has to contend himself to-day. But I pause to notice one argument used either by himself or by some of his friends, with respect to the assumption of the Provincial Debt. That hon. gentleman, or his friends, have stated in this House that they do not consider that the measure which added \$800,000 in all to the annual expenditure of the Dominion of Canada, and for which we have to raise taxes from the people of Canada, to levy new burdens on the people, because, forsooth, the Local Governments get the benefit of it. I say that that argument is doubly fallacious. I say, in the first place, that the Dominion of Canada has to put additional taxes on the people to supply that \$820,000. I say, in the next place, that, so far as the Local Governments were concerned, so far from being of the least advantage to them, it was the greatest injury that any statesman could have done them, because it offered a premium on their extravagance. I say that the Province of Quebec, and all the other Provinces, would have been far richer to-day had the hon. gentleman refused to grant their petition. I say that had he had the manhood, and the honesty, to tell them that they must provide, out of their own funds, for their necessities, instead of allowing them to put their hands into the Dominion Treasury, they would not now have found themselves in the difficulties into which their own folly has plunged them. Now, I deal with the other ascertainment that the late Government were responsible for a large part of the present engagements of this coun-

try. I take issue with that statement altogether. I say that as regards Canals, my hon. friend did not expend one-farthing on one single canal to which the previous Government did not commit the country, and for which they had not previously taken votes as the Estimates I have here show. I say that as regards Railways, there is but one small grant, a grant of one and a-half million of dollars made to the Canada Central Railway, for which my hon. friend's Administration can be held responsible, in any manner or shape, and I say that there never was a greater absurdity, a more palpable evasion of responsibility, than to attempt to saddle hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, with one farthing of the expenditure for the Pacific Railway itself. What do these hon. gentlemen tell us? That they, in 1871, made an insane and foolish bargain with the people of British Columbia, a bargain so absurd, that when I was in London, in 1874, I was asked by English officials of high rank were the people of Canada mad to enter into such an engagement. I say that these gentlemen, of all other men, should be the last to attempt to throw the slightest responsibility on the gentleman on this side of the House, and particularly on the men who composed the late Administration; because, when they had committed Canada to the absurd engagement to build a railway of 3,000 miles in length over a totally unknown and unexplored country in ten years, when we doubled the time in which that obligation was to be discharged, when we reduced its length by one-third, now we are told that we are responsible for the Pacific Railway. It may well be—I fear it is the case—that not merely the original bargain, but even the modified terms which we obtained, may prove to be impossible of execution by the people of Canada; but on that point I refrain from offering further observations, because, within a few days that subject is to be discussed at length, and I intend then to give the House my reasons for believing that it will be an act of unpardonable folly for us in the present position of Canada to proceed to expend ten, fifteen, or twenty millions in constructing a line which can be of no possible use until the main line is taken across the continent. But I can say, for my own part, that

when I was Finance Minister I lost no opportunity, in my place in the House, of warning the people of British Columbia that they must distinctly understand that, although we would do what we could to redeem the pledge which Canada had given, still that that promise was necessarily to be bounded by the ability of the people of Canada to redeem it without inflicting—for the sake of benefitting some 14,000 people—unendurable taxation on 4,000,000 of people on this side of the Rocky Mountains. Now, a word or two to say as to the extent of the burdens which that hon. gentleman had placed on people of Canada in the year 1873. His own estimate, as the House knows, is some \$60,000,000. That estimate, I regret to say, was far below what I subsequently discovered to be the true state of the case when, with the aid of my hon. friend from Lambton, I began, in 1874, and also in 1875, carefully to investigate the full extent of the obligations which that hon. gentleman had made. I found that far from \$60,000,000 being sufficient to carry out the engagement he had made, we would have required an expenditure of \$96,000,000. I found the canals which the Government of that day had undertaken to construct, were they constructed on the scales and grading of the plans which they had advised, would have required some \$43,000,000 in all. For the Intercolonial Railway, \$10,000,000. For the Pacific, \$30,000,000. Besides that, they had left us the necessity of putting the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Railways in repair at a cost of \$2,000,000, and we had to expend \$2,500,000 for the Prince Edward Island Railway. They had left behind them a whole mass of minor public works, amounting to \$4,500,000 in all. We were obliged to make certain improvements on the St. Lawrence, amounting to \$2,500,000 to which they committed us. Now, I do not pretend to say all those undertakings were in themselves bad. I have never said that, but I do pretend to say this, that it was the height of imprudence at a time when such enormous engagements were being undertaken to select that particular period to make these enormous additions to the Annual Expenditure of Canada which that hon. gentleman chose to incur at that particular period. I say that the

hon. the Finance Minister was specially blameworthy in these four points; first of all, I say, the terms on which he negotiated the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Union, involved an absolute charge over and above all the amounts that we now receive, or can for many years receive, from Prince Edward Island of at least \$400,000 per year. I say that by the assumption of the debts and the subsidy of New Brunswick, a further addition of nearly \$820,000 was made; that by the Statutory increase proposed and carried through by him, an addition of at least \$300,000 a year was made to our Annual Expenditure. Now, if you add these sums together, you will find that at the moment that—according to his own statement—he knew that he was incurring an expenditure for Capital Account of at least \$60,000,000, which would add \$3,250,000 to our annual charge for Interest, he chose deliberately to select that period to increase our Annual Expenditure by a million and a-half, and to leave behind a legacy of Minor Public Works, involving an expenditure of three or four millions more. Seven years have elapsed between 1873 and 1880, and during all which time we have spent \$1,500,000 every year for these four items above, and you will, therefore, see that I am well within the mark in saying that these special expenditures for which the hon. gentleman was responsible, fully represent an annual charge upon us of two million dollars per year, in other words, are fully equal to the whole of the largest deficit which Canada has had to meet since Confederation. Now, as to the Tariff, there is one point which I desire specially to deal with. As I said, the hon. gentleman or his supporters, insist that there has been no serious increase in [the taxation of the people of Canada since Confederation. Now, in the first place, this assumption entirely ignores one of the most material points. Those hon. gentleman have not yet grasped the full meaning of their own Protective Tariff. They must remember that of the taxation they have lately imposed, a large amount will not come into the Treasury at all, but, Sir, it will come out of the pockets of the people of Canada. However, deducting that for arguments sake,

taking them even on their own showing, we find that according to the statement which the reporters put into the mouth of the hon. gentleman, our taxation, *per capita*, amounted to about \$3.50 in 1873, and that it now amounts to at least \$4.50. If the Revenue which we hoped to attain from the new taxation was attained, it would amount next year to fully \$5 per head, in other words, our total taxation—if the hon. gentleman got his expected revenue—would have increased by fully one-third from the figure at which it stood in 1868. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), informed me that he heard nothing whatever, during the speech of the hon. gentleman, as to the calculations on which he had based the expectation that our Revenue was about to be largely increased within the current three or four months. I have looked over the arguments advanced as to the expected increase of Revenue as detailed by the hon. member in his Budget Speech. I found that the hon. gentleman declared that he had good ground for expecting that the Revenue will fully equal his expectations, because, up to the 1st March, 1880, that was to say, during the month of January and February of that year, the Revenue had increased about \$200,000 per month beyond the figure in the corresponding period up to 1st March, 1880. But in making that calculation, the hon. gentleman has not chosen to tell the House that, whereas the total Revenue, according to the published statement in the *Gazette*, up to 1st March, 1880, was just barely \$14,000,000; the Revenue up to the corresponding period, 1st March, 1878, was \$1,000,000 more, having amounted to \$15,003,000. It was tolerably clear that, if the hon. gentleman was correct in expecting an increase of Revenue at the rate of \$200,000 per month, in 1880 over the amount that had been received in 1878, the total result for the following four months would be that we would barely equal the Revenue obtained in 1878, inasmuch as he had still to make up a million, being the difference between the actual receipts to the 1st March, 1880, and the 1st March, 1878. But I observed in a statement which the hon. gentleman has furnished to the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr Anglin), that the increase for Customs

Revenue for the month of March just past, appeared to have been about \$212,000, which certainly did not indicate up to the present any very great ground for expecting that our total receipts for the current year would be larger than those for 1878, or those for the year that has just passed. I had not observed that the hon. gentleman or any of his friends had attempted to deal with the important question as to the real incidence of taxation on the great bulk of the working classes of this country; and I take this opportunity of saying that, the calculations I had submitted a few weeks ago were based on an actual analysis showing the actual number of pounds of sugar, and pounds of tea, and barrels of flour, the actual amount of money expended in dry goods and clothes by the several persons whose accounts I had caused to be examined with a view to ascertain what was the true incidence of taxation on the working classes of this country. Nor has the hon. the Finance Minister or any of his friends attempted to answer the challenge I then gave, to name throughout the whole of Ontario, so much as twelve factories employing 100 hands or over, which had sprung into existence since January 1st, 1879. I expressly stated then, that, with the exception of the sugar refineries and the cotton manufactories, I had been totally unable to discover even a dozen factories throughout the Dominion, not to speak of Ontario, employing that number of hands. No hon. gentleman on the other side, so far as I have heard or read, and none of their newspapers have attempted to produce any evidence, that I was incorrect in my statement that with the exception of these two classes of manufacturers, the National Policy so called, has, up to the present time, utterly and absolutely failed to give employment to any considerable number of persons in this country. Instead of giving us the proofs and telling us where the factories were situated, and how many hands they employed, they give nothing but vague and wild assertions that 4,000 or 5,000 hands are employed in Montreal, that 10,000 additional men are employed under the policy, or as the hon. the Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) has it, that hundreds of thousands of people have been employed since the policy

came into operation. I would now glance at another argument advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite—the argument that he brought forward as to the extent of Revenue anticipated last year. It is remarkable that if the Revenue, as the Finance Minister stated, had been anticipated in so great a degree, that, according to his own Trade and Navigation Returns, the total imports for the year 1879 should be fully \$11,000,000 less than those of 1878, and that whereas, in 1878 we had imported \$91,190,000 worth of goods, in 1879, according to the trade returns, the amount was only \$80,341,000, while if we take the articles of cotton and woollen goods and hardware which, as every hon. gentleman knows, formed the great bulk of our duty-paying imports, they found that whereas, in 1878 we had imported \$22,577,000 worth, in 1879 we had imported barely \$19,774,000 worth. These facts show conclusively that the hon. gentleman was wrong in supposing that there was any great anticipation. He sheltered himself, it is true, under the statement I made in 1874, that there was then a very considerable anticipation and over exportation; but the hon. gentleman totally forgot this important fact, that he had practically four months before the termination of the year, whereas in 1874 I had only two months and a half, and the further fact that the total volume of imports in 1874 was enormously in excess of the volume in 1879. Making allowance for the much greater length of time in one case, and for the much greater volume of goods imported at that time, it evidently appears that the hon. gentleman is wrong in supposing there was any great anticipation. In truth, in view of the Trade and Navigation Returns, I very much doubt if there has been any actual anticipation at all affecting 1879-80. But I would like to know on what the hon. gentleman bases his hope of increased Revenue. Was it on increased imports? Why, the policy he has deliberately adopted was devised for the very purpose of stopping this horrible influx of imports into this country, and to give our people the opportunity of manufacturing these goods. Now, he tells us that the imports will increase, but he must make his election. If the imports increase we could not give increased employment to our people in new

factories. I do not contend, and I have never contended, that the hon. gentleman would necessarily fail to obtain increased Revenue by the enormous taxation he has imposed. I simply claimed that he could not do both. He could not at once receive increased imports, and at the same time give the people increased employment. I dared to say that the hon. gentleman would fail in both. Both the hon. gentleman and his colleague, the hon. the Minister of Railways have made a very severe attack on me on the ground of the over estimates which, at various times, I have submitted to the House. I would like to know if the hon. gentlemen or their followers had any clear idea of the circumstances under which every Finance Minister must bring down his Estimates. These Estimates as submitted necessarily cover a period nearly eighteen months in advance of the date at which they are brought down. No Canadian Finance Minister could pretend to say more than this—that if the condition of things which at the time existed was not materially changed, if there was no great commercial revulsion, if there was no great alteration in values, the Estimates were reasonably likely to be fulfilled. Let them consider how far the late Government and myself, as Finance Minister, were blameworthy for the difference which undoubtedly did exist between the Estimates submitted by me as Minister in 1875, and the receipts realised in 1876, or as regards those of 1877 and 1878. There were some circumstances under which I frankly admit that the Minister of the day might be blameable for such a failure in his calculations. For instance, he would be wrong if he undertook to estimate for a sum largely in excess of the sum received up to the same date in the previous year, unless he had good ground for knowing that there would be a great increase in the trade of the country. But I think no man of good sense will say that the hon. the Finance Minister would be to blame because he could not see eighteen months ahead that there would suddenly arise a state of commercial depression extending over the whole world, that it would be of unexampled duration, and that it would be accompanied with the greatest shrinkage of values, known within the memory of man.

Mr. LANDRY: Hear, hear.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Let me hope that the hon. gentleman will listen earnestly and that he will profit by what I have to say. Few persons, beyond those who have been obliged to examine the matter minutely, are aware of the difference in values which this depression caused. From the work of Mr. Brassey—one of the best authorities on the subject, and from the *Economist*, a well-known English commercial newspaper—I find that, within the last four or five years, the price of Scotch pig-iron fell from 127 shillings to 43 shillings per ton. Cotton fell from tenpence to fivepence three-farthings per pound, and wool from £21 to £13 per bale. I might go on multiplying such instances indefinitely. Now, in estimating for 1876, I would have been justly censurable, had I estimated largely in advance of what had been received in the previous years, namely, \$15,351,000. But, I was not blameable in February, 1875, for stating that, unless there was some serious commercial revolution, I was likely to obtain a similar Revenue for the succeeding year. From all the circumstances by which one could judge I was perfectly justified in expecting such a revenue. Before the eighteen months the tremendous convulsion I had spoken of took place. But it was well known and has been very fully proved by my hon. friend the then Minister of Customs (Mr. Burnee), that I had made no serious mistake as to the quantities of goods required for consumption in the country. We failed, however, in not being able to estimate, so far ahead, the shrinkage which would take place in the value of the goods imported. We had, in fact, been mistaken in common with all the extensive manufacturers and business men, not only in Canada, but in England and the United States as well. Subsequent evidence went to show that the goods made in 1877 were sold for bare cost, and those made in 1878 below the cost of production, and I say again, under such circumstances as these, that the Finance Minister of the day was not responsible, because he could not forecast an unexampled depression, which swept over the whole civilised world. I find that the hon. gentleman, and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), contended that no such serious loss had

resulted from the operation of the Tariff on sugar, as we alleged. I propose to devote a few moments to the consideration of this point. There are two or three facts which everybody must admit. In the first place, the Minister cannot deny that he has added a very considerable tax to that formerly imposed, nor is he in a position to deny that one result thereof has been to inflict a very heavy loss on the Revenue of this country; so that while the taxes are increased the Revenue has fallen off 25 per cent. from what it was under our comparatively low Tariff. These hon. gentlemen dispute our mode of measuring the loss of the people and the extent of that loss; but the real test of the loss is very simple. What we have to do is to take the average prices—not occasional prices—of sugar, free in bond, in the port of New York; we have then to ascertain the average prices of sugar sold in this country to the grocers. I say that the difference between these two prices gives the exact measure of the tax upon the people of Canada. Now, a large part of this difference does not go into the Treasury, and it must, therefore, be a dead loss to the people of Canada. What is the allegation of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), copied by the hon. the Minister of Finance? His statement is that the difference between the prices free in bond, and the prices to the trade, averaged 2½ cents per pound, and he gave certain quotations in the month of November, proving his case to that effect. The allegation of my hon. friend from Kingston, than whom there is not a better authority on the point in all Canada, is that the average difference varies from 3c. to 3½c., and 3¾c. per pound. In the one case, and giving the hon. member for Cardwell the benefit of his own computation, the loss of the people of Canada is \$750,000 per annum, assuming the consumption to be one hundred and ten million of pounds per annum. In the other case the loss would be one and one-half millions per annum. I propose to take the respective proofs advanced by these two hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for Cardwell took two or three days in the month of November, and shows that the prices in New York were only 2½c. per pound lower than Redpaths'

prices. I take, not one or two of these days, not a casual transaction, but the average of the year; I take the price of the whole of the month of September, and I find that Messrs. Redpaths demanded for granulated sugar \$8.29 per cwt.; while in New York the prices of granulated sugar were from \$5.41 to \$5.85 per cwt., so that this sugar could be bought in New York at from \$3.44 to \$3.88 per cwt. less than Redpaths demanded. In the month of December, the average prices in New York were from \$5.97 to \$7.10 per cwt., while Redpaths' amounted to \$10.12½ per cwt., so that Redpaths' prices in December varied from \$4.15 down to \$3.02½ per cwt. more than New York prices. Now, the fact of the matter is, as my hon. friend from Kingston put it, if you take an isolated transaction, which may or may not have occurred *bonâ fide*, it is very easy to make a certain market price for a certain occasion. But take the average, as given for a whole period of considerable length, and we find the additional price amounts to from 3¼c. to 3½c. per pound. That is the actual tax upon the people of Canada, which amounts to about \$3,500,000 per annum, while we see, by the Returns on the Table of the House, the total Revenue likely to be received is barely \$2,000,000 per annum, and that is likely to be further reduced when the capacity of the refineries is enlarged. Now, this is a plain statement of fact. In any case, a very few weeks or months will settle the question. The hon. gentleman should be very cautious in assailing the estimates of any man. If the hon. gentleman chooses to look through the several years, beginning with Sir John Rose and Sir Francis Hincks, during the whole of that period scarcely a single estimate was correct; they varied from 37 to 25 per cent. though, of course, in some cases the estimates were in excess, and in others, largely below the actual returns. Now, the hon. gentleman was himself mistaken in 1873; he was mistaken as to amount of taxation necessary to inflict on the people of this country to carry out those great works which we had undertaken; and I may add, to go no further back than last year, we find then he was mistaken seriously, as to the Public Revenue he would derive—as to its pro-

bable extent, and as to the time to be allowed for the development of those new industries and factories. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side have advanced two or three strange arguments: One says, that the National Policy cannot advance, because the Opposition will not help that policy forward—that is an extraordinary reason to advance. How are the mighty fallen! They cannot make that ricketty infant walk, unless we guide with leading strings. There is this one grain of truth in that—they know that, although few in number, we represent a very strong and powerful body in this country; and, since the result of the Ontario elections, they are not quite certain that this minority does not represent the true feelings of the Dominion, as they certainly have been shown by those elections to represent these of Ontario. As to our prospects for the future, like hon. gentlemen on the other side, I am inclined to believe that they really did centre to a great extent on our policy in settling and developing the North-West, but the possibility of their doing any good for ourselves was being doubly menaced by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, in the first place, there is very great danger that, if the proposition now before the House become law, the funds which are absolutely necessary to develop that country may be uselessly and fruitlessly diverted to an expenditure in British Columbia. In the second place, because the National Policy is specially mischievous because it has added enormously to the expenditure of every settler going into that country, because there—where it is to the last degree important that the hardy pioneers who are going to the North-West should be allowed to purchase those articles they require in the cheapest market which the necessities of the Revenue will allow—they find themselves hampered at every turn in every single thing they have to buy by the vexatious and unreasonable impositions which the hon. gentleman has placed upon them. It may be that the great natural advantages of that country will neutralise the evil effects of this policy to some extent. As to hon. gentlemen on this side, they are anxious and desirous to do all they can to forward the development of the North-West. At a time of great difficulty and depression

my hon. friend the member for Lambton, in the teeth of considerable opposition, pushed forward, to the utmost of his power, a plan for opening up and developing that great territory. We are disposed to adhere to that policy, and we will do all we can to aid those hon. gentlemen. But I repeat that all that we can do on both sides of the House will be little compared with the evil effects of this fiscal policy on every settler in that country. I understood that the hon. the Minister of Railways had specially desired to be present during these remarks. I do not see him in his place in the House, and I would be glad to know if he has retired.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: He has.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: In that case I will say little as to two or three matters to which I intended to allude. As the hon. the Minister of Railways is absent, I will merely take this opportunity of here publicly giving a contradiction to a certain injurious statement affecting myself which that hon. gentleman had been ill-advised enough to make. His line of argument was peculiar. When I charged that the Tariff was unjust to the workingmen, the hon. the Minister of Railways had replied that I was jealous of the appointment of Sir Francis Hicks, ten years ago, to the office of Minister of Finance. When I charged that the Estimates were extravagant, the hon. gentleman had replied that I was a renegade Tory. When I charged that the sugar duty was an imposition, the hon. gentleman was pleased to say that I had hidden my head in my hat as an ostrich did in the sand. That might be correct, but I fail to see what particular connection it has with the argument. I have to say this, however, that, as the hon. gentleman is not in his place, I will take the opportunity when he is in the House of explaining who the renegades were. For the present I will content myself with simply disproving the assertion he was foolish enough to make as to the reasons why I had withdrawn my support, in 1869, from the former Administration of the present First Minister. The hon. the Minister of Railways has stated, in express terms, that I had stated on the floor of the House that I objected to Sir Francis Hincks' introduction to the Cabinet, because I expected to fill his place. Now, for this assertion, there was

not the very slightest foundation. I have this to say, that, in 1870, at the first opportunity I had after the introduction of Sir Francis Hincks, I had risen in my place and made a statement, withdrawing all connection with hon. gentlemen opposite. The reasons I gave for so withdrawing were two. First of all, I said that, in my judgment, the antecedents of Sir Francis Hincks were such as to disqualify him from again becoming a Canadian Minister; and secondly, that I could not recognise that gentleman as a representative of the Reform party; and when I made that statement the present First Minister sat in the seat now occupied by the Minister of Public Works. He heard the statement, and he did not dare to deny it, and I say here—because I have a right to hold him responsible for the language of his colleague—that the reason he did not dare to deny that statement was that he held then and holds now the hon. gentleman's own letter, a letter of six pages, filled from first to last with one long argument to prove that he was mistaken in thinking that Sir Francis Hincks would not obtain the support and confidence of the Reform party. I challenge the hon. Minister and his colleague to dispute these statements, as I am prepared, by the most indubitable evidence, to prove their correctness. I regret that the hon. the Minister of Railways is not in his place, as I wished to refer to some personal remarks made by that hon. gentleman regarding myself. As it is, and having regard to the lateness of the hour and the extreme weariness of the House, I will postpone what I have to say on that subject to another and more fitting opportunity.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: When addressing the House, a few days since, the hon. member who has just resumed his seat was not present, and I now desire to make some reference to what I consider an unfair attack and unjustifiable insinuations that he made with reference to myself. That hon. gentleman was reprov'd or rebuked promptly by my colleague, and therefore I might be satisfied, perhaps, with what was said by him; but at the same time I feel bound to say that, if the hon. gentleman had attained a position in this country as a statesman, that would warrant or justify him, in the

opinion of the House and the country, to speak in the sneering terms he did; and if I had failed as complete in everything I had attempted in my life as the hon. gentleman has, I might have submitted to his remarks with patience, and accepted the castigation he undertook to give me. But if my hon. colleague's reproof had been less complete, I would have had sufficient satisfaction in what took place on that occasion. On my first visit to Montreal, after accepting my present position, I remember meeting a gentleman of the same shade of politics as the hon. gentleman opposite, and he declared, in the most emphatic terms, that the defeat of the late Administration on 17th September, 1878, was mainly attributable to the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright). The same statement was frequently made to me in Ontario. I do not think that, under the circumstances, it is wise on the part of any hon. members on this side of the House to speak of that hon. gentleman as being a renegade Tory, because I have been told that the strength of this Government today, in a great measure, arises from the fact that that hon. gentleman looked forward to being again the Finance Minister, in case his party should be successful. My satisfaction the other night was, in knowing that, when the hon. the Finance Minister of Railways was replying to the hon. gentleman, and using, in many cases, very strong language, censuring and reflecting on him, there was as much satisfaction on the other side of the House as there was on this. I should not wonder, however, if the hon. gentlemen who cheered the hon. Minister, should rise and censure him and myself, in order to put themselves right on this matter. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), had been present when I made my last address, he would not have made some of the statements that he has made to-night. In that speech, I endeavoured to avoid bringing in anything of party or personal matters. I entered upon the discussion with two special objects in view. There is a very general impression in the country, that the increase of our expenditure from 1867 to the end of last year has been very large, and I took the statement from the Public

Accounts to show that the taxation in 1867 and 1868 was \$3.50 per head, and when we took into account the increased population and the admission of several of the Provinces into the Dominion, it had only increased by one dollar per head. I made this statement without reference to one party or the other. In fact, I defended both Governments with reference to it. I showed that the expenditure in regard to the maintenance of the Intercolonial had resulted in loss in working that road, but I do not reflect upon one Government more than another in reference to that deficit, but I wanted to show it to the House and the country for the purpose of removing the erroneous impression that the taxation had been unnecessarily increased. I went on to show just how that increase had taken place and the items of expenditure constituting them. It was scarcely necessary to do this in the House, because hon. members were acquainted with the facts, but I think it was necessary that the country should have correct information regarding the increase that had taken place in the expenditure from \$13,000,000 to \$24,000,000. I went on to show as well how the debt had been increased, and stated that \$14,000,000 of that was caused by the assumption of the debts of the Provinces, and afterwards to show that the additional \$14,000,000 of what had already been expended on the Intercolonial Railway was caused by circumstances over which neither Government had control. I did not enter into the consideration as to who were responsible for that expenditure, but I discussed the matter in general terms. In 1871, when we took up the consideration of the question of the canals, it was considered judicious to appoint a Commission to ascertain which canals should be constructed to complete the Canadian system, and that Commission reported a system which would cost, when completed, \$20,000,000. Some of the tenders for these Canals had been asked for before the Government of 1873 had resigned, but the hon. gentlemen opposite did not accept those tenders. They called for others. We were warned then by some hon. gentlemen opposite that we were entering upon large and dangerous expenditures, which should not be entered upon at that time. We had a large surplus at the time, and, as demands

came in for those works, we went on to construct them, because they were desirable and necessary. If, as I said at the time, we found the Revenue fell off, that was one of the items of expenditure we could decrease. What did the hon. gentlemen do? They came down with an increased taxation of \$3,000,000, representing the financial condition of the Dominion as unsatisfactory. The matter was sufficiently in their own hands. We did not bind them to spend \$20,000,000 of the amount disbursed. The Intercolonial Railway we were bound to build as part of the Terms of Confederation, but the condition with reference to the canals was that they should be enlarged only so soon as the financial circumstances of the country would justify; and it was quite open to those hon. gentlemen to say that they would defer such expenditure if necessary. But they went on to incur an enormous expenditure and liability, and when their conduct was questioned, they claimed it was influenced by the poverty of the country, asserting that it was a good time to construct those public works, labour being very cheap, not that they were bound to spend that amount within a given period, which they were not. What were our obligations in addition? Thirty millions for the building of the Pacific Railway. I do not pretend to say the hon. gentlemen opposite were answerable for this obligation; or, as I might say, they changed our whole policy for the construction of that Railway by which it was to be built for \$30,000,000 and a quantity of public lands. The late Government changed the plan, saying the road should be built as a Government works whatever it might cost. They assumed additional engagements, including \$1,500,000 for a branch railroad, and \$750,000 in lieu of a railroad on Vancouver Island. I have mentioned these facts to show why it was necessary for us to ask \$10,000,000 this year, and \$10,000,000 next year, to complete the railroad from Lake Superior to Red River. It was simply for the purpose of leading the House to consider the expenditure for the period from 1867 to the present year, and showing why it was necessary that taxation should be increased, and why, in the interest of the country, we had to ask for \$10,000,000 for the Pacific Railway—because the

works in progress had to be completed, to make the contracts the hon. gentlemen opposite had entered into available for the opening up and the development of the country. One thing the late Finance Minister cannot forget; in every speech he has delivered since he left office, he has discussed the expenditure of 1873-4. He repeats the same remarks, no matter how often you answer him, and, as history repeats itself, we might in the future recognise him as the historical member of this House. The hon. gentleman's opinions on this subject appear like first impressions, permanent, and ineradicable. He says he was censured by the hon. the Minister of Railways for making erroneous estimates, and he coupled with that hon. gentleman the Finance Minister. Of course the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), on assuming office, did not affect the receipts from Customs and Excise for 1873-4, or my Estimates for 1874-5, for which I was responsible; but he changed the whole character of my Estimates, by adding \$3,000,000 of taxes; and, therefore, whatever change has taken place with reference to the receipts from Customs and Excise, he cannot hold me responsible. But he says, there were several of my Estimates entirely erroneous, — for instance, \$2,250,000 receipts from Public Works, which yielded only \$1,500,000. Now, if my memory serves me, and I think I have not forgotten the circumstance, when the Rivière du Loup section of the Intercolonial Railway was opened, it was managed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, who took the receipts and paid the expenditures, so that they did not appear, in the year previous, in the Accounts. Afterwards, it was thought best to make an Estimate for this road—because it was thought we should work it ourselves, take the receipts, and provide for the expenditure. It was not known then how much of the Intercolonial Railway would be opened, and, therefore, the Estimates of receipts and expenditures for Public Works, including Railways, for 1873-4, were much larger than necessary, as the road continued to be managed by the Grand Trunk Railway; and still the hon. gentleman points to this as one of the cases in which there was great exaggeration in our Estimates of the receipts and expenditure from Public Works.

The late Finance Minister stated to-night that a large portion of the taxes levied by this Government would not be received, and that they would amount to \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000, while the Treasury would receive but \$2,500,000. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Burpee) has cited an array of figures to establish the same view. Let us see what the experience of the last six months has been. It shows the increased percentage of duty collected on the imports is $4\frac{1}{4}$, which, applied to \$75,599,992, the value of the imports for consumption last year, would give \$3,212,996 instead of \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000.

MR. ANGLIN: Where is the sugar money?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That total includes everything. The Returns show the increase over the year previous is $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., which gives that result; so we expect to receive \$2,400,000 additional duties the present year. As I estimated, the first six months were largely anticipated, by \$500,000 or \$700,000 being collected in February and March last year, which properly belong to this. For January, February and March last we received \$750,000 more than for the same period of 1878, and for the first six months of 1878 the receipts were \$500,000 more than for the same period of 1879. That shows that the Revenue for the six months from the 1st of January to July 1880, will exceed my calculations.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Then you will have no deficit?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: There will be a deficiency, but I want to establish one important point: To-night I have been told that if our policy succeeds, we will obtain no Revenue, and if it does not, we will. I appeal to the House to say whether there has not been a large increase of our manufactures within the last six months. In the face of the fact that there is so much evidence of such an improvement, and that our Revenue for the first three months of this year is \$750,000 more from Customs than in January, February and March, 1878, we are told the Tariff is a failure. From the Protection on agricultural implements, for example, as I have already shown, we derive benefit in various ways, when there is increased production; have we

the increased duty on the iron used, and the increased revenue from the consumption of dutiable goods by the increased number of men employed, the number of implements manufactured in one establishment having increased from 1,800 to 4,000. We shall thus have as much Revenue from this source as before, the purchasers and users of those implements getting them at the same price. With reference to sugar, I have already explained that under the new duties a very good grocery sugar, No. 14, the duty is $\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound less than formerly, and competition in refining is already growing up. With reference to the point made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith), what I did say was, that in connection with the sugar trade there would be a direct trade between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies, which would lead to a larger number of vessels, sailing from St. John and other ports, to engage in that West India trade. I stated that the demand for vessels for the coasting trade of the Maritime Provinces, and the trade between them and the West Indies was certain to secure them higher freights. Rome was not built in a day; and though this policy has been a greater success than we expected, it will yet produce still larger results. Down to the present, all the sugar refining has been done in Montreal, and, therefore, though vessels have returned to Halifax with sugar and been sent sometimes to Montreal, much of the sugar has gone westward by rail; but when there will be sugar refineries at Halifax and Moncton, vessels will come to those ports with their cargoes, which will increase the carrying trade and employ even more than our present large number of vessels. I may repeat that we have been obtaining lately all the sugar between numbers 9 and 14 from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. less duty than before, the Americans being shut out. The hon. member for Centre Huron says that the duty on American sugar is enormous; practically exclusive. Just so long as they give a bounty on that sugar beyond the duty on the raw, we shall maintain our present duties; but the moment that bounty is swept away our markets will be opened to them. Our duty is intended to meet that bounty in excess of the duty on the raw material. We have all

the competition of refiners in Great Britain in this sugar refinery business, with its cheaper labor, and more abundant and cheap capital; and, suppose it be true that the refineries now charge more than is reasonable for their sugar, we shall ere long, have two, three or more refineries, creating sharp competition, and securing, like the competition in the cotton and woollen trades, sales at as low prices as possible, no matter what the protection may be. I took the liberty a few days since of calling attention to the fact that the hon. member for Centre Huron, had referred to Sir Alexander Galt, stating that when I was in Washington, he was there; when I floated the last loan in London, he was there. When the last loan was floated, Sir A. T. Galt was in Canada. When I was in Washington, he was not there. He was in New York, and I did not know that he was there.

MR. ANGLIN: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say he did not see nor meet him there?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I did not meet him there, nor did I know he was in New York at that time, until I met him in Montreal three or four weeks afterwards. Some hon. gentlemen said he had something to do with framing the Tariff. I state now, what I have not stated before, that he had nothing to do with it. He was in England when it was being prepared; that he never saw or knew one of its provisions until he came here a few days after he arrived from England. We had an interview with respect to the wine duty, which was left an open question, until I could learn from him the result of his communications with the authorities in France and Spain, with reference to that question. We discussed that and the duty was arranged. At that time he asked me my provisions with reference to certain articles, and I am not quite sure he agreed with me on those points. But I assert that, with the exception of the wine question, no communication, direct or indirect, passed between us with reference to the preparation of this Tariff. It is a part of the policy of the Opposition to reproach me with having been guided by that gentleman in the preparation of this Tariff. I do not object to it, because, as I said the other day, I feel honoured by the fact that

anything I had to do in the preparation of this measure should be accounted worthy to emanate from so great a statesman. Ever since I submitted these resolutions to this House, a year ago, ever since this Tariff has been shown to be a success, and especially since I visited the manufacturers throughout the Dominion, there have been sneers and insinuations against me, everything that could be said or written, and somethings that ought not to be said, have been uttered in an endeavour to weaken my influence and disparage me in reference to this matter. I have not said this before but I say it now. I care not what they may say in this respect. I do not claim any patent for this Tariff. I said at the outset that my colleagues and myself would be glad to receive information from anyone, no matter what party he belonged to, or what interest he represented; because we did not claim, although my predecessor is said to have claimed it for himself, that we knew everything and no one else knew anything. Then something has been said, to-night, about emigrants and about workmen. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) has delivered a very long speech here to-day, and I will venture to say that in the history of this country you will find a speech, four hours in length, delivered by no public man that contains so much that is disparaging to the character and credit of the country. From beginning to end it was a picture of suffering, poverty, wretchedness and wrong.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Something was said about the "hum."

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The great trouble is that there is too much of the "hum." It has been said by the hon. gentleman opposite that I was not a prophet.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I said you were a prophet, but a false one.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Well, I can take that from my hon. friend, but I will ask the House if the question of the success of the National Policy depended upon his statement or my statement, what the verdict would be? If there can be nothing more said against it than has been said by the hon. member for Westmoreland, then the matter is settled. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam) called attention to the great boon that

was to be given to the shipping interest, and the hon. member for Gloucester said: That not one vessel was building at St. John last autumn. I can inform him that a good many vessels are on the stocks there now. We did not expect this National Policy was going to lead to the construction of a large number of ships all at once. It has been alleged that the policy of the Government has had the effect of taxing ships instead of relieving them. I hold in my hand the claims that were made down to the middle of March from the owners and builders of vessels, and the sums that were paid. I think the hon. member for Yarmouth stated we only allowed return duties on iron, copper, paints, canvass, lead and other materials entering into the construction of the hull of the ship. Cordage was not included, because the duty was increased from 5 to 10 per cent. The late Minister of Customs made a reference to the ship-builders of St. John. But what did they claim? They claimed that even the furniture of the ship, that is, all articles that do not enter into the hull of the vessel, should be relieved from taxation and from duty. That was not done before. I answered them that the object of Parliament was this: That if the ship was to be rigged and sold by a builder, everything that entered into the construction of the hull should be entitled to a drawback of the amount of duty paid. For instance, they calculated a duty on the iron tanks, built for holding water, for the caboose, the furniture, and for many other articles, none of which were imported, but all of which were made in that city. The list of claims I hold in my hand, covers all that enters into the construction of the hull of the ship, or the ship delivered at the wharf. The following is the list of claims:—

Tons.	Am't Claimed.	Am't Paid.
1,116.....	\$723.....	\$462
627.....	319.....	291
1,223.....	553.....	349
1,182.....	147.....	147
680.....	340.....	340
1,070.....	546.....	540
1,500.....	884.....	750
998.....	173.....	173
144.....	45.....	45
1,045.....	154.....	154
1,661.....	177.....	177
1,281.....	258.....	248

The total amount of claims were \$4,360,

and the amount returned was \$3,705; that includes everything except cordage. I have before me an extract from a speech, made by a gentleman in another place, who is largely engaged in shipbuilding. He says: He has built one or more vessels every year, for several years, and he is prepared to establish, that the refund paid by Government places the builder of ships in a better position than they were under the old Tariff. That hon. gentleman is Senator McClellan. It is not necessary to enlarge upon this subject; I could understand hon. gentlemen's criticisms if we were on the eve of a General Election and expected to produce some effect on the electors by their statements here. But judging from the entire confidence manifested, so far, by the people in this policy, if a General Election did take place, it would result disastrously to hon. gentlemen opposite. Experience will still further vindicate our policy and will give us increased Revenue and increased population. The large emigration it has been alleged as taking place, is in a great part only apparent, 20,000 of those alleged as leaving Canada are emigrants from the Old Country passing through Canada to the Western States. The hon. member for Gloucester states that a manufacturer told me that if he did not increase the wages of his workmen they would leave for the United States, as a proof that better wages were paid in that country. That is one case, but there are many other cases where an increase of wages has taken place, because it was promised as soon as the business of the country would warrant it. The hon. gentleman stated there was last autumn a reduction made in the wages paid in the woollen mills at Almonte. The products of woollen mills last spring were sold at a lower figure than was ever known in Canada, and it was only in September last, after having disposed of their surplus stock, that they put on the full number of their employes, and were in a position to grant an increase of wages. We have been told that a large house in Montreal has not done as large a business since 1874, as at this time. They are working night and day, and you may go throughout the length and breadth of the country, and wherever you go you will find this increased business. We have no

doubt that the Revenue will be increased, and we feel perfectly satisfied, with reference to this policy, that it will be politically, as well as generally, successful.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John) : I wish to make an explanation. I wish to point out that the percentage of taxation on the total imports of 1878 was $19\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., while the returns for the first six months of the present fiscal year indicated that it would be $19\frac{5}{8}$ per cent. These figures show that there was a difference in the taxation of the two years of \$6,500,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE : The hon. gentleman said, in reply to an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, that he made no party speech the other night, nor any attempt to influence the House or the country in favour of the present Administration, farther, than merely to state a series of facts. I take exception to that; the hon. gentleman went on to contrast the year 1873-4 with the year 1880-1, and in his calculations in that respect, I maintain he was entirely astray, and very unfair. Anyone can see, by applying his own figures to other years, how inaccurate he was, and how unfair was his comparison. The hon. gentleman says, that hon. members on this side of the House were laughing at the offensive language used towards my hon. friend, beside me, by the hon. gentleman himself and his hon. colleague. If he thinks there is an hon. member on this side of the House, who appreciates the application of such language to the hon. member for Centre Huron, he was never more mistaken in his life. It was also stated that the late hon. Finance Minister had rendered himself unpopular, but his unpopularity, if it existed, was due to his refusal to accede to the demands of avaricious monopolists. It was laid upon him to communicate the decisions of the Government to all such parties. The hon. the Finance Minister said, he did not attach any blame to the late Government, in regard to the engagements in respect to Public Works. In his first speech, however, he conveyed distinctly the impression, that the present Administration was not responsible for the great Public Works that had been carried on during their absence. The hon. gentleman does not seem to know that the Welland Canal was in actual

process of construction when he left office. He seems to forget that a very large portion of the Lachine works were done by that time. The lower basins, and the lower locks were far on in construction, and we had to proceed with these works. We did not spend anything like the amount the hon. gentleman became responsible for, with regard to the canals. In the Estimates the hon. gentleman left prepared, there was an item for the Bay Verte Canal, which Mr. Page said would cost \$8,500,000. The entire cost of the Canals proposed by hon. gentlemen, was about \$43,000,000; the Intercolonial, about \$10,000,000; the Pacific Railway, \$30,000,000. With regard to the Pacific Railway, I do not intend to enter upon that matter to-night; but I intend to vindicate myself upon that subject when it comes up for discussion. The hon. gentleman said we ought to admit that there was a vast amount of prosperity in the country. I declare upon my honour as a man, I do not see any prosperity whatever resulting from his Tariff; but I believe it had the very opposite effect. The entire balance against us in reapers and mowers, spades, hoes, and every kind of implement connected with agricultural purposes, amounts to the value of \$160,000. But, says the hon. gentleman, the North-West can be supplied by our people. Why should we tax the people going there to develop that country? This is a very doubtful kind of benefit, and the benefit to the implement-makers is of the smallest kind. Several manufacturing firms say that the amount imposed made it impossible for them to pay a dividend, which, but for the burdens imposed upon them by the National Policy, they would have been able to do. Very much was said about furniture, and the great benefit the National Policy was to the furniture manufacturers. I am sorry my old friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Hay) is not here. He comes to the point. A gentleman, speaking to him on the subject, said : "I am surprised that you support such a policy." "Glod bless you, Sir," was his honest answer, "every man for himself in this world." The entire amount of household furniture, introduced into Canada, of every kind, was \$247,000 worth. Many kinds will still have to

be introduced, on account of the high prices, because it is impossible for manufacturers here to compete in many articles with the large concerns established in New York and Philadelphia, just as it is impossible for small villages in our own country to compete with Toronto or Montreal, and we cannot obtain many classes of goods that are wanted in the furniture line. We cannot obtain, then, such articles as my hon. friend from Montreal will want in that gorgeous palace he is building there.

MR. GAULT: It is my brother's, and he has not brought one piece from New York. It is all made by cabinet-makers in Montreal. I own a better house than that, too.

MR. MACKENZIE: I shall be delighted to call some day, and examine the furniture, and see where it came from, if he will invite me. The exports of furniture were nearly \$100,000 worth, so that is the wonderful Protection given. With boots and shoes it is even worse, or better; and with respect to sugar and cottons and woollens, and other similar interests, it is only to the great manufacturers, to a few rich men, that any benefit is given, while it bears heavily against those who are burdened with the taxes imposed.

MR. GAULT: You should get up a joint stock company on that side of the House; it would be a capital speculation.

MR. MACKENZIE: Our only objection to that is that we have no faith in its continuance, and we are not so foolish as the hon. gentleman thinks we are. The hon. the Finance Minister claims no patent for this Policy, because he announced in New Brunswick that there was not to be a Protective Policy.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: No, no; quite the opposite.

MR. MACKENZIE: I cannot forget those famous telegrams. My hon. friend says it is most unfair to endeavour to weaken his influence, but the hon. gentleman knows it is his political influence we are attempting to weaken, and we have a right to so endeavour to weaken it; in other respects we will not endeavour to weaken his influence, and it is only because of our patriotic feelings and influences that we endeavour to weaken his influence in any

respect. He said, in reference to manufactures, that we were going down the hill of adversity for five years. He knows, if he knows anything about manufacturing in this country, that there is no material increase (except in the two or three instances mentioned) on account of his Protective Tariff, that there is not one single manufactory started because of his Protective Tariff. I see that he gave them a Protection on iron, at Hamilton, of 35 per cent., and they shut down; he gave Protection to the screw makers, and they shut down, in Dundas; and so I might go on over a great many places. I say that, at this moment, there is no increase in the manufacturing power of this country, except in two or three instances, where they require a large amount of capital, and have secured a monopoly of business by enormous Protection. The hon. gentleman, the other night, gave the percentage of indebtedness, or rather taxation, in 1868, as \$3.55 per head; and he has given the present rate of taxation, per head, as \$4.05. If he apportsions 3,500,000 to \$13,000,000, I do not see how he gets \$3.55; and if he apportsions 4,000,000 to \$25,000,000, I do not see where he gets \$4.05.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That is percentages are only on Customs and Excise. What you get out of your Railroads or out of your Post Office is not taxation.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is mistaken, for everything that comes out of these is a taxation of the public.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: You have Public Works and Canals.

MR. MACKENZIE: But we have to pay interest upon the capital. He knows that the Welland Canal did not pay more than 2½ per cent. interest, and that at present it will not pay any interest at all.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The interest on expenditure is a tax.

MR. MACKENZIE: The interest is against the loss to the country and against the expenditure, and there is no doubt whatever that what we pay into the Revenue is taxation. As my hon. friend beside me has gone into the Provincial Debt matter, I will not trouble the House further on that matter.

Motion (*Sir Samuel L. Tilley*) agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

MR. KILLAM: I would like to know whether the hon. the Finance Minister has given his final answer. I understood that the hon. gentleman had promised to meet a gentleman interested in this matter, and that he would reconsider the Order in Council as to the drawback to be given. I can state, on the best of authority, that the hon. gentleman promised that another Order in Council should be passed which would give, at least, \$1 drawback per ton.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The arrangement was not the difference between the old and the new Tariffs. The controversy between the gentleman at St. John and myself was whether there should be a reduction of 80 per cent. on the furniture of the ship, and I stated that that could not be considered at all. Any change that is made would apply to the whole of the ship.

MR. KILLAM: The hon. gentleman must not leave us in the position of standing waiting for his decision. We expect that the promise he made will be carried out.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Twenty-five minutes after

Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 12th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS ACCOUNTS AUDIT.

REPORT CONCURRED IN.

MR. KIRKPATRICK moved that the Second Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like the opinion of the House as to whether I should allow the Accounts of the House to be submitted to the Auditor General.

MR. KILLAM.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: With regard to the Accounts of the House of Commons, the House has already agreed to the suggestion that they should be audited by the Auditor-General, and this report suggests that the Audit Act should be amended so as to make it clear and distinct that it is in accordance with the law.

MR. MACKENZIE: There can be no possible objection to that course. It will relieve ourselves of some of the officers of the House of Commons anxiety.

Motion agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 101) To provide for the distribution of the assets of insolvent traders.—(*Mr. Abbott.*)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Order for the second Reading of resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means (April 9th) read.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant): Some few days ago I spoke to the hon. the Finance Minister in reference to a matter in which I felt a great interest, namely, the taxing of books for the blind. The hon. gentleman said the matter was under the consideration of the Government, and I hoped that, in introducing his last Resolutions, he would have acceded to my wish. As the hon. gentleman has not done so, I would ask the House to listen to me a moment or two, while I explain the condition in which the blind are in regard to literature in this country. We have a great many blind people in the country, and benevolent people are doing much to better their condition. We have three institutions for the blind in Canada. The Ontario Institute for the blind at Brantford, a benevolent Catholic institution in the Province of Quebec, in the city of Montreal, and another at Halifax. Some of these institutions are maintained by the Government, and some by private benevolence. A common shilling English primer, costs \$3.50 when embossed, and the House will readily understand what a hardship this duty is upon the blind people. No harm can be done to any Canadian publisher by the abolition of this duty. These embossed books are supplied by one firm in the United States, in which country the education of the

blind is carefully and kindly looked after. Last year, the United States Senate passed a resolution, by a vote of 43 to 7, to invest \$250,000, in 4 per cent. bonds, the annual interest of which, \$10,000, is to be devoted to the institution for the blind in Louisville, Kentucky, which is engaged in the printing of embossed books for the blind, and who sell to our blind at the actual cost of production. The United States Bible Society do even better, they give to the Protestant blind an embossed copy of the Bible at the actual cost of binding alone, but it costs the people \$20, even on favourable terms; and I think the good sense of the House will agree with me, when I ask that the tax be remitted on embossed books for the blind. I do not desire to enlarge upon this matter. I have endeavoured to show the position in which the unfortunate blind are placed, and I hope the hon. Minister of Finance and his colleagues will accede to my request, and not press their motion, to receive the Report concurring in these Resolutions, but agree to my motion, which I place in your hands. Therefore I move:

“That the Resolution be not read a second time and concurred in, but be referred back to the Committee, with instructions that they have power to place embossed books for the blind on the Free List.”

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Under the law, as it at present stands, Bibles, Testaments, or other portions of Scripture, come in at 5 per cent. The Government have taken the present proposition into consideration, and they think it rather difficult to submit to the proposition to place books used by the blind on a different footing than books used by the poor generally. The tax on the latter is 15 per cent., and as Bibles and other portions of Scripture come in at 5 per cent., it would be unadvisable to make a still further difference in favour of these as against books generally used by the poor.

MR. BLAKE: In order that the poor may be able to read, they must have the primers, and the practical operation of the Tariff is to impose, relatively, a very much smaller duty on the ordinary primers than on embossed books for the blind. You are, practically, taking away from the unfortunate blind the means of learning to read, which, to them, is more

important than to us who can see. I think the Government ought to concede this to the blind. I shall vote in favour of it if they do not concede it.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I would only add that I do not think there is any possible risk, in granting this concession in favour of embossed books for the blind; there is no chance of these being used for other purposes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I may say my hon. friend has no objection, except the possible delay in obtaining concurrence now.

MR. BLAKE: Well, we could put this through the Committee at once, formally, by unanimous consent.

Amendment, *agreed to.*

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

(In the Committee.)

Resolutions amended and ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions, as amended, reported.

Motion made and question proposed:

That the said resolutions be now read the second time and concurred in.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

MR. ANGLIN: I do not intend to move any amendment, but I once more ask the hon. the Minister of Finance, on behalf of dealers in books, to readjust the item in his schedule on books, which, as at present framed, taxes both muscle and brain alike. I would also suggest that the hon. the Finance Minister should relieve the importers from the extraordinary inconvenience and trouble they now experience from the mode in which duties are levied on woolsens and cottons. I simply appeal for justice to those who have written me on this subject, and the trade in general, which I deem it my duty again to urge should be granted without delay.

MR. DOMVILLE: If the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) would add to his list the petition I presented the other day to remove the duty from cocks and hens, I would go with him.

MR. BLAKE: Including bantams.

MR. DOMVILLE: Yes, and shanghais.

MR. MACKENZIE: And peacocks.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: A change was made last Session from an *ad valorem*

to a specific duty. After a general discussion, the proposition that we made, to impose the duty by weight instead of *ad valorem*, was opposed very strenuously by the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Anglin). We thought, at that time, that that would be a more judicious and equitable mode of levying the duty. After a year's experience, the hon. gentleman asks us to comply with the wishes of the trade. Some time since a deputation came to Ottawa, representing, apparently, the whole book-trade of the Dominion, with whom I went into a very careful examination of the operation of the Resolutions adopted last Session, and arrived at the conclusion that the same amount of duty should be raised by an *ad valorem* instead of a specific duty. Those gentlemen pointed out how the specific duty operated injuriously, in some respects. On balancing the operation of the systems, the Government decided to return to the *ad valorem* proposition, as recommended by the representatives of the trade, and it was accepted by the House. Therefore, I cannot understand how the hon. member for Gloucester can represent the trade, as he pretends, in his present recommendations. The Government will lose no Revenue by the change.

MR. CHARLTON: Before the Resolution passes, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a matter not immediately in connection with it, but with the lumber trade—I refer to the export duty on saw logs. I have found in my own experience that this duty, so far as Western Ontario is concerned, has worked injuriously to the interests of Canada. How the matter may stand in Quebec I am unable to say; but at present the trade in round timber in Western Ontario, in which there would otherwise be a large amount of capital invested, cannot, owing to this export duty, be prosecuted to advantage. To my own knowledge, a number of Canadian firms, with hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in lumbering operations, who would, but for the duty, carry on operations from the Georgian Bay pineries, have either retired from business or have transferred their operations to Michigan, owing to the obstacles put in their way by this export duty. There is a large trade in the Western States towing rafts from

Michigan to ports in Ohio and New York, a considerable portion of the round timber sent to Buffalo and Tonawanda, being shipped eastward down the Erie canal, a trade which does not in the slightest degree interfere with the sawn lumber trade of the country. One American firm undertook to embark in this business on the Georgian Bay last season. They got out two rafts; one of them was seized, the export duty was collected upon it, and the parties abandoned the business. I wish the hon. the Finance Minister to enquire whether the duty which yields, I think, some \$300 or \$400 a year, and drives from Canada a large and profitable business and centres it in a foreign country—which prevents the holders of timber along the shores of our navigable waters from realising larger prices than they now obtain—operates in the interest of this country. I am quite sure it drives away from us to Michigan a very large and profitable trade. I assure the hon. gentleman that those engaged in producing sawn lumber in Michigan have no jealousy of this round timber trade, because their trade and this, do not, in the slightest degree, come into collision. This duty debars the owners of timber in Canada from participating in a profitable trade; and I call the attention of the Government to the evil in the hope of an immediate remedy being provided.

MR. CURRIER: I do not understand how this does not, as the hon. gentleman says, interfere with sawn lumber in any way, when it allows round timber to be taken into the United States free of duty, to be manufactured in that country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), says it does not interfere with the sawn lumber business; the charge is \$2 per thousand on sawn lumber, and he proposes a way whereby the Americans could get our lumber without paying that duty. If the present export duty were taken off our round timber, the loss to Revenue would not matter much, but the quantity exported would be greatly increased, and as large quantities of building timber, cut from this class of round timber, now goes to the United States, our mills would lose the benefits of manufacturing it, and the Americans would have that advantage. I shall be glad to see the law remain as it now stands.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew): I concur in the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier). Not only is there a demand from the United States for that class of timber; but, during the past winter, several orders have been received from English houses, for the same class of timber, known as bill-timber. It seems it would be unwise to withdraw the export duty on unmanufactured timber going from this country. Such action would withdraw from our mills a large portion of the trade and profits that legitimately belong to them, from the manufacture of the raw material into lumber, in the shape in which it is used in the United States and England.

MR. MCCALLUM: In this question I am opposed, on principle, to the export duty. We used to have an export duty in former years on oak timber, and, I believe, the late Government had taken it off. We have in this country a very small quantity of oak timber, and any quantity of pine timber. But how is it that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has made this discovery all at once? The same export duty was on timber during the whole of the Administration of the late Government, which that hon. gentleman supported, and yet he never seems to have discovered it. Before the change of Tariff he knew nothing about it. Of course, as far as I am concerned, I do not know whether the late Government was put under much pressure to remove the duty. But I am opposed to the duty on principle, believing that if a man has timber to sell he ought to be allowed to sell it wherever he can get the best price for it, without paying export duty.

MR. COLBY: I hardly think the hon. member for North Norfolk is chargeable with inconsistency in this matter. He has consistently advocated, for many years, the proposition he now advances; and, if I recollect rightly, at one time he moved for a Committee on the subject. I think those are his settled views, but I do not think my hon. friend is justified, in the peculiar circumstances under which that duty has been imposed, in characterising it as an absurd duty. It arises clearly out of the exceptional character of the legislation of our neighbours, who imposed a duty upon sawed lumber, for the benefit of their

own manufacturers, but permit logs to go into the United States duty free. That involved a duty on the part of the Government of protecting our own manufacturing industries, and justifies the exception to the general rule. Now I know many localities in which mills have been erected at great expense, and which are of very great utility to those localities, but they would be entirely blotted out of existence were this duty to be repealed. The total supply of logs upon which they depend, would float along the waters a little further into the United States, to be manufactured by the mills of that country. There are other sections of this Dominion where this law works injuriously; there are sections like those referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk, where no advantage can be obtained by the local mill owner. If it were possible, under the exceptional circumstances of this case, to give the Government power of remitting the duty in those localities, where it is clearly no protection whatever to any vested interest, and where the imposition of the duty is taking just that much out of the owner of logs, that, I think, might be so applied as to produce excellent results. We would then have protection to existing mills and manufacturing establishments where that protection would be beneficial, and, on the other hand, we would relieve the owners of timber from an onerous burden where no compensating advantage would be obtained. It is simply a question as to whether that class of legislation would be, under the circumstances, permissible. If so, I think it would be beneficial to the country at large, and I would suggest that view of the case to the hon. the Minister of Finance.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I may say that far from any pressure having been made upon the Government to remove those duties, the pressure has been in the direction of increasing the export duties which the Government then thought it advisable to submit to the House. That law has been in operation since 1871, and, so far as I know, no application has reached the Government for its removal, and no complaint has been made. I take it for granted that the law has been satisfactory to that section of the country where this timber

is produced since no serious objection has been made to it.

SIR RICHARD. J. CARTWRIGHT: I must say that a good many protests were made in former days; and, if I recollect aright, some modification was made on two or three grades. At the same time I feel bound to say, that the difficulty presented by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), was such that we were not able to meet his wishes. There is a serious hardship in certain sections of the country, that, notably in which he resides, and some others. There is no doubt that reasonable evidence was given that much of the timber grown was so perfectly useless that it had to be destroyed. However, I cannot pretend to advise the hon. gentleman to do what we did not dare to do ourselves.

MR. CURRIER: I understand the condition of things no longer exists in the locality where my hon. friend wanted them remedied four or five years ago. It is only on Lake Huron and on the large waters where this timber can be taken now. But as regards the Ottawa country we saw more feet of building timber of the class my hon. friend speaks of than any other locality furnishes.

MR. CHARLTON: There is a difference between the circumstances of the Georgian Bay and Ottawa districts. There is no timber belt in the United States, corresponding in location to that here, to come into competition with that of the Ottawa Valley. The Ottawa Valley has a great advantage in point of transportation over the American timber belts further west, but the Georgian Bay region comes into direct competition with the Michigan region, where the distance and the cost of transportation are nearly the same. That being the case, an export duty of \$1 per thousand operates simply to annihilate the trade in the Georgian Bay region. It is true that there are difficulties in the way of abolishing this duty. I may say that the only favour we were able to get from the late Government, was to get the export duty taken off oak logs, and the duty was left as it is upon pine. The reason no pressure was brought to bear upon the present Government was, because the impression prevailed that, when the Tariff Resolutions were brought in, the export duty had been abolished. Such was not the case, but those interested in

the round timber trade were not aware of their mistake until the duty was exacted upon the rafts that I mentioned as passing from the Georgian Bay to Lake Huron. So far as the interests of the section of the country referred to by my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) are concerned, I must confess I am in some degree of ignorance. There are, however, no sufficient reasons for the imposition of these duties, as far as the west is concerned. It is to be regretted that the owners of the fine timber on the Georgian Bay are unable to compete with their Michigan rivals in a business which is a very profitable one. If it were possible for the Government to make some regulations by which the law would operate in one section and not in another, the trade from the Georgian Bay and the Upper Lakes would be promoted, and a great boon would be conferred upon other sections of the country. I urge upon the Government a full and fair consideration of this matter.

MR. BOWELL: The adoption of permissive regulations would lead to a great deal of trouble and dissatisfaction. The imposition, some time ago, by the American Government, of \$2 per 1,000 on manufactured lumber, resulted in many lumbermen, who had large and extensive limits, exporting logs unmanufactured. The refuse, which is thrown away in this country, more than pays the expense of towage in the American market. A large number of shingle mills were pulled down and the machinery taken to the United States, and the shingle bolts being taken there and manufactured into shingles. It is, therefore, very much better, in the interest of the country, that there should be no relaxation whatever on this point; he desire was, last year, to extend it to a number of other qualities of timber. The Government, however, thought it better to allow the law to remain as it had been for a number of years.

Resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

FIRST READING.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 102) To amend the

Act 42 Vic., cap. 15, intituled an Act to alter the duties of Customs and Excise.

Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

VIII.—ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

53 To meet expenses in connection with care and collection of Public Archives \$5,000

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Will the hon. the Minister of Agriculture inform us what has been done with respect to the Public Archives. Why is an increase of \$2,000 required? What progress has been made in obtaining copies of those documents relating to our early history.

MR. POPE (Compton): During the past year the appropriation was expended in copying the Haldimand papers. The number of these books which have been copied will be found in my report upon the Archives. There are now thirty-five volumes of that valuable collection deposited in the vaults, and there are seventy volumes more in England, ready for shipment. There are 233 volumes in all of these, but they will not be copied in full, parts being omitted to save expense. We hope the work of copying that collection will be completed this year. The United States, it might be mentioned, had, within the last year or two, obtained complete copies of this collection. There are many other documents referring to the early history of this country, and we thought it right to ask for a larger vote for this purpose, the last vote being insufficient.

MR. ANGLIN: Can you give any idea of what the entire cost of procuring these documents is likely to be.

MR. POPE (Compton): It is quite impossible to tell. If my hon. friend will look at the report of 1873 he can give as good an estimate as I can.

Vote agreed to.

54 To meet expenses in connection with Patent Record..... \$7,200

MR. VALLÉE: The *Patent Record* is printed in English. A law passed in 1873 enacts that they should be published in French as well as English. I desire, therefore, to call the attention of the Government to this.

MR. POPE (Compton): The patents are printed in the language in which they are taken out.

MR. VALLÉE: There is only, in the case of a French patent, the name of the patent printed in French.

Vote agreed to.

55 To meet expenses in connection with preparation of Criminal Statistics.....\$ 5,000

56 To meet expenses in connection with the Census..... 200,000

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked for some explanation of how this was to be applied.

MR. POPE (Compton) said that the Census must be taken during the next fiscal year; that, as we had no regular statistical staff, as in England, the Commissioners and Enumerators had to be educated to the work; and that some considerable amount of money must necessarily be spent for that purpose.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked if the hon. gentleman was prepared to send a circular to the members of the House, with a view to obtaining suggestions.

MR. POPE (Compton) said it had escaped his memory, that he had promised to lay details before the members. He was only prepared to state generally what the schedules would contain; and would be glad, as in every other case, to obtain suggestions from members of the House. He would, if possible, lay a synopsis of the schedule before the House, in a rough form. It would be quite impossible to give the schedules as they would be in the end, as there were continual suggestions made, some of which might be adopted up to the time for commencing the work.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said that it should be submitted before concurrence. He would suggest, also, that in taking the Census, pains should be taken to ascertain statistics showing the nature of buildings, the qualities of houses inhabited by the people, the description of house, whether of wood, brick, stone, or rough cast, and also the number of rooms. He thought such information would be valuable in giving an idea of the progress of the people.

MR. POPE (Compton) said the hon. gentleman's suggestion would have due consideration.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) hoped the schedule would be brought down early, so that members' suggestions could be given, and any that were of practical value, adopted; for, as the Census was only taken every ten years, it was important to have it taken in as complete and efficient a manner as possible. He called attention to the fact that we had only thirty-six columns under the head of Agriculture, while the United States schedule had seventy-two columns under that head. This information, therefore, took a wider range than ours, and their Census gave minute details. In the United States a Committee was appointed, decennially, to prepare these schedules, and the most experienced men composed that Committee. He thought that, with regard to statistics relating to the lumbering interests, the particulars might be better obtained from other sources than through the Census Enumerators; there were certain licenses to be taken out, and the lumbermen had to make certain returns, from which the statistics could be obtained. It was essential, too, that the statistics, when obtained, should be published without delay. He (Mr. Ross) understood that one of the volumes of the Census of 1871 was not yet distributed.

MR. CURRIER said he thought that, with regard to the lumbering interest, the statistics could not be obtained in the way suggested by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), because there were large quantities of lumber cut on private lands.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if it was intended to include information as to the value of property, as the Municipal Statistics, in this respect, were notoriously deficient, especially in Ontario, the values being suspected to be, in most instances—and especially in regard to real estate—stated considerably below their actual value to avoid the taxes.

MR. POPE (Compton) said this had not been done before. If there was any way of obtaining the value of property it would be desirable to do so; but he was afraid we should not get the correct values. Owners would put in their own values. He (Mr. Pope) thought, with regard to the manner of taking the Census, he would be able to give a general idea to hon. members before the

Session closed, and receive and consider any suggestion that might be made. He thought, too, with the cooperation of the Provinces, we could arrange for a yearly collection of statistics, or, at any rate, for a collection at less intervals than ten years.

Vote agreed to.

IX. IMMIGRATION AND QUARANTINE.

57 Immigration.....\$159,750

In answer to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. POPE (Compton) said, as to the grouping of all these items, it was done at the suggestion of the Auditor-General, because it was quite impossible to fix the exact amount to be paid for any one of these services.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I would like to know what our contract is with the Mennonites—whether any return has been made for the loan or not?

MR. POPE: There has been no return as yet. The time is nearly up, but every dollar will be returned.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): Will the hon. gentleman explain to what extent free passes have been given from one part of the country to another.

MR. POPE: The Government have given no free passes to anyone, except to absolutely indigent emigrants. I explained that assistance was rendered emigrants under an arrangement between the Dominion and the Ontario Governments; emigrants to Ontario, no matter of what kind, were to go there free.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is about the tenant farmers the hon. gentleman is speaking.

MR. POPE: No matter who the emigrants are, if bound for Ontario, they must go there free, if the Ontario Government desire it. We are bound to carry out the arrangement made in 1872, which was that we give free passes in the first place, the Ontario Government refunding two-thirds.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. POPE: Yes; if Ontario insists, we must perform our agreement. Our emigration is already larger than in former years, and will be considerably larger from the influx of the British tenant farmers. Up to this time, it is double that of last year. The Opposition have largely

dilated upon the emigration of Canadians to the United States, asserting constantly that our country is being denuded of its population. One hon. gentleman stated that 31,000 persons had lately left Canada. As one here who knows as much about it as he does, he included 20,000 emigrants from Europe, who intended going to the Western States and passed through Canada for the purpose. The last Census of the United States showed that Maine and New Hampshire, two of the New England States, lost population between 1861 and 1881, and the increase of the whole of the New England States in that time was only 10 per cent. against $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for Canada, and that it lost as much by emigration as Canada. People go to the west because land is cheaper in that region. It is, of course, right that we should direct our emigrants to our own North-West.

MR. TROW: To whom does the hon. gentleman refer as knowing about as much in regard to this question as any one else?

MR. POPE (Compton): It was the hon. member for Bothwell who made the assertion referred to.

MR. TROW: I can prove from the United States returns that 31,000 Canadians left the Dominion and settled in the United States in 1879.

MR. POPE: Yes, including the 20,000 I mentioned.

MR. TROW: No.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does that apply to the previous year also?

MR. POPE: Largely.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then, relatively, the figures are correct. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) gave from the Census of the United States the figures for six or seven years, showing that all the time we were in office the number of emigrants from Canada was small, and the moment the present Government was formed it began to increase.

MR. POPE: In 1878, 11,000 emigrants from Great Britain passed through Canada to the United States, only 18,000 coming to settle in Canada; while in 1879, 20,000 went through Canada to the United States, and 30,000 settled among us. So the relative proportion is about the same.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): The

hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) showed from official reports of the United States that for the first five years of Confederation there went from the Dominion to the United States an average of 42,000 Canadians a year.

MR. POPE (Compton): He gathered those figures from United States returns.

MR. ROSS: The hon. member for Bothwell stated that he wrote to the Bureau of Statistics, in Washington, and got the correct number of emigrants from Canada for the years mentioned. He thus ascertained that the yearly average of emigration from Canada, for the five years during which the late Government held office, was but 32,000. Those figures can be corroborated by evidence within reach of any hon. member in a few minutes. Those numbers do not include a single emigrant from Europe. The difference between the emigration from Canada and that from the New England States referred to is, that the Americans simply went from one portion of the Republic to another, while Canadians have been going to the United States. Under the policy of this Government there is a systematic attempt not to transfer our people from one part of Canada to another, but, by systematic efforts, including advertisements in Government pamphlets, to transfer them to the Republic. Every document issued from the Department of Agriculture, during the incumbency of the hon. member for Compton, contained advertisements favourable to the settlement of the lands of the United States. He paid, last year, for the transport of emigrants, \$74,335, issuing free passes to 8,871; and I fail to find in his report any guarantee that those emigrants, whose passages were paid from Halifax westwards, remained, or were supposed to remain, in the Dominion. There does not seem to be sufficient care taken that the money spent for emigration purposes accomplishes the object in view.

MR. PLUMB: Hon. gentlemen opposite find it necessary for their sinister purposes to show that Canada is being depopulated. They are willing to accept the reports of the Statistical Bureau, or of irresponsible anonymous newspaper writers in the United States, while they

reject the statements of Canadian Ministers and officials, in respect to the character and amount of the emigration from Canada to the United States, if not in conformity to our official statistics. The United States officials have no means of knowing whether the emigrants who cross from our territory to theirs come from Canada or Europe; but our friends in Opposition are very anxious to show that Canada is being ruined by the present Government, and that the people are leaving it by thousands. It is necessary for those hon. gentlemen to strain and distort the statements of the Public Records, in order to support their case. I may suggest to the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) that the emigration to the Canadian North-West need not necessarily be confined to the agriculturists. Some of the most prosperous farmers in Ontario, to-day, were formerly of such crafts as those of blacksmiths and weavers, which he has mentioned as unfit to produce farmers. I presume my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) has not read the reports of the English gentlemen and delegates who visited the North-West last year; they do not look on emigration to our prairies in the restricted light in which he views it. They bear testimony to the facilities for visiting and learning the character of the country, furnished by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture and describe the Canadian as far superior to the American North-West. All the visitors unite in saying, that there is no finer country under the sun than our vast prairie region, which far excels Montana and Dakota, and they recommend their friends at home to give it the preference. I do not hear any such recommendations from the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are doing their best to recommend Dakota and Montana to emigrants, very much as my hon. friend from Lambton, on a former occasion, advertised Texas as a preferable field for emigration to Manitoba or the country beyond that Province. As regards the recommendation of Texas by the hon. member for Lambton, my hon. friend said, in stating the disadvantages of the North-West, that the climate was a terrible one, that transportation was difficult, that there was no timber, that there was sparse settlement, that these were heavy discouragements to the

emigrant, who would not go there and buy land, even for the small price asked for it, because he could get better land elsewhere. When asked where, he replied: In Texas. We hear constantly hon. gentlemen on the opposite side endeavouring to persuade the public that there is a constant stream of emigration towards Montana, rather than Manitoba and our North-West. It would not suit the hon. gentlemen to have it understood that there are advantages, for the settler in Manitoba or the North-West, at least equal to those of the States along the border. I happen to know that in Montana there is a very limited amount of arable land: it is said not over three or four million acres. It is said, also, that the whole of Canada is filled with touters and land agents, who are endeavouring to turn the tide of emigration from this country to the United States. I understand there are a dozen agents of this class in Toronto alone, who are greatly aided in their business by the speeches and newspaper organs of the Opposition. I think it would be a good plan to put a tax upon those agents, and compel them to pay for a license. There is not a gentleman who has spoken on the opposite side yet, who has not decried in some way the prosperity of Canada. The testimony of these hon. gentlemen respecting the advantages of Manitoba and the North-West, as compared with those of the American Territory on the border, is directly contradicted by the testimony of the delegates from the tenant farmers of England, who state that our own Territory is immeasurably superior to that south of it, along its borders. Why should our hon. friends labour so earnestly to disparage our own resources, and to eulogise those of our neighbours across the lines.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: The House would do well to remember that this emigration from Canada to the United States, has been long a great evil. In 1871, the Census of the United States showed that there were then 489,000 persons in that country who had been in the British North American Provinces. Of these much the largest proportion came to the United States between the years 1861 and 1872. Doubtless, there has been a counter emigration from the United States to Canada, but certainly vastly inferior from that

which went hence to that country. I would like to have from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture a somewhat more definite statement of what has been done by the tenant farmers who came over here from England, and what results have accrued from their visit.

MR. POPE (Compton): I learn from those agents themselves, as well as from English newspapers, that they have addressed public meetings in various large towns in England. I am informed that, in consequence of their reports of the advantages offered by Canada, we may expect a large emigration from that country to this. Without any exception these gentlemen were pleased with what they saw in Canada. They looked upon the North-West as second to none on this continent, and they highly recommended it in their addresses to the English people. They were asked to visit several counties at home, where they met with a hearty reception from hundreds of tenant farmers and land owners. A few of the emigrants have already arrived, and, I am informed, others will sail on the 15th of this month, and others on the 1st of June. The Government have not yet considered the subject of procuring delegates from other parts of Great Britain. I have, however, been in correspondence with some parties in Hertfordshire, Lincolnshire and some other counties, from which farmers had emigrated to Texas and returned home again. These parties have enquired about sending delegates out to Canada. The Government, without making any definite arrangements with them, have replied that we should be glad to see them and hoped that they would come.

MR. ANGLIN: The hon. gentleman from Niagara (Mr. Plumb), while indulging in a rhetorical flourish, has accused hon. gentlemen on this side with a want of patriotism, with a desire to decry and injure the country. We bring certain facts to the notice of the House, in order that certain faults, of which we complain, may be remedied as soon as possible. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think it patriotic to deny certain notorious facts; they think it patriotic to deny that large numbers of people are now leaving the country, although we all know it to be a fact. The emigration from Canada during the last four or five months has

been unprecedented in its volume and character. I hear every day from the Lower Provinces that this large emigration still continues. I saw it stated, in a St. John newspaper lately, that in one steamer 350 emigrants left at one time for the United States, a large number being from Nova Scotia. Some persons go there with the intention of remaining permanently, others with the hope of returning to this country, but nearly all because they could not obtain employment at home. It is a positive duty, under these circumstances, to state these facts, and bring them frequently before the attention of the House and the Government, with a view of devising some means of remedying the evil.

MR. PLUMB: In reply to the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), I beg to say that I have never made any statements with reference to the unfortunate connection of the late Prime Minister with emigration to Texas, that were not amply justified and proved. I took pains to ascertain from Washington and Texas exactly what was the position of that State in respect to the system of free grant lands, before I ventured to say anything on the subject. The hon. gentleman's statement with regard to Texas, is as follows:—It was in the course of his speech, last Session, on the Pacific Railway Resolutions:

“MR. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. gentleman imagine that settlers will go to the North-West to take up land at \$2 an acre when there are millions of acres to be had for nothing in the United States.”

I venture to ask where the millions of acres in the United States were situated, that could be had on such easy terms. The hon. gentleman, who is noted for the promptness if not the accuracy of his replies, when challenged, immediately said, in his very courteous way:

“My hon. friend may be very wise, but if he will examine the conditions upon which land is settled upon in Texas, he will find that that State will furnish any quantity of land free.”

The hon. gentleman stated that emigrants would go to the United States, where superior advantages were given to emigrants, and where they could get land for nothing; and when I asked him where, he answered: “Texas.” Now, there are no free grant lands in Texas. Lands are

held at a high price in Texas, except between the 101st and 103rd parallel, where lands can be bought at a minimum price of 50c. per acre, but this in unorganized districts, where there are vast tracts of arid, sandy desert, destitute of tree, shrub, grass, or water, and utterly valueless for emigrant settlement. I think hon. gentlemen make a great mistake in provoking me to reiterate this statement, but I shall reiterate it as often as I am accused of misstating or wearing threadbare a story which will bear a good deal of repetition, especially while its accuracy is disputed.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I desire to call the attention of the hon. member for Niagara to the injustice of attributing to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House unpatriotic motives. When he sat upon this side of the House it was his privilege, in common with the privilege of each of his political friends, to criticise the policy of the Administration. I will not ask him what sort of a Legislature this would be if hon. gentlemen were only to criticise the acts of the Government without finding fault with its policy. It is the duty of a Government to confine themselves somewhere near the facts, and I think they wander from the facts when they seek to tell us there is no emigration going from this country. There is no doubt that there is a large exodus from the Province from which I come, and when hon. gentlemen seek to misrepresent the condition of things, such conduct is criminal.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The hon. member for Niagara, in referring to bonanza farms, spoke of great landed proprietors as large employers of labour, and he pictured the great benefit to be derived by these large proprietors holding vast tracts of land. In order to point out what a careful American observer, within the jurisdiction of his own country, found to be the state of things growing out of the system of bonanza farming, I will read a few extracts from the January number of the *Atlantic Monthly*. This Land Commissioner said:

"He spoke enthusiastically of the country, and particularly of the rare opportunities they presented for the investment of capital in ag-

riculture as a first-class financial operation; also of the general and particular attention that great capitalists were giving to the matter, especially on the line of that road, and mentioned a large number who had already embarked in the business."

Hitherto the farming population has been supposed to be the safeguard of the nation. He speaks of various farms—Thompson and Kendall's farm, and Rock county farm, one of which, along the Red River, occupying, I think, four miles, 40,000 acres—cultivated with great success. He says he had placed in his hands a circular, in which it is endeavoured to be proven that investments made in the lands of that road, at current prices, and cultivated in wheat and other crops, will pay 20 per cent. upon the whole investment the first year, and 55 per cent. the second. The article abounds in tables, which would be interesting, but I will not trouble the House with them all. The Rock County Farming Company, he alludes to, as having a farm containing 20,000 acres, of which 4,625 are under cultivation—3,251 acres in wheat, 312 acres in barley, 550 acres in oats, 312 acres in peas, and 200 acres in corn. They have \$15,000 worth of farming implements. The number of men employed was 20 for the month of March; 56 for April and May; 40 from June to July 20th; from July 20th to the 20th of August, 115; from August 20th to 15th November, 70; and from November 15th to the end of February, 12. The average wages are \$18 per month. In looking over the farm he found that there were magnificent crops, and he was able to tell where the culture was scientific and where not. By the failure of Jay Cooke and Company, in 1873, large tracts of land were thrown open, and large quantities of land held by that unfortunate firm, belonging to the Northern Pacific Railway, were thrown into the hands of those who had an interest in its securities. Among them was Mr. Dalrymple, who owned the farm of 40,000 acres already mentioned, who entered into an arrangement with some of the holders by which he was to undertake the management of their lands in the growing of wheat and other products, upon condition that when the products of the farms had repaid all the expenditure, with an agreed interest, he was to receive a clear title of one-half of each farm, with its

stock and improvements. In the spring of 1876 he commenced his operations and carried them on until he obtained the 40,000 acres, as mentioned. Then he gives another farm of 28,000 acres on the Red River. I will read some of the details, skipping over most of those that might be interesting if time allowed. The number of men employed in the place are, from April 1st to May 1st, 150; from May 1st to July 15th, 20; but if breaking new ground, 50; from July 15th to July 30th, 100; from August 1st, to September 15th, 250; from September 15th to November 1st, 75; from November 1st to April 1st, 10 men. The wages are, from November 1st to April 1st, \$15 per month; from April 1st to May 1st, \$18; from May 1st to August 1st, \$16; from August 1st to August 15th, \$2 per day; from August 16th to September 15th, \$1.50 per day; from September 15th to November 1st, \$18 per month. The tools, machinery and animals employed are, 67 plows, 64 harrows, 32 seeders, 6 mowers, 34 self-binding harvesters, 7 steam engines and threshers, adapted to burning straw for fuel, 50 wagons, and 125 head of horses and mules. Every facility was afforded for the fullest observation, and it would be difficult to find a finer sight than was presented by those magnificent fields of grain standing breast-high, and taking in the golden yellow that precedes the harvest, and so on. Some portions, the writer continues, would, it is said, give more than thirty bushels to the acre. The small farmers and their families, he says, in that region, were not numerous; but, so far as he could learn, their condition was not relatively better nor worse than in other sections. He goes on to say that the system of monopoly prevailing on these farms is such as prevails anywhere where capital is combined with machinery. These capitalists have advantages in every way over small men; even their railway rates being 50 per cent. lower. The two great facts, he continues, shown by these observations are, that those who have gone into wheat-growing upon a large scale, making use of the most improved machinery and cheap labour, are making colossal fortunes at 70c. per bushel for wheat, limited only by the number of acres cultivated and the skill with which the work is done, and

that wheat may be grown at large profit; on the other hand the small farmers, depending mainly on their own labour, with limited capital and less machinery, are not making a comfortable subsistence, but are running behindhand, and must go under. The development of the large farm interest is by no means confined to Kansas, Minnesota, and Dakota. It has extended largely to other States. Even Texas is mentioned by him. He says in the North-Western States, between 1860 and 1870, the number of great farms had nearly doubled, and in the north-eastern section, the very oldest portion of the agricultural region of our country, the increase had been 19 per cent. Before the present great division of labour, the farmer and his family, when not employed in planting and reaping, were engaged in spinning and weaving; they had local industries from which they could make up little loads of their own production, and take them to the little towns and villages adjoining; but the advance of the railway, and the facilities afforded for transportation, all this had been changed. Against the unlimited use of this combination of capital, machinery and cheap labour, the individual farmer, either singly or in communities, cannot successfully contend, and must go under. It is a combination of the most powerful, social, and economic forces known to man, and all efforts for competition must and will fail so long as the three remain united. The development of the large farm interest has the direct and immediate effect of impoverishing the sections in which the farms exist, and skinning the lands without any compensating benefits. Not one dollar of the gross amount, or net profit received from the product of the soil, is returned, and placed upon the land from which it is taken, except in the construction of the fewest buildings necessary to shelter and protect the labourers in the working season, and for the care of the work, stock and the tools. On the whole 5,300 cultivated acres of the Grandin Farm there was not one family finding a permanent home, by virtue of title, in the soil, where there should have been, at least, one to every fifty acres of plow-land, or 106 families. This would give 106 houses in place of the five there at present, and 106 barns in place of three

with other buildings in like proportion, and a population of at least 500, where there is not now one fixed inhabitant, with all the accessories of household comforts and home improvements that do not now exist in the smallest degree. The large development of the tenant system of farming is an evil of the greatest magnitude. It threatens to overwhelm the country. And the writer then goes on, eloquently, to describe the dangers. I thought the hon. gentleman would forgive me for calling his attention to the great enterprise which is being sprung on the emigrant to the North-West, and for pointing out that municipal taxation will not prevent the evil. I thought this subject well worthy of attention. To provide an efficient check would be a start to the goal to which we are all looking forward, in the opening of our vast North-West Territory. I do not care to enter upon the merits of this question, but merely wished to call the attention of my hon. friend to it. It did appear to me that the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), who is usually very intelligent, seemed to favour the great farms. It did not appear to me, however, that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, no matter what his colleagues may think, was impressed with this idea. The hon. member for Niagara, however, has favoured us with that Texas story again; he threatens us with it every little while. What does he suppose will be his position in history, when he is doing nothing else but rising in his place, to be continually pointing out and trying to prove that the ex-Premier was merely a Texas Land Agent. He might be pardoned for using it occasionally, but when he does it deliberately, after taking his meals, his meat and his drink, and his sleep and his exercise, does he expect to occupy a high position in the history of this country? I would recommend him seriously to consider the advice intended to be conveyed the other day by the *Mail*, which said that, of course, nobody thought it of any consequence, but the Opposition leader should not be so restive about it. In short, I think it is about time the hon. member for Niagara should let us have a rest about this Texas business. I believe the hon. gentleman will admit that, so far as emi-

gration is concerned, this country is not without competition, and that if our terms are made less favourable than those of the United States, we cannot expect to be successful in our competition. We must admit that the machinery of the American system is very powerful, and, perhaps, more favourable than our own, although we all desire our own system to be such that it may populate that vast territory in our North-West. The emigration into the United States has been so extensive and so successful, in point of numbers, that it has alarmed and astonished the world. We need not attempt to deny or belittle these things, any more than the Esquimaux could truthfully assert that his position is better than that of his richer neighbour. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not seem to suppose there would be competition, and my hon. friend only spoke of the fascinations the neighbouring Republic had for emigrants, a fascination heralded all over the world. That Republic has had the reputation of giving equality to the people, and a life free from the oppressor. Men leave their native land to seek freedom from oppression, as well as for food. I know our country is not one whit less favourable to the emigrant, whether seeking food or seeking freedom, but the world does not know it yet. The course of history has not made it known. The crime my hon. friend has committed, and for which the hon. member for Niagara is continually reproaching him, is that he has simply pointed to that successful country on our borders and said: "Do not fancy you have no competition; be alive to the fact that the American system may outstrip you." We have not the means of obtaining a system of emigration so complete as that of the United States, and for my part I do not regret it. I believe that it will be better for us, if we are longer in populating our country with foreign elements, which might too soon absorb our citizenship and endanger our British laws and institutions. I am glad that the tide of emigration is not so boisterous, and I would rather see this tide flow from Great Britain; I would rather see that vast fertile territory in our North-West populated by the men to whom the institutions we cherish have been made sacred by their associations. I would like to see

those lands peopled by the English, Irish, Scotch and French, from the Old Provinces and the Old World, who know how to work them. They are far more likely to hold them for our glorious future, than those who simply go for food, who are without any knowledge of the means by which our institutions are to be perpetuated. None of us are so unpatriotic as the hon. gentleman, to decry the country, as he did. We do not decry the country, but we try occasionally to point out the real weaknesses and the dangers to avoid.

MR. PLUMB: My hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Huntington) has wasted a great deal of eloquence and elocution on this matter. I did not intend for a moment to insinuate that the hon. member for Lambton was a Texas Land Agent; but I did say that the tendency of that hon. gentleman's speech, last year, was to draw attention to Texas as a favourable place for emigration, compared with the North-West. My hon. friend read an article from the *Atlantic Monthly*, in support of his views. I will also quote, but from another publication, as follows:—

“From geographical positions and its peculiar characteristics, Manitoba may be regarded as the keystone of that mighty arch of sister Provinces, which spans the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It was here that Canada, emerging from her woods and forests, first gazed upon her rolling prairies and unexplored North-West, and learned as by an unexpected revelation that her historical territories of the Canadas; her eastern seaboard of New Brunswick, Labrador, and Nova Scotia; her Laurentian lakes and valleys, corn lands, and pastures, though themselves more extensive than half-a-dozen European Kingdoms, were but the vestibules and ante-chambers to that, till then, undreamt-of Dominion, whose illimitable dimensions alike confound the arithmetic of the surveyor and the verification of the explorer.”

“Such is the opinion expressed by the late Governor-General on the occasion of his visit to Winnipeg, in 1877, of a country which, until a few years ago, was the hunting ground of the Indian and the pasture field of the buffalo. The traveller's first idea on gazing across the vast prairie lands is that it deserves the name applied to it, or rather to the whole North-West, by Lord Beaconsfield, when he called it ‘that illimitable wilderness.’ But upon a closer examination he sees that beneath that surface of dried grass or ashes, consequent from the frequent fires, there lies hidden a treasure in fertility of soil which, when developed, will sustain millions of the human race. * * * Chemical analyses of this soil have been made, and the results establish that the soil in Manitoba

is among the richest in the world. But the best analysis of the quality of the soil is when we find that under such indifferent farming such excellent crops are grown. Near to the Portage-la-Prairie, about sixty miles west of Winnipeg. I saw a field which had grown thirty crops of wheat in succession, without any manure, the last crop having yielded thirty-five bushels per acre; the owner was ploughing this field for the thirty-first time, and still did not consider it necessary to plough more than five inches deep, although he had quite two feet of soil to work upon.

* * * Three-fourths of the great wheat producing belt of the Continent lay north of the boundary line of the United States. There the future bread supply of America, and of the Old World, too, would be raised. The beef raised in this northern district was found superior to that produced farther south.

* * * Along the river banks and up on the bluffs, timber abounds, oak and poplar being the prevailing kinds, and amongst the brushwood we noticed the raspberry, dogrose, and a thorn very much resembling the white thorn of England and Scotland.

* * * That there are millions of acres of land in Canada of the finest quality, and within a few days' journey from this country, and which can be purchased for less per acre than the yearly rent of land here—in a healthy climate, and under the same Government as our own—(applause)—and where, at least, all the necessaries and many of the luxuries and comforts of this life are fully insured.”

Here is a word for my exigent and critical friend the hon. member for Gloucester, who seems so anxious to prove that artisans should have no part in our great inheritance, because they are incapable, he argues, of turning from the loom or the anvil to the plough. It may be true that their agricultural work may not be “high farming,” but it seems to have attained a tolerably satisfactory result:

“It was not to be expected that good farming would be witnessed throughout Canada, because many of those holding farms were weavers, miners, tinkers, or tailors, who had landed with scarcely a penny a piece, but who had, by perseverance and industry, carved out for themselves happy homes. These men had to clear the land before they could get a crop. The Canadians loved their country; many old men who came over to England with the intention of ending their days went back again. They like the climate of Ontario better than that of England.

* * * There is no doubt that the climate of Canada is more to the extreme than ours in England. I have not had sufficient experience to speak feelingly on the subject; but from what I could learn, the people look forward to the winter more as a time for pleasure rather than dread, as we in England are lead to suppose. From my own experience it is much superior to ours—instead of the heavy, damp, foggy atmosphere, they have the bright, clear

refreshing breeze, and altogether the air seems much purer and lighter."

These are not the statements of a sensational magazine writer, whose ware are written in such a strain to bring the best price in the market for which they are designed, and are purchased and paid for by the page, but the candid statements of clear-headed, practical English and Scotch farmers, who came to see for themselves, and whose reports cannot be suspected of bias towards us. They are fittingly prepared by the eloquent words of our honoured and beloved ex-Governor-General. My hon. friend from Shefford, in the height of his polysyllabled magniloquence—to borrow his peculiar style for a moment—speaks of the yearly exodus of the *habitants* to the United States for summer employment as a "multitudinous expatriation." Multitudinous expatriation is good, but it is only a rhetorical flourish and may pass as such. But, Sir, I do not share in the gloomy views of my hon. friends of the Opposition in respect to the depopulation of the Dominion. I believe exactly the contrary, and, as to the peopling of the far west, I do not doubt that the very fact that the British emigrants know that coming here they would teamong a people possessing English laws, traditions and culture, would prove a powerful inducement to them to prefer the northern side of the boundary. It is not right for hon. gentlemen opposite to insist that the system of the United States is more favourable to the emigrant and the settler than ours. I have shown that it is only within a short time that the United States have enlarged their free and preemption grants from 80 to 160 acres for each settler, and they compel him, at the outset, to declare that he will become a citizen of the Republic, a condition offensive to the patriotic feelings of many, and in which Canada does not, to her credit be it said, imitate that country. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), has referred to the lands thrown upon the hands of the formerly bankrupt Northern Pacific Railway Company. They have a land grant, I believe, of forty millions of acres, only 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 of which are supposed to be arable; that road, therefore, is to pass through a country much less cultivable than ours; large tracts upon its line are

unfit for settlement. Why cannot hon. gentlemen opposite see that the Dominion Government, with its excellent credit and enormous resources, may easily build our Pacific Railway, when one private company has built that through the United States, and the embarrassed Northern Pacific Company are likely soon to complete theirs? The late Government accepted the Carnarvon Terms, divested of the condition laid down by their predecessors, that the road should be built only as fast as our means should warrant. In reply to the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), who declared that settlement should precede railway construction, I hold that the conditions must be reversed; the settler needs and looks for the means of communication before making his home in the wilderness. I hold that the hon. member for Shefford has proved my case, and not his own, in his argument just concluded. In conclusion, I defy any hon. gentleman to controvert a statement I have made. I always intend to speak from undeniable facts and figures. I have been called a partisan; I acknowledge and glory in the character; but I hope the time is far distant when, from partisanship, I shall seek to betray the honour or injure the interests or retard the progress of the country.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): I wish to correct the misapprehension of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, that in the 25,000 or 30,000 emigrants reported by the Washington Bureau of Statistics as having gone from Canada to the Republic, were included many emigrants from Britain passing through the Dominion. In no case does the Bureau report the emigrants merely passing through Canada to the United States; but in every case does it directly credit the nation from which the emigrants come. Thus I can prove that the statements of the hon. member for Bothwell are substantiated by the Bureau of Statistics, and that the number of emigrants from Canada does not include any from Britain. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture and *confreeres*, when in Opposition, asserted that it was owing to our policy that the people were expatriated, they being unable to find employment at home. But the evil exists now in an aggravated form, a greater number than ever leaving the country at present. The Government are not taking the proper method of pre-

venting the exodus. The policy of the Agricultural Department, in circulating literature, like the pamphlet of Mr. Peter Mitchell, praising the United States at the expense of Canada, is highly detrimental to the interests of the country. In addition to the Mitchell Pamphlet, came a pamphlet, printed in the Montreal Gazette Office, eulogising Dakota and Turtle Mountain, at the expense of our North-West.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell): On enquiry in Montreal, I found that that pamphlet was written by the Rev. Mr. Armstrong, a gentleman who has manifested great interest in emigration to the North-West, and that he ordered the pamphlet on his own account. The copies ordered by the Department at Ottawa had not the advertisements objected to, although the others, ordered by himself, had, and he had a right to print them.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex): It is remarkable how readily an explanation can be found by hon. gentlemen opposite. This Turtle Mountain pamphlet I hold in my hands, I got from the Department two days ago. On page 49, speaking about Dakota, it says settlers pay \$1 an acre, get twenty years to pay for the land, and so forth, and that this is a more liberal policy than that of the Dominion is apparent. That is the description of Manitoba, as contained in this pamphlet, which hon. gentlemen opposite will circulate, in order to induce emigrants to settle in that country. I do not know in what climate it will be suitable to circulate a pamphlet like this—certainly not in the temperate climate of England and Scotland, but rather in Iceland and Spitzbergen, or some other frozen region. We object to the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, not that they are unwilling to secure the settlement of our North-West, but that they are blundering in every attempt they make to settle those lands, and doing it in such a way as to repel settlers instead of attracting them. Anyone reading that pamphlet would certainly not risk his life and that of his family, in such a cold and inhospitable climate as Manitoba is there represented to be. The other pamphlet from which I have quoted, also contains disparaging references to our own lands as compared with lands in the United States. I am surprised that the hon. member for Niagara does not re-

buke the Minister of Agriculture for circulating pamphlets which speak in such disparaging terms of this country. But this policy of expatriation still goes on. Have hon. gentlemen showed that it does not go on? In to-night's *Free Press* I read:

“A party of masons and bricklayers leave for Chicago to-night, there being no work in this locality for them.”

It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to charge us with disloyalty, because we make a plain statement of facts which are published in the papers, and which the hon. the Minister of Agriculture dare not deny. Now, the policy of the Opposition is to prevent the Minister of Agriculture from carrying on his system of expatriation. It is because we exposed his pamphlets that the advertisements were cut out, and from the same cause the objectionable advertisement was cut out of his Turtle Mountain pamphlet. I hope the Opposition will never forget their function of preventing the Government, as far as possible, from making mistakes, which would be fatal to the interests of the country. I hope also that, in the future, my hon. friend will be more careful in the circulation of his emigration literature, and that he will no longer encourage the hon. member for Niagara to rise in the House and shout: “Texas.” We have heard a good deal about Texas, but so long as we have evidence of this kind in our hands, we are willing the hon. member for Niagara may say all about Texas he chooses.

Mr. POPE (Compton): I had hoped this question would continue to be discussed fairly and honestly, on its merits, as it was by the hon. leader of the Opposition and the late Finance Minister; but when the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) declares that this Turtle Mountain pamphlet came from the Department of Agriculture, I tell him the statement is false. There is not one word of truth in it. Not a single copy of that pamphlet has ever gone out with that advertisement in it. The attention of the publisher was called to it, and there was never but that one copy came into the Department with the advertisement in it. The hon. member for Bothwell stated, the other day—and his statement has been reiterated by the hon. member for West Middlesex—that 30,000 emigrants went

from Canada last year. That is by no means the truth. Every emigrant passing through Canada from Europe is put down as an emigrant from Canada, even when these European emigrants had bought through tickets to the Western States before leaving their homes. I told the hon. gentleman that the emigration from Canada included emigrants passing through it, but he still goes on repeating his misstatements. Let us see whether more persons went from Canada last year than in the years preceding. I have here a table showing the number of emigrants that went through Canada to the United States, and those that remained in Canada, which is as follows:—

Year	Passed through Canada to the U. S.	Returned to Canada.
1873.....	40,000.....	41,000
1874.....	40,000.....	25,000
1875.....	9 000.....	19,000
1876.....	11,000.....	14,000
1877.....	7,000.....	15,000
1878.....	11,000.....	18,000
1879.....	20,000.....	30,000

The number of emigrants that remained in Canada last year was larger than in any other year since 1873, and the proportion of those who merely passed through was less than the average of those years. But I do not bring that as a charge against hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. Undoubtedly the hard times had something to do with the smaller number of emigrants remaining here during those years. When I spoke before Recess, I said that, comparing the Eastern States with Canada, we would find that Canada had increased more in the last ten years than had the New England States, while several of those states had actually diminished in population. This fact shows that the population is moving west, not only in Canada, but also in the United States; and when we had no West of our own, it was but natural and inevitable that our people should go to the Western United States. This emigration began long before 1861. I remember, well, in my own neighbourhood, in 1836 and 1837, that a large emigration took place to the west, and it has been going on ever since. I do not think it is fair for hon. gentlemen opposite to hold up this country before the people of Great Britain, as being in a state of distress and poverty, so that

our own people are compelled to leave us and go to the United States rather than to our own North-West. Every word they utter here will be used against Canada and against our North-West. My hon. friend (Mr. Huntington) says that farming has become a speculation, that large farmers are not to be encouraged, but only men of small means. Now, I do not agree with him; I would induce every farmer, large and small, I could, to go on to our prairie lands. In Great Britain, where land is dear and labour is cheap, perhaps the hon. gentleman's theory might be correct, but here we have a boundless territory and railways to reach it, and our only difficulty is to get men to settle it. I think these monopolists, the hon. gentleman speaks of, would become the employers of labour, and induce the poorer settlers to go out and work for them, and they would in time become themselves proprietors. I think that both these classes of people should be induced to go into that country. The hon. gentleman says the great danger is in putting too much land into the hands of one man, and he says we should adopt the United States system. But the Government of the United States have nothing whatever to do with emigration. They grant large quantities of land to railway companies; they place a large part of their territory in the hands of these very speculators, whom the hon. gentleman denounces. These railway companies become emigration agents. They employ such means to attract emigration as we cannot employ; they expend larger sums in circulating emigration literature than we can do, and, consequently, they succeed in attracting immense numbers of emigrants. The hon. gentleman says the extension of the franchise in England has endangered their institutions. I cannot agree with that view. It has generally been thought the greater share you give people in the Government of a country, the more they are brought to feel that they have an interest in the country, and, consequently, the better citizens they become. To guard against all danger, the masses must be educated, as it would be dangerous to confine education to the few. The hon. gentleman seems to think that it may be unsafe for us to have too large an emigration to this country. I think the danger is chimerical. If we bring

them into this country and send them to our North-West to cultivate our land, they will become, in a very short time, taxpayers and producers of wealth. Let us not hesitate before any of these imaginary dangers, but go on in the way we have commenced.

MR. BOULTBEE: I have read the Turtle Mountain pamphlet to which the hon. member from Middlesex (Mr. Ross) referred, but its contents and purpose are widely different from those asserted by the hon. member for West Middlesex, and I consider that it is highly eulogistic of Manitoba in every sense, and by no means calculated to deter emigration. There is nothing in it to suggest the idea he would convey to the House, and the promulgation of the assertion of the hon. gentleman, in respect to the alleged emigration from Canada to the United States, as arising from our alleged miserable condition, must be highly detrimental to the interests of this country. This debate, however, has not been without satisfactory fruit, for we have at length had one prominent member on the Opposition side of the House come forward and state that he does not believe these things are true, and that he believes Canada to be as good a country as there is on the face of the earth to settle in, and that our institutions are surpassed by none. I allude to the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington). Unfortunately, however, he said the resources and advantages of Canada are not known throughout the world, and this is, in a great degree, due to the fact that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House rise day after day, and night after night, and assert that a different state of things exists. It is a consolation for us to know, however, that during the last year there was an enormous emigration into our land, and that we have information to the effect that there are prospects that during the coming year that emigration will be doubled if not trebled. It is also a source of consolation to know that the affairs of the country are in the hands of men who have given the people what they demanded, but which the late Government refused—a National Policy. We may now hope, as years roll by, especially if we have a patriotic action on the part of the Oppo-

sition, to see this Canada of ours grow into the proud position indicated by the hon. member for Shefford.

MR. HESSON: I desire to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to the question of the emigration of Germans to this country. It is a matter worthy of consideration, whether the obstacles which have stopped this class of emigration cannot be removed. The number of German emigrants coming to this country has fallen from 16,453, in 1867, to 349 last year. I think it very desirable that this House should do something in the direction of encouraging and promoting this very valuable class of emigrants to come to Canada. It will not do, Sir, to say, that the German Government are opposed to our efforts in that direction, seeing as we do that the Americans have been most successful in obtaining a very large emigration from that country through some well devised scheme, such as employing their resident Consuls, Hamburg ship-agents, and by the most liberal distribution of information published in their own language, both by press and pamphlet, giving a glowing picture of the resources of their country. I would suggest to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture that a sufficient sum be placed in the Estimates, even at the expense of some of the other usual items in the Emigration expenditure, for the purpose of publishing in the German language, in a similar way, full and reliable information of the great resources of our own country, and which has been liberally supplied both to our English and French-speaking citizens. I fear, Sir, however, that the real objection arises from our very unsatisfactory alien laws, and which I am sorry to say, operates in a very unfair way against our foreign population, affording them no protection, even after taking the Oath of Allegiance to our Queen and country, if found travelling outside British territory. I am glad to see an enquiry placed upon the Notice Paper by an hon. member of this House, asking hon. Ministers what they have done or intend to do in regard to this very objectionable law. I hope it will be found possible to remove this stigma from the country.

MR. TROW: I have received a package containing similar pamphlets to the one referred to by the hon. member for West

Middlesex, from the Department of Agriculture, and I have received not only one, but fifty or one hundred. Until I knew the nature of their contents I was anxious to distribute them among my constituents, and other parties applying for information respecting the great North-West. On examination I found the greater portion of the information could not possibly be of any service to intending emigrants; nor does it offer any special inducement to settlement in the North-West. Instead of inducing parties to emigrate it would have a tendency to keep them away. The pamphlet I have reference to contains many useless advertisements, totally unconnected with the subject of emigration. Why, the first page is taken up with advertising the "Cook's Friend," for making pan-cakes, griddle-cakes, and dough-nuts, etc.; then we find a map descriptive of the line of the projected Emerson and Turtle Mountain Railway, sketched purposely in the interest of speculators. The writer then describes his mode of travelling and his stay in a house 12ft. by 7ft., made of boards tongued and grooved, lined with felt-paper inside, in which was a cooking stove. After partaking of the hospitality of a poor Mennonite, he describes the house as a bad-smelling tenement, and before leaving lectures the proprietor on ventilation. The following night the party was not as comfortable as they were in the bad-smelling Mennonite house, for the writer says the thermometer was 25 degrees below zero, and the wind blowing fifty miles an hour. Little streams of water were running down their necks; they lay under snow two feet in thickness; the poor horses had eaten the trunks, teapot, cups and saucers. Finally, the party let the horses loose, depending upon their natural instinct to take them back to the settlement. Such gloomy descriptions are not the most encouraging to emigrants. We find other very objectionable features to these pamphlets—glaring advertisements of private individuals, companies, etc. I notice one John Schultz advertises 20,000 acres of land for sale in Manitoba, and village lots in various parts of the Province. I cannot conceive why the Government should advertise lands for Dr. Schultz, a member of this House. Let the Government advertise

only Dominion lands, surveyed and open for colonisation. We find the Americans are lavish in regard to advertisements. Tons of fancy coloured advertisements are plastered in every conceivable place over the whole Dominion; even this city of Ottawa is liberally covered with advertisements of lands for sale in the United States. I deny the charge against hon. members on this side of the House of unpatriotism, made by the hon. member for Niagara. I have not heard one word from my hon. friends but what has been in the interest of Manitoba and the North-West. Every hon. gentleman must be aware that in passing to Manitoba, emigrants must, until the railway is constructed through our own country, pass through the United States, through large tracts of arable land in Minnesota and Dakota, the latter state alone being twenty-five times as large as Manitoba, and it is only natural to expect that they will, in numerous cases, be entrapped into staying in those states, unless we can offer greater inducements. Tens of thousands are yearly leaving this Dominion and going into the States. Mr. Young, a gentleman in whom the hon. the Minister of Finance places implicit confidence, values every able-bodied emigrant at \$800, and if we lose, as the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) says, 20,000, as we did last year, the proper policy is not being adopted to keep them within our limits. We find, since 1872, that 228,415 emigrants have left different parts of the Dominion and settled in the United States. I know that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture desires, and has endeavoured, to do right, but he has overlooked some gross carelessness which I am afraid exists in his Department, in reference to advertising and circulation of pamphlets. It is high time to put a check on this worthless literature; it does a great deal of harm.

Mr. WHITE (North Renfrew): Hon. gentlemen opposite endeavoured at first to account for this exodus by attributing it to the bad effects of the National Policy; but, finding that it was absurd to contend that emigrants were going from here on account of Protection, and flying to a country where there is more Protection still, they fall back on these pamphlets as the cause. The proper

solution of the problem would be found by looking to the policy of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), and the delay he allowed to take place in the construction of the Pembina branch of the Pacific Railway. The success of the emigration system in the United States is due to the facilities afforded by the railways; and I venture to say that the policy now adopted of pushing the Pacific Railway into the fertile prairies west of Red River, will cause people to seek homes in our own territory.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell): It seems, Mr. Speaker, as if we were never to end the discussion about these unfortunate pamphlets. I think the statement of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, made upon his responsibility, on the floor of this House, in reference to them, ought to have been accepted. Referring to the Mitchell pamphlet he stated that he neither bought, nor ordered, nor distributed them, and was in no way responsible for them, and we find that statement confirmed by the *Montreal Herald*, at the office of which the pamphlets were printed, in the interests of the St. Paul and Manitoba Railway, owned in part by the hon. member for Selkirk. The statement of the *Herald* is to the effect that:

"The pamphlet being circulated gratuitously, a number of them were sent to the Canadian Department of Agriculture by the printers, on the instructions of the parties at whose instance the edition was issued."

That certainly confirms the statement of the hon. Minister. It is from an authority which hon. gentlemen of the Opposition do not usually question, and it ought to end the discussion in relation to this matter. The other pamphlet to which reference has been made by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), deserves a word of explanation. The hon. gentleman read from it a passage describing a camping-out in a snow storm in Manitoba, with the view of proving that the pamphlet was calculated to deter emigrants from going to the North-West. Now, everyone knows that there are snow storms in the North-West, as everyone knows that there are snow storms in Minnesota and Dakota, so much so that the railways in the latter states were last winter detained eight or ten days in consequence of the storms. But surely that does not prevent people from

settling there, nor should it prevent them from settling in our own North-West. The passage quoted occurs in a pleasant description of three weeks' travel in winter through Southern Manitoba, and instead of injuring the usefulness of the pamphlet, its very candour will tend to inspire confidence in the statements made in it. If the hon. gentleman had desired to deal fairly by his country, instead of selecting this passage which, wrested from its context, seemed to tell against the Province, he would have read other extracts. Let me supply the omission, and take two or three sentences at random. Here is a passage:

"Next morning we walked over some of the farms in this district, which is called the 'Mountain.' The scenery is very pretty, and in places quite grand. The settlers have raised good crops and are in good spirits."

That surely might have been quoted. Again:

"We are struck here, as everywhere else in our journey, with the strangeness of the phenomenon that, even in the newest districts, we find society as quiet, orderly, and honest as in any old-settled district of Canada. To one who has travelled a good deal in new settlements in the United States, the contrast is delightful indeed."

He might have read that in favour of his country. Here is another passage:

"We are much delighted with all this country from leaving Emerson until we reach Pembina Crossing, on the Pembina River, seventy-five miles from Emerson. We have not crossed a single tract of bad country. We feel that we are travelling in the richest agricultural country that we have ever set foot upon. The weather has been delightful during these three days."

Again:

"It seems to take less fuel to heat a house in Manitoba than in Quebec or Ontario. We slept in several very comfortable houses of a good size that were heated by a small cooking stove only. The same sized house in Quebec would have a box stove besides the cooking stove."

Then, again, continuing the description, we have the following:

"Mr. McLaren is now engaged in putting up a house for a stopping-place. Here, too, is wanted immediately a good general store, post-office, blacksmith shop, etc. There are around Clearwater Village, 150 square miles of the best land in the world to support these things, besides a great travelling public. The village is situated in the midst of the Paisley colony. This colony made an arrangement with Government that only actual settlers

should take up the land in the four townships which were reserved for it, and, as a consequence, all the land has been taken up by actual settlers, who will be out in the spring. This, of itself, will make it a most desirable locality."

Then here is another passage :

"We could not have chosen a better time to see the country. From Range 16 to Range 19, and during the following days to Range 22, we pass over a magnificent country in which there is no waste land. Occasionally, we find a gravelly or stony knoll, but the gravel and stone are all on the surface even there, and below it are two feet of splendid loam, with a rich clay subsoil below that."

Then, again, we have this statement :

"We were fortunate enough here to meet the surveyors, who had just finished their survey. They told us (I attach certificate) that there are here 150 square miles of merchantable timber, the best water in the country in abundance in all directions, and good soil everywhere. Wood, water, and soil—a settler's paradise. Every man can secure 320 acres of land, and twenty acres of wood. There is enough for 5,000 settlers in this block alone."

Still again, let me quote :

"We meet several old Red River settlers here, who tell us that a farmer's life is much more pleasant here than in the Red River Valley. They prefer the soil, although it is not so strong. They have splendid home markets, and will have, with new settlers coming in for years to come. They have wood, coal, and good water. They say that it is too level in the Minnesota and Dakota prairies, and in the Red River Valley."

MR. TROW : Read a little on pages 23 and 24.

MR. WHITE : I shall come to that in due time. Again, the writer says :

"In the very last day's explorations, and when we had reached our farthest westward point, we met Mr. Norton, mining engineer (whose certificate I attach for publication), who is now engaged in mining coal at the Souris River, about 300 miles due west from Emerson. He told us that the country he had traversed for 200 miles west of where we were, was as good as the country we had come over. He had gone over it both in winter and summer. He predicts that one of the big cities of the future will be 300 miles west of Emerson, at some point on the Souris River. We find him as enthusiastic about the country as all the other Englishmen we meet, which means that he was very enthusiastic."

I might go on quoting, but it is unnecessary. We have, in addition to this description, an extract from Consul-General Taylor's speech, in which he bore testimony to the superiority of the Canadian North-West, as a grain growing region.

MR. WHITE.

We have some excellent directions for reaching Manitoba. We have eight solid reasons why men should settle in the wheat fields of the Dominion of Canada rather than anywhere else. We have a description of winter in Manitoba which tends largely to neutralise the effect of the statements which have been too common on that subject. Then we have the testimony in favour of the Dominion wheat lands from the *Philadelphia Press*, an American newspaper. The hon. gentleman asks me to read from pages 22 and 23. These pages are not in the book. They contained the advertisement of Kansas lands, which has been complained of, and it seems strange that the absence of that advertisement should cause anxiety to the hon. member. But it is complained that there are other advertisements in the pamphlet. This is quite true. The pamphlet was written by the Rev. Mr. Armstrong, a Church of England missionary, who has had large experience in the Eastern Townships, who during recent years has been doing mission work in Manitoba. On two or three visits which he made to different parts of the Province of Quebec, he has lectured upon the advantages of Manitoba, and has been a practical emigration agent. Recently, under medical advice, he has been compelled to give up his ministerial labours, for two years, and he has resolved to devote himself to emigration work. This pamphlet was printed at his own risk. The advertisements complained of were obtained by him to help pay the cost. They may do no good, but they certainly can do no harm, for it cannot be a disadvantage to the people who read them to know that they can, in this new country, obtain in the business houses of Manitoba, all the ordinary articles which they have been accustomed to obtain in the Old World. The railway lands advertisement was obtained in the same way. Mr. Armstrong induced the Department to take some copies of this pamphlet, but under instructions from the hon. Minister this particular advertisement was removed from all the copies taken by the Department. These are the simple facts in relation to this pamphlet. There is no doubt that there has been, and that there is still, a large emigration going on from

Canada during the present season. The circumstances in the manufacturing districts of the United States have been such as to attract people from this country, but many will find themselves disappointed, and the return stream of Canadians will be heavier than it has been before. One way to remedy this is to afford this class of people the same kind of labour in manufactories in Canada that they go to the United States to obtain. With regard to emigration from Europe, I may say that I have never entirely agreed with the system of assisted passages. I believe it is not an overstatement when I say that upwards of \$100,000 a year of our money has gone towards bringing people from the Old Country through Canada to the United States. I am quite satisfied, however, that the means taken by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to induce the tenant farmers to come here will have a good result. There will be a large emigration from the Old Country during the next few years, and we will do well to secure that class of settlers. The hon. gentleman complained that advertisements for United States lands were to be found all over Canada. That is true. We have seen this evening a sample of those advertisements printed in the *Toronto Globe* office. I do not complain of that, because the *Globe* has a printing office in which anything may be printed that is not immoral or indecent, if it is paid for. But those advertisements are issued, not by the United States Government, but by land and railway companies. Those parties are very enterprising. When I had the honour of being in England for the Ontario Government, in 1869, I found agents of Kansas land companies lecturing, with a view to inducing people to go to that state. We find to-day, however, that there is a great emigration from Kansas, because people have found out that the representations of those agents were incorrect, that the "golden belt" was but leaden after all. I am sorry that such speeches as we have listened to are made, because we give American agents the opportunity of taking up the *Official Debates* and extracting statements which are, unfortunately, better for their purposes than anything which appears in their pamphlets. If hon. gentlemen will consent to hold their

peace, if they cannot speak favourably of their country, I venture to think that we will have nothing to regret in connection with emigration to the North-West in future.

MR. VALLÉE: This question of immigration and emigration is too important, more especially for the Province of Quebec, the population of which serves as the basis of Parliamentary representation, to be allowed to pass in silence by the representatives of that Province. It may seem contradictory that we should make enormous sacrifices to attract a foreign population to this country, when we see, day by day, a portion of our own population deserting it. It is undeniable, and we witness it with regret, that every year a considerable part of our population set out for the United States; and I must admit that this year, more than in previous years, an extraordinary large emigration has taken place from certain districts in the Province of Quebec to the United States. What are the causes of this? It was said, a moment ago, by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, that it was not well to reveal the weak points of our country, that we should not dwell too much on the evils by which we are afflicted, lest we frighten away foreign emigrants, whom we desire to attract. Now, in my opinion, we too often incline to hide our weaknesses, through fear of injuring the general population of the country; we are afraid to probe the wound in order to apply a salutary remedy. This is a mistake. It is better that we should know the extent of any evil that may exist, if we desire to adopt the means of removing it. It is no use attempting to throw dust in the eyes of other countries, and trying to make them think they will find extraordinary advantages here, when they are in a position to see for themselves that our own population is leaving the country. This question must not be looked upon in the light of a party question; for if we were to deal with it in that way we should be led to false and erroneous conclusions. We must consider it from a national and patriotic stand point, and place the subject on a higher sphere than that of our ordinary discussions, banishing from our minds that spirit of animosity which too often excites strife between political

parties in dealing with questions which require, for the general good, to be discussed in union and harmony. What then are the causes which result in a portion of our population leaving the country, in order to go and settle in the United States? There are many of them. It has been stated, this evening, that our people are going away in order to look for employment; but, I can mention districts from which the tide of emigration is considerable and where, nevertheless, there is work for every one who wants to do it. The principle cause of the emigration in our rural districts is a taste for luxury, a disgust for agriculture, induced by extravagant living, the result for the most part of the facility with which farmers can borrow money. Another cause which helps, indirectly, to induce our population to leave the Province, is the fact that farmers, when once they have lost their property, are ashamed to become workingmen or mechanics among their companions; they go away to the United States to work in factories or to engage in labour which they refuse to do here. They prefer to leave the country and enter the service of foreign masters rather than remain at home and adopt more frugal habits. Such are the causes of the evil we lament. What remedies can be applied to this state of things? I have already pointed out some of them. We must, in the first place, give our emigrating population the means of reaching the North-West Territories—that Great North-West so highly praised by many writers. It would, perhaps, be proper to offer to the children of the soil, who desire to emigrate, the same advantages as are offered to foreign emigrants. I remember that, last year, I wanted to send a family to Manitoba. The family were themselves extremely anxious to emigrate to the United States. It consisted of seven persons. I went to the emigration agent at Quebec, and asked him to give that family the same advantages he gave to foreign families entering the country. He made answer that those advantages were given only to those who came from foreign countries. I was shown the regulations, and found that in truth they did not permit the granting of the aid I applied for. The family left the country for the United States. It

MR. VALLÉE.

seems to me to be but a short-sighted policy to confine ourselves solely to promoting foreign emigration, when our own people are going away to the United States, in place of emigrating to our North-West Territories. Can we not give another direction to the current of emigration of the sons of the soil, by offering to the latter the same inducements that we offer to foreigners? It is time the attention of the Government was called to this matter; and I trust the hon. Ministers who represent the Province of Quebec, at all events, will take it in hands. We all remember the astonishment occasioned in the Province of Quebec by the publication of the Census of 1870. Everyone was surprised to learn that the population had scarcely increased during the decade. I very much fear that our next Census will show that our population, instead of increasing, has fallen off. Our population serves as the basis of the representation. Its increase or diminution may have serious consequences. It is evident, at a glance, how important it is for us, in the Province of Quebec, to retain our population, and to adopt, without delay, such measures as will keep our people in the country. But it will be said that we are unable to prevent our farmers from going away to the United States. That may be true to a certain extent, but I believe we can offer obstacles to this lamentable exodus. Can we not prevent American agents from offering tempting baits to our Canadians in order to induce them to emigrate to the United States? Allusion was made a moment ago to the advertisements scattered broadcast everywhere, to the placards affixed in public offices, and even in the waiting rooms of our railway stations, setting forth the inducements offered to Canadian emigrants by the United States. It is easy to pass a law prohibiting the circulation of such advertisements and the posting up of such placards. These placards are to be seen in railway stations belonging to the Government. Could not the Government prohibit the posting up of placards of this kind? The Local Government of Quebec might adopt that course also, and forbid the exhibiting, in public places, under its control, of advertisements inviting and soliciting our people to go abroad. There is another means

of inducing a portion of our agricultural class, who are ashamed to remain in our old parishes, of inducing them, I say to cling to their native land. In the Province of Quebec we have the territory of the Valley of Lake St. John, a fertile district, but difficult of access, which we might place at the disposal of those who are fully determined to remove. If the Government were to return to the old policy—a policy so grand, so noble, so patriotic—the policy of repatriation; if the Government would continue to place each year in the Estimates a certain sum, to be used in promoting the repatriation of our Canadians now in the United States, we could then send Canadian agents to that country in order to induce our people who are there to emigrate to Manitoba, or to the Valley of Lake St. John. Large sums of money have been expended in sending agents to England, in order to attract emigrants to this country. Up to the present time we have seen no great results from this policy; but if the \$50,000 spent for that purpose were used in preventing our own people from leaving their country for the United States, and in inducing them to turn their steps towards Manitoba and Lake St. John, an immense benefit would be conferred on our country and on our own people. If that amount were expended in keeping our population in the country, we could send hundreds of families to Lake St. John and to Manitoba, and in this way the most satisfactory results would be secured for the future prospects of our country. It will be said that, in so far as the settlement of the Valley of Lake St. John is concerned, the Local Government should take the matter in hand. But it seems to me that it is rather the duty of the Dominion Government to promote the settlement of that district, inasmuch as this Government has charge of the matter of Emigration. For it is the interest of the Dominion Government that our population should not diminish, because our revenue would diminish in like proportion. It is the interest of that Government to retain our population in the Old Provinces, in order to enable us to settle our Territories in the North-West with our surplus population hereafter, when those territories shall have been opened up. If our Eastern Provinces become

depopulated, from whence shall we derive our resources to meet, for long years to come, the expenditure we shall be compelled to provide for in the North-West? This shows how very important it is that this question of population should be well considered by the Government; and I trust that next year we shall have a new law in relation to Emigration, based on the principle that we must, as far as possible, keep the children of the soil in the country.

MR. MERNER: While so much encouragement was being given to emigrants of other nationalities, the Germans should not be overlooked. It was only fair that they should be helped and encouraged to settle in the Canadian North-West. There were millions of Germans in the United States, and while thousands had been spent on English and other pamphlets to encourage emigration to the Dominion, not \$10 had been spent on anything in German. I believe much good could be done by sending delegates to Europe to give all information respecting Canada. I do not believe in the usefulness of emigration agents in the Old World. I think the Opposition are wrong in running down this country, which presents many advantages to the emigrant. It is a mistake, also, to disparage our manufactures, as behind those of the United States. I also believe that the late Government was wrong in making large reservations of land for Mennonites and Icelanders, and favouring such large colonies. Those foreigners have not the same privileges as British subjects till they take the Oath of Allegiance. The Government should discourage such settlements.

MR. CASEY: There have been many attempts to raise side issues, and cast on this side of the House the imputation of lack of patriotism, because we have called attention to the blunders made by the Government in their emigration policy. Nothing more was needed than the speech of the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée) to destroy the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite. He stated that the emigration of the inhabitants of Quebec to the United States has been, and continues, very large, despite Conservative Government and the National Policy. The speech of this hon. gentleman, who is a friend of the Gov-

ernment, exonerates the Opposition from blame, and confirms our view that steps should be taken to retain the present population in the country. I have heard that the clergy of Quebec have been compelled to use their influence in the pulpit to stay this emigration, which threatens to depopulate the Province. The Government should strive to make the North-West attractive to the French-Canadians as well as other emigrants. One evil described by the hon. member for Portneuf ought to be stopped—the posting of advertisements of United States Territories and other attractions, at Intercolonial Railway Stations, for the enticement of French-Canadians to the Republic.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: That is the first I have heard of it, and I am glad the hon. gentlemen have called my attention to the matter.

MR. CASEY: The hon. member for Cardwell said that the proper remedy was to foster manufactures and afford home employment. Yet in face of the statements of hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side, that thousands of fresh hands have been employed in Montreal and other places, by the National Policy, we have these startling confessions of our enormous emigration from the Lower Provinces. The Government should give the people more encouragement, by more liberal land regulations, to go to the Canadian North-West. If it gives away half the land to large railway companies, and then circulates, at its own expense, their pamphlets by thousands, it adopts a costly way of advertising the half it retains. The Government, besides, has been circulating pamphlets, written for a railway company, advising emigrants to go to the Turtle Mountain country, as the best in the North-West, thus giving the preference to the interests of a company over those of the country. I agree with many of the remarks of the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Merner) as to the propriety of encouraging German emigration to our North-West. No better settlers could be found. I regret to learn that the efficient and promising scheme of German emigration, matured by the late Government, has been dropped by the present hon. Ministers. Madame de Koerber had established favourable re-

lations with the Berlin Government with the view of obtaining our share of emigration. It is only through the agency of such parties as Madame de Koerber, who have a standing and position, that we can ever get our share of German emigration, as the Government is suspicious of strangers. I am sorry to hear that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture has put a stop to the negotiations in progress. I am informed, however, that there is a prospect that a large wave of emigration from Germany is about to set in to this country. Emigration from that country appears to move in periodical waves, and it seems that, at the present time, large numbers of young Germans are ready to leave their country for this continent. I would recommend this matter to the hon. member for South Waterloo, to see if he cannot get some person to conduct this emigration from Germany to Canada.

MR. FISET: I have listened with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to the well-timed remarks of the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée), respecting the emigration of our population to the United States; and he is, almost, the only member on the other side who has admitted the fact, although evident to all. In the Province of Quebec, the emigration this year has reached such grave proportions as to become almost a calamity. So much so, that in several places our worthy pastors have thought it their duty to interfere and to advise their faithful flocks, from the pulpit, not to leave their firesides in order to go to foreign parts. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) likewise admits that there is a sort of emigration to the United States, but it is only of young people who will come back to us this autumn. Such is not the case, in my opinion. At the present time this emigration appears to have assumed a new character. It is no longer only the young people who emigrate, but whole families; and we know that the latter, even though they might wish to do so, cannot return so easily, and, in the greatest number of cases, do not come back at all. I cannot share the opinion advanced by the hon. member for Portneuf, that a taste for luxury is the principle cause of the emigration of our fellow-citizens. No; those who leave our Province for the United

States, especially those in my section, are unacquainted with luxury, and have never known it. I admit that there are a few exceptions, but the greater part consists of poor farmers who cannot procure from their lands, still in an unimproved condition, means of subsistence for themselves and their families; and finding no labour, no work by which they might obtain what is wanting for their support, they sell the little property they have, and go to seek, in a foreign country, work which will provide them with bread. It is painful to confess it, but it must be admitted that it is misery which compels our fellow-countrymen to emigrate. We expend considerable sums of money in enticing hitherward foreign emigration, and this year we are going to pay away more than \$150,000 towards this object, and yet we do nothing to keep our fellow-citizens in the country. At least, rather than see them emigrate to the United States, it would be much better to give them the same advantages which we give to foreigners, and, in this way, to provide them with the means of establishing themselves in Manitoba or the North-West. To this end we ought to do as is done in the United States, that is to say, keep agents in the great centres who would watch the arrival of the railway trains, and would endeavour to engage our countrymen to go and settle in the North-West, by giving them the necessary instructions, and, if needs be, furnishing them with the means of transport, etc., as is done by certain American agents; for there is no concealing the fact that emigration from our own country is such as not to encourage foreign emigration to direct itself towards us. A stranger, seeing our country in this way abandoned by its own children, has every reason for enquiring into the cause of this abandonment, and then he asks himself whether the advantages offered to him are real, and we all know that doubt under similar circumstances may often have the effect of altering the route of the emigrant. I have not made these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, in a party spirit, and I think that in a question such as this there should be no party spirit. Although I have not forgotten the speeches of several hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of this House, who have promised us that Protection

would bring back to the country thousands of families who now live in a foreign home, and that it was going to provide work for everybody, and to retain in our midst our unfortunate countrymen, however it may turn out, I hope that this very year, and not next year, as the hon. member for Portneuf desires, the Government will seriously concern themselves with the important question of French-Canadian emigration, and prevent its continuance on the present disastrous scale—disastrous for the whole Dominion and the Province of Quebec in particular.

MR. McQUADE: I recollect that, in 1876, a number of emigrants came from France. Five thousand dollars was expended in bringing them here; but when they were brought here there was nothing for them to do, and they had to be taken back again at a very large expense. I recollect one time, when we were passing the Estimates, an item of \$10,000 was passed, under the late Government, for emigration purposes, but as I never heard of it afterwards, I supposed it was spent in election purposes. I think the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition should allow the Estimates on the head of emigration to be passed in a more gentlemanly manner.

MR. WRIGHT: In the city of Jerusalem there is a street called the place of wailing. By the Opposition, this House has been turned into a place of wailing. Their literature is that of Lamentations. Like the Englishman of Froissart, they take their pleasure sadly, and amuse themselves by weeping and wailing, and gnashing of teeth. When the Jews remember the departed glories of Israel, the destruction of the temple, and the incidents of the Babylonian captivity, they retire to the street of wailing and indulge in a protracted wail. And so with our friends of the Opposition. When they think of the departed glories of the political Israel, of the lost shekels of the treasury, and of the flesh-pots of their political Egypt, they betake themselves to the predictions of their favourite Jeremiah, and relieve their minds with a protracted wail, "Like the wolf's long howl on Onolaska's shore." Well, every man to his taste, but I prefer a more cheerful and pleasant mode of ex-

pression. It is the old, old story, the operation of the universal law—

“Then let the stricken deer go weep,
The hart ungalled play,
For some must watch and some must sleep,
So wears the world away.”

I must confess that, while bowing to the inevitable, my sympathies are with the laughing instead of the weeping philosopher. I do not care for studies of morbid anatomy. Some of our friends have drawn pictures of our condition, which excelled in all their loathsome details, the awful description of the plague at Florence, or the still more ecologic picture of the lepers of Tracadie. We do not wish to investigate the secrets of the lazar house; nor do I think such studies to be of a profitable character. If the statements of the speakers of the Opposition be correct, this is a country to emigrate from, and not to ask people to settle in. I am satisfied that there is a silver lining to the cloud—that things are improving; that the storm has spent its fury, and the reaction has taken place, and that a bright day has dawned. All the accounts which reach us announce that every kind of business is improving. Much has been made of the famous statement that Ministers can do nothing to promote the prosperity of the country, and that they are literally “flies on the wheel.” Well, there are many kinds of flies. In the summer season their name is legion. The present Minister of Finance may be called the little busy, busy bee, who goes humming around, and hears the pleasant sound of all those mechanical devices which promote the development of our industrial resources. To borrow the suggestive language of Dr. Watts:

“How doth the little busy bee
Improve each shining hour,
And gather honey every day
From every opening flower.”

The late Finance Minister (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) may be compared to an active and energetic wasp, who flies about like a Median knight, striking his lance or his scing into his opponents, and gathering anything but honey. I was much pained to hear from the hon. member for Portneuf as to the exodus of the inhabitants from the Province of Quebec. The way to cure this evil is to build up manufactures in our midst, give them work, and

keep our own people at home. We have in the Province of Quebec all the elements of national greatness and material prosperity. We have unlimited water power, and vast mineral resources—great facilities for developing our manufactures. We have an active, industrious, and intelligent population, who should be kept at home to aid in the development of our own resources. It is for these reasons that I gave in my adhesion to the National Policy, the protection, as far as possible, of Canadian industries. We all know what the economic arguments are. To buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market has been held as the true economical evangel. If this economic law be of universal application; if absolute Free trade between all nations can exist, there can be no doubt of the soundness of the system. But, unhappily, these laws are not of universal application. The United States have a highly protective system. They tax our productions and make our country a slaughter-market for their surplus goods. Under these circumstances, I was most reluctantly compelled to modify my Free-trade opinions, and give my support to the policy of protecting our Canadian industries; and I am satisfied that, with some modification, this policy will prove successful and satisfactory. Now, I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will direct his attention to the solution of the great problem of settling the waste lands of this Dominion. The future of the Dominion depends on the satisfactory solution of this problem. If the surplus population of the Empire can be induced to settle on our waste lands, our future will be assured. Why could not some scheme be devised by which the gallant and generous Irish, the sturdy German, and hardy Scot could be induced to make the Dominion their home. The visit of the representatives of the tenant farmers was a most satisfactory arrangement, and will, no doubt, produce desirable results. I hope that the hon. Minister will not lessen his efforts in this direction. The Russian Government appear to understand the exigencies of the hour. When there is a surplus of population in Finland those who are willing to go are committed in war ships to the Amoor. Why cannot the English transports be employed in a

similar manner. During the last ten years five millions of British subjects have settled in the United States, taking so many from England and adding them to a foreign country. If the people had been settled in Canada they would have added to the wealth and strength and power of the Dominion. I hope that the energies of the Ministry will be devoted to settling Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen on the waste lands of the Dominion. I believe that the Mennonites and Icelanders will prove good settlers, but I prefer the natives of the British Isles. I would like to see the inhabitants of the older Provinces aided, if they desire to settle in the western portions of the Dominion. If wise counsels prevail, if settlement is carefully and energetically carried out, the grave problem of the future will be successfully solved. I have no sympathy with those who systematically decry and disparage the resources of the Dominion. I have no sympathy with those who give their attention to studies of morbid anatomy. Philip of Spain was in the habit of descending into the vaults of the Escorial, and gazing on the features of the dead queen, whom he loved so well. Is this Canada of ours dead or is she living. Do we look on the dead queen lying in state, with all her jewels upon her, in all her still and solemn and stately beauty, or is she the blooming and beautiful and blushing bride, who springs to our warm embrace. Sir, our country is still full of life, energy and vitality. It has a grand future before it, and it is better to have a future than a past.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked what was the condition of the Icelandic settlement, and whether it was proposed to bring any more settlers from Iceland.

MR. POPE (Compton): I am sorry to say that the settlement has not been as successful as I had hoped it would have been. It seems that some interference on the part of a certain clergyman has caused a good many of these people to leave, and I am informed that others are going. Those that remain, however, are doing very well. We have no hopes of any more coming out this year.

MR. KRANZ: The emigration from Canada to the United States, which has

been commented on so unfavourably by hon. members of the Opposition, is mainly due to the fact that, in former years, Canadians had emigrated to the Western States, attracted by their rich and easily cultivated prairie lands, and numbers of others now follow them on that account. At that time, however, our Great North-West was not opened up, but as soon as this event took place, the tide of emigration commenced to flow in that direction. The emigration to Kansas from the county which I have the honour to represent, was brought about by the instrumentality of land speculators, who used every effort to settle tracts of land which they had bought in that state. In my opinion the Government should use every effort, and not spare expense, to make known to German emigrants the resources and fertility of the lands of our North-West Territories. If this was done, I think a large number of German emigrants could be secured for Canada, and no doubt German capitalists might be induced to invest in the purchase and the development of our mineral lands. A report brought down lately, giving the imports during six months ending 31st December, 1879, shows that a large amount of duty has been paid on farm produce imported from the United States for consumption in Canada. Now, if the Tariff has really not increased the price of these articles in Canada, then there can be no doubt of the fact that the American producer has contributed the amount of the duties into our Treasury. The German Tariff, being much higher than the Canadian, I do not think that the fear of heavy taxation would keep German emigrants from coming to Canada, and I wish to recommend them to the serious consideration of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. GILLMOR: I do not rise for the purpose of criticising the emigration policy of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. He has had a good deal of experience in that Department, and is doing the best he can to make this branch of his Department a success. I approve of bringing the tenant farmers to this country, and I approve of furnishing information to the different countries in Europe from which we may expect emigrants, giving them both the lights and shadows they may expect to find in Canada; but I am entirely opposed to

paying out our money to bring any emigrants from Europe. We have purchased the North-West, said to be so fertile, and lauded, I think, above its deserts. We give free grants to settlers, and are building a railway to enable settlers to get into that country, and emigrants not satisfied to come, under these circumstances, at their own expense had better remain at home. We have taxed our people quite too much already to bring emigrants from Europe, many of whom have gone to the United States. This discussion has been prolonged by hon. gentlemen on the Government Benches, charging the Opposition with a lack of patriotism, and by denying that there are any very considerable number of people leaving this Dominion for the United States. As regards patriotism, it is simply silly to allude to it as it has been alluded to. I presume there is about as much on one side as the other, man for man. Hon. gentlemen are now forced to admit, what ought not to have been denied, for it is a fact that more people are leaving Canada for the United States this year than on any former year in my remembrance. No hon. member on this side of the House has charged the Government with having been the cause of this; but, we do say that all the loud-mouthed professions that the National Policy would find work and bread for all, and keep our people at home, have proved a melancholy failure, and the National Policy has only made it harder for the working-man to get a living in this country.

MR. ARKELL: There appears to be a desire on the opposite side of the House not to people the North-West. There are a number going to Dakota, but they are going there because there is a railway to bring them to the parts they want to go to; and I am satisfied, if the railway we are building is opened, these people will go to our North-West Territory. If hon. gentlemen opposite had pushed on the railway west of Winnipeg, we should have a very large population in that Territory now. We shall now, under the present Administration, do this.

MR. LANGEVIN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this Resolution to pass without addressing a few words to this hon. House, and more especially without

MR. GILLMOR.

showing to my hon. friend the member for Portneuf that I have listened to his remarks, and making it evident to him that I regret, as he does, the departure of our fellow-countrymen. The Government deplore the emigration of the Canadians, and more especially when that emigration goes to the United States. But the fact itself is nothing new. Our fellow-countrymen, or, at all events, very many of them, have at all times loved a life of adventure. They have traversed nearly the whole of America, and settled in a large number of the states of the American Union. Moreover, this mania for emigration is not confined to our French-Canadian fellow-countrymen. It seems to prevail in every part of this continent. Look at the eastern states of the American Union, and you see whole populations, almost, leaving for the west. Why is this? Because the west, by its immensity and its natural wealth, attracts them. They hope to better their position there, and they go there to settle. The hon. member says: But why have you not done for the people of the country—for our own people—what you have done for aliens? The hon. member is mistaken; the Government does not pay the fare for the sea voyage; it only pays the fare from Halifax or Quebec to Toronto, and the Ontario Government repays us two thirds of that expenditure for those who remain at Toronto. Now, as regards Canadians who desire to emigrate, the Department of Agriculture does its best to secure from the railway and steamboat companies the most favourable terms possible for our emigrants, who wish to leave the older Provinces for Manitoba. These advantages are offered to all our fellow-citizens, without distinction of creed or origin. If they hope to better their position by leaving Ontario or Quebec, or the Maritime Provinces, and going to Manitoba, why prevent them from doing so? But, I am asked, why not pay their fare? If we paid the passage of those persons, must we not, in like manner, pay the fares of those who leave Manitoba in order to return to Quebec or to Ontario? The latter would clearly have as good a right as the former. Where should we stop? The Government might quite as reasonably be asked to pay the passage of those who desire to go

from one Province to another for any and every reason. But one thing is certain, namely, that if emigration, on a large scale, is now taking place from certain counties, it is because there has not hitherto been any emigration from those counties. There are many other counties, from which Canadians have emigrated, in order to settle in other Provinces. It is the surplus population that is leaving those counties which are now losing their inhabitants by emigration. They have employment, their farms are well tilled, and, in fact, better tilled than they were before. Those who have left have gone to settle in Manitoba, or in the North-West, and, I regret to say, a large number have gone to the United States. But how can you prevent them going away to settle in the United States? The other day the Rev. Father Lacombe, from the North-West, came to Quebec, and there made preparations for the removal of a certain number of families to Manitoba. He had completed all his arrangements, and the families were all ready to start; but what happened? One half of those emigrants left him, and went away to the United States. How can you restrain such people, if they are absolutely bent on going to a foreign country? It cannot be done. They are attracted there, as the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) said, by their friends who have gone there before them. You cannot prevent this. You may adopt any measures you like, and yet, after all, large numbers of our fellow-countrymen will continue to go to the United States. For these nothing can be done. But we are asked, why do you not strive to bring back to our country from the United States those who are already there? Well, something is being done in that direction. This very day, if I am not mistaken, an emigration agent, Mr. Lalime, leaves Chicago with 400 Canadian emigrants for Manitoba. So you can see that an emigration of that nature already exists; and there are other persons in the United States engaged in inducing Canadian emigrants to go to Manitoba. The other day, I saw a Winnipeg newspaper which announced the arrival of three families from Manitoba; the names and the number of members of each family were also given. We must not be

alarmed then at the number of persons who emigrate from one Province to another. It is in the nature of things. We see the Germans, the Irish, the French, the Swiss, and the Italians leaving their own countries, in order to better their condition by going elsewhere. Why do the Germans, for instance, leave their country and come to Canada? It is because they are not satisfied at home; they have laws which do not suit them; they have enormous taxes to pay. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Kranz) alluded to his fellow-countrymen on the other side of the Atlantic, and asked why the Department of Agriculture had not published a pamphlet in German in order to invite German emigration. I am in a position to tell him that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is now publishing a pamphlet in the German language in Germany, where it will be circulated. That pamphlet will help to diffuse a knowledge of our country amongst the inhabitants of the German Empire, who desire to emigrate. The hon. member for Portneuf remarked just now, that much might be done towards inducing Canadians to remain in the country, by selecting tracts of land in the Province of Quebec, in the Saguenay district for instance, in order to get them to locate themselves there. To this I reply, that the Government of Quebec provides great facilities in that respect. It must be borne in mind that the two Governments have their respective and separate attributes. The lands in the Province of Quebec belong to the Local Government and, consequently, we cannot interfere there. The Quebec Government is thoroughly well disposed to encourage the colonisation of those lands, but if our fellow-countrymen do not choose to remain there, if they prefer going to a foreign country, we cannot retain them against their will. The hon. member indicated, as causes of the emigration, a dislike to farm-life—a desire for enjoyment, etc. He might have specified much more weighty reason than those, and that is the apathy of the wealthy class, who have capital, and who neglect to invest it in manufactories, thus failing to avail themselves of the advantages afforded to them by the magnificent water power which the Province possesses. We see such manufactories estab-

lished elsewhere, but unfortunately it must be said, that in the district from which the hon. member comes, and to which I, myself, belong, capitalists have not as yet done their duty. They invest their capital in banks from which they derive six or seven per cent., so that that capital in no way benefits the population. Let our capitalists act as those of Montreal and elsewhere have done, and we shall see manufactories and industries established, at which the population will find work. That has already begun elsewhere. The National Policy was adopted but a few months ago; time must be allowed for that policy to produce all the good results which are to be expected from it. I am satisfied that next Session we shall see much greater results than those which we to-day behold. For my part I rejoice over the increase of prosperity which has manifested itself in the country since last Session. There can be no doubt but that the financial as well as the industrial condition of Canada has greatly improved. There can be no doubt but that we have now in the country a much greater demand for labour than was the case a year ago, and that a much larger number of the industrial class have found employment. The hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) put me a question just now. He was deploring the departure of a large number of our fellow-countrymen for the United States, and he asked: why do these people go to the United States? Why do they not remain in the country, if the National Policy is so fine a thing? I will tell him why. They go to the United States because the National Policy has been in operation in that country for a longer time than it has been in ours, and has, therefore, had time to produce a much greater abundance of fruit. Numerous manufactories and industries of all kinds have been established and give employment to hundreds of thousands of workmen, and that is why our fellow-countrymen go to the United States. Let us, therefore, give our National Policy time to produce its effect, and we shall see that very soon, not only will our fellow-countrymen in want of work remain in the country, but further, those who are already in the United States will return to reside permanently among us. It must not be supposed that our fellow-country

men go willingly to seek for work in the United States. They would a hundred times sooner remain in the country. Many of them who have had experience of the United States, would be willing to return but have not the means of doing so; they are there, and there they are tied by necessity. If they had but devoted to the cultivation of their land in Canada the same energy and the same labour which they have expended and displayed in the United States, and if they had not suffered themselves to be led away by the delusive prospect which that country presents, they would now have been prosperous; they would have followed in the steps of many others who, at the commencement, struggled with adversity, but at last, by dint of labour, attained an enviable competence and bequeathed a rich patrimony to their children. But to make our fellow-countrymen understand that they ought to remain in the country, it is necessary that we should show them an example. We must not disparage our country; we must make our fellow-countrymen understand that when they have a home in the country it is better for them to remain there than go abroad. But if we hint or say to the country population, who, in many instances, have but little education, that our country is not a good one, that our institutions are bad, we must expect these people to bend their steps in the direction indicated to them and go abroad. I shall not pursue the subject further. I wished only to convey to hon. members who have spoken on the subject, that the Government regrets all emigration which is a loss to the country, and that it is their intention to do all that lies in their power to prevent that emigration. And in reply to the hon. member for Portneuf, I may tell him that, until to-night, the Government were not aware that posters had been put up in the cars of the Intercolonial Railway, tending to attract emigration to the United States. The Minister of Railways assures me that he will see that nothing of the kind occurs in future.

In reply to Mr. HUNTINGTON,

Mr. POPE (Compton): said, Sir Alexander Galt was to take charge of the emigration business on the other side of the Atlantic, under the direction, of

course, of the Department here ; and that Mr. Annand was to still occupy a position.

MR. HUNTINGTON asked, further, what were the relations of Sir Alexander Galt to the Government? Did he express their views? Were they and he "two hearts with but a single thought?" Were the Government responsible for that gentleman's utterances, and especially for the sentiments put forth by him at the recent Montreal banquet? If so, where were we drifting to? Sir Alexander Galt had, at that banquet, stated that the construction of the Pacific Railway was beyond our ability without Imperial aid. He would like to know if the Government expected to get that aid, or whether it is intended to wait until that aid is given. Sir Alexander Galt had almost stated that we could, under the Confederation Act, make treaties with foreign States independently of the Imperial Government, except the employment of her diplomatic machinery. This was rather startling. We were told that the treaty-making power was ceded to us, and that Great Britain could not make any treaty affecting us without our consent. Were these statements such as expressed the views of the Government? He (Mr. Huntington) supposed that since the whole diplomatic machinery of the Empire was at our command, then, if we wished to make a treaty the British army is to be placed at our disposal, in order to inflict punishment on those who treat us improperly. Would the Government give the House some definite information as to the relations in which Sir Alexander Galt stood to them? He (Mr. Huntington) thought it very important to have his questions answered, and he would give them two days' notice; but they would hear more about it as they drifted towards that terrible desolation which the "Jingoes" have experienced. In that speech of his, Sir Alexander Galt—with two Ministers sitting beside him—spoke of a British Zollverein, which would bring us back to the old state of things, when we should have our Tariff regulated for us by the Empire. Was this one of the schemes intended to be carried out by our High Commissioner on his present mission? He (Mr. Huntington) did not want to embarrass the Government, he thought this matter would

embarrass them of itself; but he had a secret which he would tell the Government. It was this: The Conservatives saw that this gentleman, whom they had sent to England as High Commissioner, was a dangerous man, that is, that he was a great man, who must be got out of the way, no matter what expense it entailed upon the country. Sir Alexander Galt was a dangerous man, he was a popular man, who might trample the party's National Policy under foot, if he liked, or he might defy it if he chose. The hon. the Minister of Finance ought to rise at once and explain the discrepancy between himself and the hon. gentleman who represented him in England, and whether there were certain sky-rockets of which we were to have the benefit. If Lord Beaconsfield had been left undisturbed we might have had a Naval Reserve, and all sorts of grand things in Canada; but though such a change had occurred, though the mighty Jingoes have fallen, and the vulgar Radicals have taken their place, all these things were still open for the hon. gentlemen opposite to explain.

MR. LARUE: I cannot allow the circumstance before us to pass without drawing attention to the conclusions arrived at by the hon. Minister of Public Works, in relation to the emigration of the French-Canadians to the United States. We have just heard one of the Conservative Ministers officially admit the fact that, it is impossible to prevent the French-Canadians from emigrating to the United States. I have often heard that evil deplored, but this is the first occasion on which I have heard a Minister declare that no remedy could be found for that state of things. We all know that the Conservative party, when the General Elections were going on, extolled Protection as the panacea for all our ills, and as tending especially to prevent the emigration of French-Canadians to the United States. And now the hon. Minister has just acknowledged to us that his great remedy has failed, and that there is no way of preventing the emigration which we all deplore. The hon. Minister and his friends told us at the time, and proclaimed from the hustings, everywhere, that the emigration of the French-Canadians to the United States would cease as soon as Protection came into force. Protection has been in force

for fourteen months and the emigration is greater now than it ever was before. I thank the hon. Minister for having furnished us with an argument which we can use with such effect in the Province of Quebec, in the fact that he told us in the name of the Government that it is impossible to prevent the French-Canadians from emigrating to the United States. The hon. Minister stated further that a desire not to remain in the country is a characteristic of the French-Canadian. That remark appears to me to be of such importance that I cannot refrain from expatiating upon it, to the end that the country may know what to expect under the circumstances. I am glad to be aware that the hon. the Minister of Public Works has, to-day, officially declared that it is a characteristic of the French-Canadian to emigrate to the United States. When he was sitting at the left of the Speaker's chair, under the late Government, he several times declared that a remedy might be found for that great moral evil. How does it happen that, with all his talent, and with all his vast experience, he has not yet discovered that remedy? How is it that the Conservative Government, which rose to power by means of Protection, has been unable to discover that moral remedy which was to prevent French-Canadians from expatriating themselves? While the General Elections were going on, we were told: Wait, wait; we have found Protection; we shall enrich the country; we shall teach farmers how to live in Canada without going to the United States; we shall provide the father of the family with an opportunity of finding employment for his children in the factories; we shall provide him with the money necessary for the purchase, in new parishes, of farms upon which his children may settle. What do we see to-day? We have had experience of the National Policy; and the hon. the Minister of Public Works tells us, officially, that the National Policy has not yet had time to produce its effect. How soon then will this Protection, this wonderful National Policy, provide us with an opportunity of preventing French-Canadians from emigrating to the United States? It is probable that we shall have to wait for new General Elections. Now, I am satisfied that the

only remedy for this state of things is the infliction upon our Conservative friends of as crushing a defeat as that to which they subjected us at the last General Elections. A good reason given by the hon. Minister to the House to prove that it is impossible to prevent French-Canadian emigration to the United States, is the following:—"If we give the Canadians money to assist them to go and settle in Manitoba, we must also give the inhabitants of Manitoba the money necessary to enable them to return to the Province of Quebec." I considered that reason a very good one, but especially a very original and a very ingenious one. The hon. Minister knows perfectly well that Manitoba is a new Province, and that the tide of emigration sets from the old Provinces towards the new, and not from the new towards the old. I shall say no more; I did not, intend, expect to speak upon this question, but I could not refrain from making the remarks which I have done to the end that the electors of Quebec might know what to expect from the present policy of the Government, especially in so far as relates to emigration, that incurable evil, which threatens to depopulate Lower Canada for the benefit of the United States.

MR. LANDRY: The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. LaRue) has good reason for saying that he dwells in the cold regions of Opposition. The speech which he has just made proves this incontestably, inasmuch as it bears the stamp of the place which witnessed its birth, and the spirit which brought it to light. The House, as I do, asks what does the hon. member mean, and what is the meaning of this curious mode of reasoning, and of replying to the arguments of his adversaries. The method adopted by my hon. friend is very easy, its recipe is very simple, and the feeblest of orators can always make use of it. It consists solely in rising, and, without any consideration, without knowing anything of the question under discussion, opening his mouth, and shrieking out that his adversary is not serious, that he wishes to make an ill-timed joke, that he is childish in his statements, comical in his ideas, and, if he has the talent of spinning off for ten minutes arguments of this character, he may take his

seat, innocently believing that he has convincingly answered the arguments of his adversaries. But then the House always reserves the right, as in the present instance, of smiling in pity at these fruitless efforts. This is all which results this evening from the speech which the hon. member for Bellechasse has just made. It is not my intention to refute the arguments brought forward by the hon. member, for the very good reason that he has not advanced a single one, and he has simply talked for talking's sake. Such is the opinion of this House, and such will certainly be that of the country when it is apprised of my hon. friend's extraordinary arguments.

MR. MACKENZIE: Can the hon. gentleman tell me how much of this money he expects to expend in promoting emigration to the North-West.

MR. POPE: A very large portion of it will be expended for that purpose.

Vote agreed to.

58 Quarantine \$33,266

X. PENSIONS.

59 John Bright, Messenger, House of Assembly 80
 60 New Militia Pensions 5,133
 61 To meet the probable amount required for Pensions to Veterans of War of 1812 30,000
 62 Compensation to Pensioners in lieu of Land 6,500

Resolutions ordered to be reported.
 House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Ten minutes before
 One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 13th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

Bill (No. 81) To confirm the purchase by the Dominion of a portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the agreement made with the Grand

Trunk Railway Company of Canada, with respect there to.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Bill (No. 94) For the final settlement of Claims of Land in Manitoba by occupancy, under the Act 33 Victoria, Chapter 3.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

SUPPLY.

XI. MILITIA.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Ordinary.

63 Salaries of Military Branch and District Staff..... \$23,800
 64 Salaries of Brigade Majors..... 17,400

MR. STRANGE pointed out the inadequacy of the vote for Militia purposes, and for placing the forces in a proper and efficient condition. The whole force for several years had been languishing, not from lack of martial spirit in the young men of Canada, but because it was impossible for them to give their time unless adequately remunerated, or at least unless they received more encouragement from the Government than they had done. Since 1875 no Brigade Camp had been held in Canada, and it was necessary for efficiency to have a Brigade Camp in every district every other year, or every year if possible. Some changes begun by the late Minister of Militia had been for the better. For instance, gunpowder, which formerly had to be obtained from England, was now supplied by the manufacturers of Canada, and it was as good in quality as that formerly supplied by the Imperial Government, and at a less expense of 5 or 10 per cent. In addition to this reform in the service, the late Minister of Militia also put into motion the idea of converting our own ordnance into rifled cannon. That is a great step in the interest of the Militia service. He also commenced the manufacture of 7-inch Palliser guns. I believe two are being manufactured in Canada, as shells and projectiles might be were there funds. Ammunition, that we used to import from England, also is being made in Canada. I extremely regret the hon Minister cannot increase the vote for Militia purposes this year. I believe that, if this vote cannot be increased for some years, our only alternative is to reduce the standing force. At present, it consists of a total force of officers and men of 36,211, including forty-two troops of cav-

alry, eighteen companies of artillery, four troops of garrison artillery, five companies of engineers, and eighty-three battalions of infantry, together with eleven provisional battalions. Our Canadian force has two objects: first, being a citizen soldiery, the quelling of internal dissensions, which, in the past, it has admirably effected, though I hope the next occasion for its employment in this manner is far distant. Still, considering the extent of our territory and circumstances, we need such a force, with a view to such contingencies. No means could be more suitable for putting down internal disturbance, than by the use of the Militia force; its presence, without the use of arms, being likely, by the moral effect alone on an unruly multitude, to prove sufficient, in many cases, for this purpose. Our Militia force has, for its second object, the guarding of our country from the inroads of external foes. As in the past, so in the future, it would be able to hold its own with any foreign enemy till assistance arrived from the Imperial authorities. I look upon foreign molestation as a visionary contingency; I do not think there is anything to fear in that respect. But still our motto always has been: "In pace paratus." I think the force for both these purposes should be kept up to moderate strength. Having shown that the vote is not adequate to give the present force twelve days' drill, I think our only alternative is to reduce it. I think that a well-drilled and efficient force of 20,000 men would be ample for the two objects of the force—the quelling of internal disturbance and the protection of our shores from a foreign enemy. That number would give us thirty regiments of rifles and infantry of the full strength of ten companies each, or a total of 14,500 officers and men. Then to the scientific branch, and to the engineers, artillery and cavalry would be allotted the remainder, or 5,500 men, I believe, that would constitute a force perfectly adequate for the purposes for which a Militia is maintained. The remaining 16,000 men might be placed on the Reserved Force. In making those arrangements, the strong battalions, which have kept up their strength and efficiency, should receive the preference and be kept on the Active Force, the mere skeleton regi-

ments being placed on the Reserve. The District Staff, besides, might be reduced with advantage, the Brigade Majors being dispensed with, and their duties discharged by the Deputy Adjutant Generals; the saving thus practicable would be \$17,400, and without detriment to the efficiency of the service. Then the drill allowance to many of the corps is virtually a waste of money at present. At present, I regret to say, the drill allowance, in many cases, goes into the pockets of the captains and is not expended on the regiment. I believe if you reduce the force to 20,000 men that you might certainly reduce drill allowance by 50 per cent, thus saving \$20,000 a year. Then you might reduce the vote on ammunition 50 per cent., saving \$12,500; the vote for clothing might be reduced 50 per cent., saving \$25,000; the vote on military stores might be reduced 50 per cent., saving \$20,000; the vote on public armouries might be reduced 25 per cent., saving \$13,000; the vote on contingencies might be reduced 25 per cent., saving \$11,500; making a total saving of \$119,400. Now, as against this saving, I believe it is imperative that the drill pay should be increased; that is one item on which I think the Government ought to bestow a generous expenditure. The present vote for drill pay is \$175,000. I would suggest that it be increased to \$250,000 a year. By this means you will be able every year to drill the whole force in Brigade Camps, and be able to pay them a \$1 a day for the men, and the officers according to their respective rank. It seems to me, by this means we could have a force which could be depended upon at any moment. If this vote is increased by \$75,000, and you subtract this increase from \$119,400, which might be saved in other branches, you would effect a saving to the country of \$44,400 a year, and, at the same time, have an efficient force in the country. I have heard much said about the Head Quarters Staff. I must say that I am not in favour of making any reduction in that staff; I believe it is a thoroughly good staff, and that every member of it has his hands pretty full. If the forces were reduced by one half, possibly a few clerks might be dismissed, but I think the vote for the maintenance of the Department should be, at all events, not decreased by

any great amount. I have not made this proposition out of any spirit of hostility to the present Government, but I felt it my duty, as an officer of militia, as a citizen of Canada, and as a member of this House, to bring this matter before the House. I trust that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will give the matter serious consideration. I can vouch that a large amount of this sum, now voted every year, is money thrown away. If such a scheme as this, or some modification of it, were to be entertained, this sum would be thoroughly well spent, and the country would save each year the large amount I have indicated.

MR. MASSON: I am thankful to the hon. gentleman for his kind appreciation of the efforts I have made to put the Militia force of the country on a good footing; I have tried to do so without incurring a larger expenditure than has been incurred in the past. I was rather disappointed in hearing the hon. gentleman speak of the actual condition of the force. My opinion was that the force, to-day, was perhaps on a better footing than it has been for several years past. If I were to refer to the regiment of which the hon. gentleman himself is so distinguished an officer—the Queen's Own of Toronto—as an example, I should be satisfied that it was very far from going down. I admit that the condition of the force is owing more to the generous efforts of the officers and men themselves than to the grant given by the Government. The funds at the disposal of the country at the present moment are necessarily limited, and it is necessary to limit the funds for Militia purposes, in so far as is consistent with its efficiency. The hon. gentleman's suggestion that the force should be reduced is an easy one to make, but difficult to carry out. In order to reduce the force, we must discriminate between the different corps. I have heard many people say that we should only maintain the city corps, and dispense with the rural corps, but that, in my opinion, would be a grievous mistake. The force, as it exists to-day, does not cost too much for the services which it renders to the country. It would be a mistake to disband the rural corps. I know that the city corps, by their dash, their activity, and their tidiness, are the

pride of the Dominion; but you must remember that the strength and solidity of the volunteer force, depends mainly on the rural corps. The country does not regret the amount spent on its volunteers, and it would be a great difficulty for the Minister of Militia to make any reduction. I am satisfied that the volunteers, and the people generally, are content with the present condition of the forces. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the District Staff. What can be said of the staff can be said of the whole of the forces. People do not see the advantages of that staff until its services are required. But whatever argument can be made against the staff, can be made against the rank and file. When the emergency arises and the volunteers are called out anywhere, then the public will be quite willing to admit that it is better to pay these men well. If the troops were called out to quell a riot in either of the large cities, the people would very soon forget the amount of money that had been expended for Militia purposes. The Government last year, at my recommendation, made some reduction in the staff. We have reduced that vote by \$6,000, and I think that that is as far as we can go at the present time. The hon. gentleman has paid a deserved compliment to the Head Quarter's Staff. I agree with him, and I take this occasion to recognise the eminent abilities, and the kind and courteous disposition of the officer who has been acting as Adjutant-General of these forces for so many years.

MR. BUNSTER said this was a very important subject. The Pacific coast was of considerable extent, and greater means of defence were necessary. The subject was one which, he thought, was one worthy of the grave consideration of the hon. the Minister of Militia.

MR. DOMVILLE: I was very sorry to hear my hon. friend from North York speak of the Militia service of the country as he has done to-day. When he spoke of the reduction of the number of Brigade-Majors, I wondered how we were to get on in the event of such trouble arising as that referred to by the hon. the Minister of Militia. I should be very sorry to see the number of these necessary and capable officers reduced. I do not think the amount appropriated

for instruction pay is too great, and I certainly cannot support the hon. gentleman's assertion that there is too much spent for clothing. If any reduction is to be made in the Militia, I would suggest that the pruning-knife should be applied to the city corps, which are of a less permanent character than the rural corps.

MR. BOULTBEE: There is a very strong conviction through the country, in order to render our Militia force efficient, the attention of the Department must be directed largely to the keeping up of the corps. If any reduction is to be made, make it in the expenses of the staff. The staff in the local centres are much too extensive, and something should be done in direction of reducing the expense.

MR. WILLIAMS said that he disagreed with the hon. member for North York in so many of his suggestions that he felt compelled to trespass upon the attention of the House. He understood the hon. gentleman to recommend a reduction in the numerical strength of the force; in his opinion such would be most prejudicial to the welfare of the Dominion. In Great Britain the party, whose anti-colonial policy was so marked, is again about to assume the reins of office, and probably such a course as has been suggested would only be readily construed into an intimation that we were unwilling to bear a share of the defence of the Empire, and the tendency would be to weaken those ties which we hold so dear; and, if the reduction were made, the result would have a large proportionate reduction in the forces of the rural districts. I had every confidence in the corps—the Queen's Own—of which the hon. member was so talented and ornamental a member; it was a corps that would do honor to any regular army in the world; he felt that the hon. member had no desire that that corps should suffer in the suggested reduction of the force. We were well aware that the rural corps, as a rule, did not understand the art of dressing themselves with that neatness that so marked the city corps, but he felt satisfied that when endurance and pluck were required that those from the country would be found to be quite equal in efficiency to those corps that the hon. gentleman seemed to prize so highly. He would

not take up the attention of the House by following the hon. gentleman in his suggestions in detail, many of which he thought most objectionable, must not lose sight of the fact that it was necessary that the valuable stores of arms, clothing, etc., which were scattered throughout the country, had to be frequently inspected, or a serious loss would be entailed upon the Government. He thought then that it would be false economy to make any reduction in the staff.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said no vote was so important as this; it was an expenditure all over the country, and was understood by the people thoroughly.

MR. MACKENZIE: Except the Wimbledon expenses.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said the Wimbledon expenses, although spent in another place, did much good, and were the means of making Canada better known. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) did commence a military career; he went through the goose step; but I never heard that he went any further. It was quite unnecessary to reduce the staff; it was better to drill the force even once in three years, than to disband them, for, in case of emergency, they could be got together. He thought it a good plan to move the District Staff about to different locations every five years. He did not see why one Gunnery School should not be sufficient, and he suggested that it should be kept at Quebec. If there was another school necessary let it be a school for cavalry and infantry. The artillery got too much attention, when compared with the cavalry. The artillery get a dollar a day and fodder for their horses, whilst cavalymen get only 75c. a day, and have to find their own fodder, and the artillery had no harder work than the cavalry.

MR. WRIGHT said he thought the statement respecting the rural battalions was most unfair. He had three companies, perhaps the first soldiers in the world. He ventured to say every member in the House would say the same. He had great pleasure whenever they drilled; and he could state most emphatically that they did not spend their money at the taverns, they belong to the Tilley and Tupper wing of the great Conservative party. He thought his friend who had

gone to Wimbledon had illustrated Canadian military tactics. He had a grave charge to make against the Department in not encouraging the organising of a company offered in his county; they maintained three companies and two of the men had been selected for Wimbledon this year. He thought the subject should be treated gravely, and he hoped the application, with regard to the organisation of a regiment in his county, would receive consideration.

MR. MASSON said that any company formed in that district would be acceptable, but No. 5 district had 1,500 men which was above its quota. It was proposed to reduce the city corps, and the rural corps would be found to be better.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) said, in reference to the amount appropriated for drill, the money was almost wasted. When the battalions were called out they had only four actual working days. There was the day on which they came into camp, and the return day, on which little or nothing was done; they came on Monday and left on Saturday; and, therefore there were only four actual days given to drill; that was all that was done for the money received. It was a great farce. We agreed with the idea of drilling at head quarters. In the cities, he said, the corps were mostly officered by gentlemen of means, but they were not by any means, with this exception, as safe or reliable as the rural corps, which really formed the bone and sinew of the country, and it was upon them that the country must depend when hard work was to be done. We have had instances already in our Canadian history. Everyone must remember the unfortunate affair at Ridgway, in which the city battalions were the first on the retreat.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I am glad to hear that there is to be no discrimination against the rural districts. The words of the hon. gentleman will be a comfort to the volunteers of the country.

MR. STRANGE: I was not present at Ridgway, but, from what I heard, several valuable lives were saved, and the city battalions went to the front in good style.

In reply to MR. DESJARDINS,

MR. MASSON said in relation to the formation of a new regiment at Montreal, I may state that before leaving the

Militia Department, in view of the fact that District No. 6, and the French district of Montreal, had not a number of volunteers proportionate to that in the other districts, I gave instructions to the Department that, in the event of its being desired to form new companies, such might be done to the extent of 700 men. I know that three or four companies were formed before I left the Department. I do not know the position of affairs since then, but I will enquire of the hon. the Minister of Militia, and will give the hon. member the explanations when concurrence in the vote is before the House.

Vote agreed to.

65	Allowances for Drill Instruction..	\$40,000
	{ Ammunition.....	\$25,000
66	{ Clothing.....	50,000
	{ Military Stores	40,000
		115,000

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I have a small grievance to which I should like to call the attention of the hon. Minister. Last autumn a number of Snider rifles were imported for the 33rd Battalion Rifle Association, on which a Customs duty of \$30 was levied. I think it was the custom, in former years, to admit arms for such purposes free.

MR. MASSON: I think that in the case the hon. gentleman refers to, the rifles were imported by individual members of the association.

MR. MACKENZIE: I observed in a newspaper a statement that the Government were going to uniform a body of schoolboys, who are forming a rifle association in a western town.

MR. MASSON: That statement is not correct. All those associations have to provide uniforms at their own cost. The Government had got clothing for the Militia better and cheaper in Canada, of late, than the clothing formerly purchased abroad, inclusive of a duty of 17½ per cent.

MR. MACKENZIE asked would it not have been possible to have got this clothing made in the Penitentiaries?

MR. MASSON said that he was informed the experiment was never tried.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was tried, and that there was no reason why that clothing should not be made in those prisons,

as it would supply labour of a most legitimate kind.

MR. MASSON said the Government had made one step in the right direction, and it would consider whether it could not have the clothing made more cheaply by convict labour. It was determined that the great coats should be delivered complete in store, the same as from England. That was why Ministers thought proper to adopt this system instead of purchasing the cloth ourselves and having it made up as was done once in the past.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. MASSON said those great coats are supposed to last five years; but those made here this year, being of greatly superior quality, will be expected to last longer.

MR. CARON said he did not agree with the views of the hon. member for Lambton in using convict labour in the manufacture of this clothing. He thought that this labour should not thus be brought into competition with the work of the respectable artisans.

MR. MACKENZIE asked how would the hon. gentleman employ the convicts.

MR. CARON said he would set them at such work as stone breaking and road making.

MR. MACKENZIE said this would be competition with a still poorer class of labourers than tailors—with the men who broke stone and mended roads. They surely had as much right to Protection as the workmen above them.

MR. CARON said there was a distinction between the two kinds of labour. In England, where the subject of convict labour had been much studied, those prisoners were kept at such work as stone-breaking and oakum-picking. He would oppose their competing with our tradesmen, for whom we had not, at present, enough skilled labour, and were striving to create more. He would, if he must speak plainly, prefer to see convicts idle than decent men, who had to maintain themselves and families. We were doing all we could to start new factories, and it seemed altogether opposed to this policy to allow convicts to manufacture the goods required by the State, thus preventing free labour from being encouraged and developed.

MR. MACKENZIE,

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. MASSON said orders for the furnishing of the clothes were not asked for, but enquiries have been made from several manufacturers in Montreal and elsewhere. The average price of a suit would be about \$7, including tunics, trowsers and forage cap.

In reply to MR. GALT,

MR. MASSON: Information has been asked for in regard to the military clothing from several establishments in Montreal, and it is admitted that they cannot, at present, get the clothing at anything like the prices we pay for it. I do not like to give names, but we have taken means to fully ascertain the facts.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. MASSON: We have determined to purchase our powder in this country, and have done so the present year. We have purchased 20,000lb. or 25,000lb. from the Hamilton Powder Company, in the Province of Quebec. The powder was submitted to a severe test, which it underwent with success, and I am informed, on good authority, will suit our purpose as well as any powder we can get, besides we get it 4c. or 5c. cheaper than we were paying for English powder, on account of freight, and especially of insurance, which is very heavy. I think we are paying the Hamilton Company 16½c. a pound, whereas we paid 19c. a pound in England for powder delivered here. As to the question of small arms ammunition the vote of the past year has not been all expended. The Government thought proper to take part of that vote and this year's and purchase, in England, the machinery necessary to manufacture our own small arms ammunition in Canada. I have recommended that these factories should be placed at Quebec, and be under the charge of B Battery, as I thought it could be managed more economically, making use of the staff there, and availing ourselves of the cheaper labour of the men whenever we want their services. The machinery, delivered in this country, will cost about \$35,000. By this arrangement we shall manufacture our own small arms ammunition in Quebec. We had intended to place the machinery for the making of the shell of the cartridges and the bullets

at the Artillery Barracks in Quebec, but on account of the danger to property in that city, we have decided that the ammunition should undergo the final process of manufacture outside the walls. We thought it best to have the manufacture at Quebec, because we have there the necessary buildings, and the cost would be less than elsewhere. The Government have decided to send an officer to Woolwich, England, to learn the manufacture of cartridges; and he will superintend, on his return, the manufacture at Quebec. He will also see to the purchase of the machinery. Our reserve to-day is about seven millions of rounds, but we shall reduce it to about five millions, as when we have the machinery on hand it will not be necessary for us to keep such a heavy stock in reserve. As to the question of the use of the Boxer cartridge, we have sent an officer to England on purpose to investigate the question. The Government will act on this advice as to the kind of cartridge we shall use in this country.

MR. CARON: I take this opportunity of congratulating the Government upon the establishment of a cartridge factory in Canada. Its importance must strike every one, more especially in the event if we should, at any time, require to protect ourselves against a foreign foe. It is obviously a prudent measure to manufacture our own cartridges in this country. As to the locality where it is proposed to establish it, I must say that there is a feeling in Quebec against its being established in the old Artillery Barracks. All Quebecers remember the frightful explosion which took place some years ago, before the regular troops were removed from Quebec. It took place exactly in these barracks where the Government propose now to establish this factory. I consider that, for the safety of the city it should be removed outside the walls, as was done immediately after the explosion I referred to took place in Quebec. There are a number of lots outside where these works can be carried on without endangering the safety of the city.

MR. MASSON: It is the intention of the Government to manufacture only the shell of the cartridge in the Artillery Barracks, and then the shells and the bullets will be transported outside the

city, where they will be filled, so that there will be no danger to the city.

MR. CARON: This is perfectly satisfactory. I merely wished to get from the Government a positive statement that the safety of the city would not, in any way, be endangered by the factory in question.

MR. MASSON: I think that, in a month or two, we can make all the cartridges we shall need for the use of the force, under ordinary circumstances, during the year.

MR. JONES: There is always more or less change going on in the arms and ammunition of a country, and that must be taken into consideration. If we intend to make changes in our arms and ammunition, it will be a useless expenditure to get machinery which may not serve, if a change should be adopted in the ammunition. I think \$30,000 for machinery is too great an expenditure. I fear, moreover, that the expenses connected with the manufacture of cannon will be greater than the Government expect. I am very glad that we are going to have within ourselves, in case of necessity, a means of furnishing our own arms and ammunition. I fear, however, that unless we enter upon this innovation with due consideration, we shall become involved in a very great expenditure.

MR. MASSON: The cartridge used, which is generally made in England, is the Martini-Henry cartridge. We are getting out machinery to make the Snider cartridge, but the alteration of the machinery necessary for the manufacture of either cartridge is exceedingly trifling, and can be effected without great expense. The manufacture of these cartridges has been attached to one of our enrolled batteries in order to avoid any extraordinary expenditure.

Vote agreed to.

67 Public Armouries and care of Arms, including Store-keepers and Care-takers, Storemen, and the rents, fuel and light of Public Armouries.....	\$52,000.
68 Drill Pay and all other incidental expenses connected with the drill and training of the Militia	175,000
69 Contingencies and General Service, not otherwise provided for, including assistance to Artillery and Rifle Associations and Bands of efficient Corps.....	46,000
70 Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges....	10,000

MR. DESJARDINS asked whether any agreement had been arrived at with the corporation of Montreal in reference to the drill shed.

MR. MASSON: No arrangements have been made up to the present moment. The Council, some time ago, requested an interview with me, and I told them that the Government would consider favourably the submitting to Parliament of a proposal to help the city to re-roof and re-fit their drill shed, provided the plans of the proposed repairs were submitted to the Government for their approval, and he regretted having yet received no intimation of any action from the city corporation on the subject.

Vote agreed to.

Extraordinary.

71 Care and maintenance of Military Properties transferred from the Ordnance and Imperial Government, including rents,	\$ 8,000
72 Royal Military College.....	59,000

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I perceive by the *Gazette* that the Government propose to add \$100 a year to the charge for cadets entering this College in the future. I can say nothing against the proposition in the one sense. The sum demanded is small, looking at it as are compensate for the education given; but it will, I fear, have the effect, to a very considerable extent, of preventing the sons of our not wealthy yeomen competing with those who are better off. I would suggest the advisability of offering on the present bonus eight or ten openings which might be called scholarships.

MR. MASSON said that these cadets were under no obligation to the State, as were the cadets in most military schools in other parts of the world, and the Government thought that, by this increase—which they regarded as a reasonable and equitable one—they would be able to reduce the expenditure of the country by about \$10,000 a year, which was a very serious consideration.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I understand that twenty-four of these cadets will come out this year. The British Government will place four Commissions at their disposal. But how are these to be distributed? It is a matter of great moment

to know what the Government intend to do, as to a reasonable proportion of the remaining twenty, whether provision will be made for them in some Department of the Public Service, where they might, in virtue of their particular training, be made useful.

MR. MASSON: The matter is of great importance, and has for some time engaged the earnest attention of the Government, and they will consider it their duty to take some action in the matter.

MR. MACKENZIE: I felt, personally, very much that it was essential for the efficiency of the volunteer force to keep these young men in the country, and that, as far as possible, we should employ them in the Public Service. In the Public Works, typographical engineering—which they are taught in the College—and other field work necessary to be done in connection with the Railways, might be done by them. I do not go so far as to absolutely say that this should be done, but I certainly think something should be done in that direction, and I am very glad to learn that the Government have taken the matter up.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said he did not want it to be understood that everybody going there should be provided for by the Government, but that a proportion should be looked after, and the rest would lose nothing, as they would have the benefit of a good education.

MR. MASSON said, to this, as to all other matters, the Government would give due attention.

MR. BLAKE said he thought it was of the utmost consequence to preserve, in this country, persons who have been educated at so very great an expense in this institution. He thought that we might better dispose of our best men of this class than by sending them into the British Army. He could not see that the four Commissions offered to Canada were such a boon after all, for that, after educating these young men at an enormous expense to the country, they would be practically lost to us. He thought, however, that not many would take advantage of this so-called boon, for he understood that a line Commission in the British army required the person accepting it to be worth some \$1,200 or \$1,500 a year, in

order to support his position. It would not be a very advantageous thing to incur this large expenditure for educating these young men in order to fit them for another service in some other country, either British or foreign. He thought it would be desirable, however, that on perfecting their education, in this institution, they should be put to some use in the Public Service.

MR. MASSON said he thought the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) did not fully appreciate the Imperial act, which accorded to Canada four Commissions in the British army. It was, however, considered, generally, by the country, as a very great boon for our young men to be thus enabled to perfect their education in service under the Imperial Government, and he thought, moreover, that if we could offer a better position for these young men here, they would, of course, remain. The sentiment expressed by the hon. member for West Durham did not seem to be in accord with the general opinion of the public, as appeared by the press.

MR. BLAKE said he was quite aware that he was not in accord with some newspapers; but nothing that had been said had shaken his convictions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he thought that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) did not appreciate the boon accorded to us by the Imperial Government. He considered the benefit to be thus derived by these young men would be invaluable, not only to themselves, but to Canada. It would enable them to perfect their education, and in case of an emergency they would be the first to return to Canada to give us their services.

In reply to MR. KIRKPATRICK,

MR. MASSON said some extension of the College was intended to be made for the better accommodation of the cadets and officers.

MR. LANGEVIN said it was not intended to make a separate building but to make an addition.

Vote agreed to.

73 Military Schools and Drill Instructors in Colleges \$14,000

In reply to MR. MACKENZIE,

MR. MASSON said that this vote was intended to provide for the drilling of pupils in the use of arms, and what is generally requisite to render young men

efficient in military bearing, and to inspire in them a military spirit, and was entirely independent of the school for cadets provided for under the preceding vote.

Vote agreed to.

74 Pay, maintenance and equipment of "A" and "B" Batteries, Garrison Artillery, and Schools of Gunnery at Kingston and Quebec \$115,000

75 Pay and maintenance of Guard at Rideau Hall 5,000

In reply to MR. MACKENZIE,

MR. MASSON said this guard was a sergeant's guard taken from the regiment by rotation. It consisted of one sergeant, one corporal and six privates. The whole of the money might not be spent.

Vote agreed to.

XIV. PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—
CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

Public Buildings, Ottawa.

104 Eastern Block, Departmental Buildings, Construction of Fire and Burglar Proof Vaults..... \$80,000

In reply to MR. MACKENZIE,

MR. LANGEVIN said that this was for the Departments, and it was intended to secure the letter preservation of notes and other securities, the vaults at present not being safe.

Vote agreed to.

105 Western Block, Departmental Buildings, finishing rooms in basement for Dead Letter Branch, Post Office Department..... \$2,400

Telegraphs.

106 For Land and Cable Telegraph Lines for the Sea Coasts and Islands of the Lower River and Gulf of St. Lawrence, etc., etc \$200,000

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had promised to make some changes in the management of Telegraph lines belonging to the Dominion. A Mr. Gisborne, he understood, had been appointed Superintendent of Telegraphs, and he would like to know if the latter was an efficient telegraph operator and manager, and where were his headquarters; and also, whether or not it was time he was going to England to purchase a cable.

MR. LANGEVIN said Mr. Gisborne was a good telegraph operator and manager, and had made the telegraph system a study for many years. Mr. Gisborne

had been appointed Superintendent of Telegraph Lines, and his head-quarters were in Ottawa. He was not aware that any one would have to go to England in reference to a cable. That was the first he had heard in reference to purchasing the cable referred to. Before sending to purchase any cable, there would need to be a vote, and there would be no necessity in any case to send any one from this side of the Atlantic in order to make a purchase. It would be remembered that, last year, Parliament voted an annual sum of \$15,000 for a period of thirty years or more for a Telegraph system for the Maritime Provinces. Tenders were called for by the hon. the Minister of Railways for the laying of the cables, but the tenderers stated that the Government would have to work them afterwards. After full consideration of the matter, the Government thought that it would be a more economical plan to obtain a vote of a capital sum of \$200,000, in order to purchase the cable and lay it down, so that the cost would only be the interest on \$200,000; and as this interest would amount to only about \$9,000 or \$10,000 a year, this would make \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year less than the \$15,000 per annum granted by last year's vote, and this yearly surplus of \$5,000 or \$6,000 would be more than sufficient to work the lines. Of course the Act of last year, granting the annual sum, would not be repealed.

Vote agreed to.

XV. PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—
CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Public Buildings.

107 Ontario \$71,542 06

MR. HESSON said he believed the Government should promptly take advantage of the offer, by the town of Stratford, of a site for a post-office, worth \$7,000, with the view to the erection of such a building on it as early as might be convenient. If the work could not at present be entered upon, the foundations might be laid, or some step taken to secure the site, which the town might otherwise decide to retain, or devote to a different object. Stratford had every right to a new post-office.

MR. LANGEVIN said the proper course would be for the hon. gentleman

MR. LANGEVIN.

to submit the matter to the consideration of the Postmaster-General.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if there was proposed a vote to pay the balance on the Ottawa Post-office site.

MR. LANGEVIN said that the amount paid by the Government, in the first instance, for the lot on which the post-office was built, was the basis upon which it determined the amount to be paid for the twenty-five feet bought from the heirs, Egan.

Vote agreed to.

108 Quebec \$153,500

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. LANGEVIN: The item of \$5,000 for Durham Terrace extension is in addition to the \$15,000 already voted, and which sum was not sufficient to complete the work: The \$35,000 asked for securing the cliff under the Citadel, is for the purpose of preventing the cliff from falling down on the houses below and crushing them. Unless some precautions are taken, the giving away of the cliff will lead to the falling of the wall of the Citadel. It will be necessary to purchase some of the houses below. After the proposed repairs are completed, it is expected the work will last one hundred years.

MR. DESJARDINS asked if any money had been asked for for the purchase of lands with which to furnish labour for the convicts at St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.

MR. LANGEVIN said that the Government did not think it desirable to ask Parliament this year for an appropriation for this purpose.

Vote agreed to.

109 New Brunswick \$151,500

MR. ANGLIN enquired why it was considered necessary to purchase a site for the Woodstock Post-office and Custom-house, when it was not intended to proceed immediately with the building.

MR. LANGEVIN: We want to secure a site in order to go on with the building next year.

MR. MACKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman inform us why it is considered necessary to erect a building at this small town. I am satisfied that there are twenty or thirty towns of a much more important character, in point of revenue,

which should receive prior consideration.

MR. LANGEVIN: We desire here, as we have done elsewhere, to concentrate the Government business into one building. It is a great inconvenience to have these offices scattered through the town. By bringing them together the public convenience will be consulted, and the business will be so facilitated that it is thought a reduction in the number of officers would be rendered possible.

Vote agreed to.

110 Nova Scotia.....	\$5,500
111 Prince Edward Island.....	4,000
112 Manitoba.....	9,000
113 North-West Territories.....	15,000
114 British Columbia.....	22,000

MR. BUNSTER said he would like to draw attention to the claims of Nanaimo for a post-office and Custom-house. More revenue was derived from that city than from some others which had been favoured by the Government. He must urge upon the Government the duty of doing justice to Nanaimo, by erecting in it a post-office. The town was thriving and important, and the Premier, who had been honoured by election by a British Columbia constituency, should compel the Minister of Public Works to do it justice.

MR. LANGEVIN said all the improvements wanted could not be accomplished at once; this one, like others, would receive practical attention as early as the public finances permitted.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster), should be patient. There was a good time coming and he must wait a little longer for this post-office, which should be granted as soon as public circumstances warranted.

Vote agreed to.

115 Public Buildings generally.....	\$ 15,000
116 Rents, Repairs, etc.....	260,800

MR. LANGEVIN said it was not the intention of the Government to ask for an increase of this estimate for 1880-81, as it intended to close the workshop. His experience justified the belief that Government could get its work done for a great deal less than it cost by its workshop.

MR. MACKENZIE said that was his opinion also.

MR. LANGEVIN said he thought

they would be able to save 33 per cent. on the public works by the change.

Vote agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers.

117 Ontario.....	\$59,850
------------------	----------

In reply to Mr. BROWN,

MR. LANGEVIN said the \$2,000 asked for for the River Trent, was for the purpose of excavating rock, and constructing a coffer-dam. All these works belong to the Dominion Government. The Order in Council transferring them to the Ontario Government had been cancelled.

MR. BROWN asked that the importance of improving the port of Belleville would be taken into consideration, and that a sum might be provided in the Supplementary Estimates for that purpose.

MR. LANGEVIN said that a sum was voted for, and expended on the improvement of Belleville Harbour last year, and it had been deemed desirable to wait for another year, before making any further appropriation, for the purpose of ascertaining what new works were required. If any dredging were found necessary it might be found possible to take something out of the General Fund, and have one of the dredges sent on. The Government would carefully consider any representation, as to works that are absolutely necessary.

118 Quebec.....	\$45,500
119 New Brunswick.....	21,000
120 Nova Scotia.....	21,770
121 Prince Edward Island.....	9,900
122 General repairs and improvements, harbours and rivers, Maritime Provinces.....	10,000
123 General repairs and improvements, harbours and rivers, Manitoba.....	1,000

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): Is it the intention of the Government to spend anything for the improvement of the Assiniboine river which, last year, was navigated as far as Fort Ellice. Tenders should be given out for the improvement of that river, by the removal of boulders and other obstructions. A few thousands could not be better spent as regards developing the country, and bringing in emigrants.

MR. LANGEVIN: My attention has been called to those improvements, but I have not yet decided anything in regard to them. I cannot now say whether we will submit any vote for the purpose. It

will be considered in connection with the Supplementary Estimates.

In reply to MR. RYAN (Marquette),

MR. LANGEVIN: The grant of last year for this work has been all expended.

MR. SCHULTZ: It is intended, I believe, to improve the navigation of the mouth of the channel of the Red River, to the harbour. To make it useful, to any great extent, it will be necessary to cut a very narrow bar at the mouth of the stream. I hope, in view of its very great usefulness, and in the likelihood of a larger craft being put on the lake, the Government will put in the Estimates a small item for the purpose of dredging the bar at the mouth of that channel.

MR. LANGEVIN: I think \$5,000 would do the work, amply, or possibly less.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): I believe that a comparatively small sum spent on the improvement of the Saskatchewan would enable vessels to navigate it a large part of the season. At one place the removal of twenty or twenty-five boulders would greatly help navigation. Other improvements are required about the Grand Rapids. If obstructions from the Sturgeon Lake upwards were removed, a great impetus would be given navigation. The improvement of the Saskatchewan and Assiniboine would give you a great highway into the country, for a very considerable portion of the year.

Vote agreed to.

124 British Columbia.....	\$3,000
125 Dredging	114,000

In reply to Mr. KING,

MR. LANGEVIN said that the item of \$42,000 for dredges in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, was for works continued last summer in those Provinces, at the special request of the Lieut.-Governor of New Brunswick. This year the Government was not in a position to say how much work would be done the coming season. Several applications for the dredges had been made, but no decision came to yet.

Vote agreed to.

House adjourned at

Twenty-five minutes before

One o'clock.

MR. LANGEVIN.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 14th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAYS—PROTECTION TO BRAKEMEN.

QUESTION.

MR. HESSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, either in the construction of new freight cars, or in the alteration of those now in use, to carry out the valuable suggestions recently made by men of long experience in the running of railway trains, and so make better provision for and afford greater protection to the persons and lives of brakemen and other employes on railways under their management.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This matter is now engaging the serious attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways. He has a great many suggestions and applications which are under the consideration of the professional staff in his Department.

SANDFORD FLEMING.

QUESTION.

MR. CHARLTON enquired, Has it been determined by the Government to send Mr. Sandford Fleming to British Columbia; and, if so, for what purpose?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government have come to no determination in the matter.

MARINE AND FISHERIES—COST OF REPORT.

QUESTION.

MR. TASSÉ enquired, What was the expenditure incurred for the publication of the Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the years 1877 and 1878, respectively? What amount of saving, if any, has the Government effected in the publication of the Report for 1879?

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): This information is procurable at the office of the accountant of the House of Commons. Application for it has been made, but I have not yet received the return. I may, if asked for it, be able to give the information to-morrow. As to the account for the present year, it is not made up, but a very large saving has been effected,

the expenditure being much less than for the two preceding years.

MR. MACKENZIE: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state the number of pages in the Report for each year. There were not so many pages, perhaps, last year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: If there were not so many pages, we have turned over a new leaf.

NATURALISATION LAWS.

QUESTION.

MR. KRANZ enquired, Whether there has been any recent correspondence with Her Majesty's Government on the subject of the Naturalisation Laws?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There has been no recent correspondence on this subject; but it is the intention of the Government to renew correspondence with Her Majesty's Government on the subject.

ST. JOHN RIVER—BRIDGE ACROSS.

QUESTION.

MR. CONNELL enquired, What steps the Government have taken, or what steps they propose to take, to remedy the grievance complained of by the inhabitants of Carleton County, N.B., both last and this year, by several largely signed petitions, stating that a certain Railway Company, incorporated under an Act of the General Assembly of the Province of New Brunswick, has constructed a bridge across the River St. John, at the town of Woodstock, with a draw so placed as not to allow sufficient accommodation for steamers to pass up and down the river with safety in prosecuting their business, thus impeding the navigation of the said river, contrary to law.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not in order to put a long argument in a question. In this there are a number of assertions taken for granted.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No doubt this question involves an argument which no person ought to put in a question. The question ought to be strictly limited to the enquiry, whether the Government have taken, or propose taking any steps, under this petition that has been presented. With respect to this portion of the question, the Government are enquiring into the matter, and will, of course, as is their duty, endeavour to remove any obstructions to the navigation found to exist.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONS.

QUESTION.

MR. VANASSE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to revoke, this year, the Harbour Commissions of the Dominion, and to place the several harbours under the direction and care of the Department of Public Works.

MR. LANGEVIN: It is not the intention of the Government to do so.

TEA IMPORTS.

QUESTION.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT enquired, 1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to levy a differential duty on teas imported from the place of growth, when ordered under letters of credit, part by "overland," part by Suez Canal, and the balance, with dust of the whole, *via* United States, by sailing vessels round the Cape of Good Hope; 2. In the case of teas bought at the same time and imported by two or three routes, as above, and their arriving at different dates, will the Government consider such division as breaking bulk; 3. Will the whole purchase be held by the Customs until completed by the arrival of the dust; 4. In the event of part of the said teas being unsaleable in Canada, will importers be allowed to dispose of such teas at New York, without prejudice to rates of duty levied on balance.

MR. BOWELL: 1st. It is not the intention of the Government to levy any such duty. The question of route is not considered, other than that the teas shall be a direct importation from the countries of growth. 2nd. The Government does not recognise an importation of tea, as direct, when bulk has been broken in a foreign port; but in the case of a consignment of tea to Canada from the place of growth, the Government does not insist upon the whole consignment being brought to Canada in one vessel, or by any particular route, but the Customs dues require that all the teas or dust, referred to the original novice, be entered for duty. If part of such consignments only had arrived, the balance might be entered to arrive, or the tea which had arrived, might remain in sufferance warehouse until the whole consignment shall have been received. 3rd. The third question is covered by the answer to the second question. 4th.

After teas, whether of a direct or indirect importation into Canada, have had the duties required by law, paid thereon, the owner thereof is at liberty to dispose of the same in whatever market he pleases, without interference on the part of the Government. The teas may, however, be entered for warehouse, and afterwards entered ex-warehouse, for duty or export, at the option of the owner.

FORT FRANCES LOCK.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. PLUMB, in moving for copies of all correspondence, papers, vouchers, and reports, connected with the construction of Fort Frances Lock, said: In moving the Resolution which I am about to submit to the consideration of the House, I beg leave to remark that, when the hon. leader of the late Government propounded his Pacific Railway policy, he undertook to utilise the famous water stretches between Fort William and Selkirk, including the navigation of Rainy Lake and Rainy River, to which he proposed to gain access from Port Savanne, by means of several small lakes and seven or eight intervening portages, varying in length from a few rods to three or four miles. Over the portages we were to have tramways, and the scheme involved the construction of the far-famed Fort Frances Lock, at the foot of Rainy Lake, which was to be built by day labour, under the careful and economical supervision of a faithful ally of the hon. gentleman. The policy referred to was a fruitful theme of discussion during the political campaign which preceded the downfall of the late Government. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), in addressing, during that campaign, large audiences in Ontario, would expatiate eloquently on the subject of the advantages which would accrue to the country from the opening of that chain of navigation west of Fort William, by the construction of the Fort Frances Lock, which, he said, would, with other improvements, overcome the ascent and descent of the 400 feet between Port Savanne and Rainy Lake, and permit of the navigation of swift rivers of little depth, for the accommodation of the vast traffic of the North-West, while they were completing, for the purposes of feeding this valuable line, the two ends of the Railway from

MR. BOWELL.

Fort William to Selkirk, at a cost of \$10,000,000. The hon. gentleman stated that those two ends would be built for half the cost of the Intercolonial; that he had entered into the necessary contracts which would secure that economy that all Governments aimed at, but which it was reserved for the Reform Government, of which he was the head, alone to succeed in achieving. He assured us that more elaborate surveys had been made of the most difficult parts of the route of this portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, than of the Intercolonial, and that he would accomplish the great engineering feat of constructing it for \$24,500 a mile, and to furnish it with the means of accommodating through traffic, he proposed to construct the Fort Frances Lock. In the first place the scheme was on a very large scale, but there was no definite working plan adopted, and the hon. gentleman discovered very soon that there were serious obstructions in the way of it, and that while he intended to have seven feet depth on the mitre sills of his double lock, there were obstructions in the lake and river adjacent, which made him at length recede from his proposition, and he at last, as we understand, authorised a change to four feet depth of mitre sills. He made these remarks in his speech to the electors at Forest, at a great public demonstration, on the 29th of June, 1877:

“You have seen the accusation that I have been spending a great deal of money on the Fort Frances Locks. Those not acquainted with the geographical description of the country from Fort William to Selkirk will not understand my plan, as developed in my election speech at Sarnia, and my plan now in regard to the Pacific Railway was that it was impossible to carry out the bargain which the late Government had improvidently and improperly made with British Columbia—made apparently with no other object than to be in a position to let enormous contracts, and get enormous sums from the contractors, wherewith to corrupt the public of this country. (Hear, hear, and cheers.)”

One may wonder whether Sefton, Ward and Co., Purcell and Ryan, Oliver Davidson and Co., the excellent but brittle Mr. Glass, and others of that stamp, were among the hearers and cheerers of the last sentence. He goes on to say:

“One object was to keep that promise as far as it could be kept consistently with our means, but we had determined on no account to tax the bulk of this Dominion for the mere

benefit of 10,000 or 15,000 people on the Pacific coast."

The hon. gentleman did not then say anything about having accepted the Carnarvon terms without any proviso against increased taxation.

"At the same time we admitted that we were under moral obligations to the people of British Columbia to carry out, as far as possible, the promise that our predecessors had made. They were the trustees of the public as we were, and my idea was this: that we should begin at Fort William, at which point there is excellent water navigation during seven or eight months in the year, as soon as possible, without waiting for the completion of the surveys west; that from there we should build in as straight a line as possible to the crossing point of the Winnipeg River at Keewatin; that we should build as much of the west end as would bring us from Selkirk to the waters of the Lake of the Woods at Keewatin; and on the east end as much as would take us to Shebandowan Lake. We have found that we can build the road between Selkirk and Fort William, the distance supposed to be 432 miles but is not more than 408 by the surveyed line. We have contracts going on which will enable us to have the road from Selkirk to Winnipeg River, 110 miles by the end of next season; and we have contracts to English River 114 miles from Fort William westward."

It is very interesting to note here that the line from Selkirk to Keewatin, embraced in contracts 14 and 15, were to be finished at the end of 1878, and that nothing is hinted about having utterly failed to carry the line to Shebandowan Lake, which was well known to the hon. member long before. He then continues:

"At the distance of about 70 miles (from Fort William) we reach the waters of Lake Mille Lac. When we reach there two points west and east, we have only a few portages. I think six in all, the longest three miles, and others very short, which we can overcome by cheap tramways for some years, and then we get into Rainy Lake. From the east end of that lake to where the railway touches the Lake of the Woods, at Keewatin, we have well on to 200 miles of clear navigation, with one lock at Fort Frances. We therefore took a vote of Parliament, and proceeded to build one large, deep lock with a lift of 23 feet, to overcome the obstacles. We ask where is the charged impropriety? Did we give the contract improperly to any person. The whole wrong about it is, according to these gentlemen, that we did the work by days' labour instead of by contract. * * * It was a shocking thing for one to employ men by the day, and put the work in charge of a skillful engineer and fireman, to execute a work which, when completed, will give us a highway through our own territory, which we can use for a number of years until we

are able to build the 180 miles in the middle between the sections of railway under contract."

The hon. gentleman has often said he never intended to delay the construction of that central portion of the road for any great length of time; but in that speech he indicated very clearly that he intended, for some years, to utilise the water stretches by way of Fort Frances, as has already been shown by the extract from the speech that I have quoted, and has been proved time after time by his utterances here and elsewhere, but the hon. gentleman's memory is a most accommodating one. It was then the intention of the late Premier to make connection by way of several portages through Rainy Lake, Fort Frances Locks, Rainy River, and the Lake of the Woods, which would carry the traffic of the west from the point where the railway from Red River terminates, to the point connecting with the railway again at Port Savanne on Lake Mille Lac, or at Lake Shebandowan, as he still asserted in 1877, although that route had been abandoned and the contract cancelled in 1876. That contract was entered into for the railway construction from Fort William to Lake Shebandowan, forty-five miles, with Sefton, Ward and Company, on 5th April, 1875. At that moment the late Government had no knowledge whatever of the route, although the hon. member for Lambton gave us to understand there had been sufficient surveys, and that the agreement was based on specific quantities of work to be done. But the quantities, which it has been found were mere guesses, were made up in his Department in Ottawa, and had no relation whatever to this work. It was found, after much of the work had been done, that a practicable line could not be found to Lake Shebandowan. The Government then carried the route, for some reason I cannot understand, except to give an opportunity of settling with Sefton, Ward and Company, forty-two miles beyond the point of departure at Port Savanne, on Lac des Milles Lacs. The mistake made was precisely the same at the other end, where a contract for specified quantities was given for the work without the slightest knowledge of the route, and in fact, as we now know, before any engineer had ever been on the line. The Engineer (Mr. Carre) had examined but

ten miles of the eastern end, when he was called away to Winnipeg to make up quantities for the contract, and the remaining sixty-six miles had never been seen. The engineers actually went up with the contractors to find the line on which to base the construction. That was a specimen of the exhaustive and elaborate surveys and the improved economical plan of letting contracts by which the hon. member for Lambton used to boast he would proceed with his railway construction, and on which he attempted to delude the people of Ontario, at the last election, into giving his Government a renewal of their confidence, which they wisely declined. A worse state of things, though not involving so large an outlay, followed the next movement, showing the reckless blundering which characterised the whole of the construction of the works from Fort William to Red River. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) was one of the first to discover the mistake, to call it by no harsher name, which the late hon. Premier was committing in regard to the Fort Frances Lock, and the utter folly of attempting to carry traffic by their route. But, with his characteristic firmness, which might be called something else, he refused to listen to the information offered, and continued the work so long as he was in power, it being only stopped, and with it the useless drain on our impoverished resources it occasioned, when the present Government was formed. I never could obtain from the late Government the papers in regard to this, to the Kamistiquia terminus, and other similar matters. We have some information, through papers that I obtained by order of the Public Accounts Committee, in regard to the Locks, but it is confined to the last fiscal year. I find that the works have been a gold mine, almost as rich as Cariboo, to certain gentlemen, who have worked the vein with great assiduity. The work, as we have seen, was done by day labour. After it had been undoubtedly impressed on the mind of the late Premier that it was an utter failure, and he had discovered from the report of the Superintendent that the route could only be expected to have the capacity of five railway car loads a day, or about 1,560 bushels of wheat, and that from the 1st

September to the 25th October, the only period in which wheat was likely to move eastwards to market—that there could be at the utmost only about 80,000 bushels carried over it, or scarcely two vessel loads—that from the opening to the close of navigation its full capacity would amount to only 280,000 bushels, still there was an attempt made by the Superintendent to carry out, by the completion of the work, this enormous piece of blundering. Besides, the hon. gentleman in the Senate, who is at the head of the great organ that sustains the member for Lambton, then voted for the further prosecution of that work, and the leader of the late Government in the Upper House supported it also after it had been proven, beyond doubt, that it was an impracticable, foolish, futile scheme. I had the curiosity, lately, to look into the accounts and to ascertain if anything was discoverable there which would explain why there was such perversity on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in pushing forward this work by days' labour, or in fact in continuing it at all. I do not know that I have got the key to the whole matter. It may be well for the House to know, however, that there was a staff of employés there which was equal to the construction of a work involving millions. I will give an idea of the economical manner in which my hon. friend succeeded in obtaining a result which all preceding Governments, he said, had vainly endeavoured to secure, but which it was finally reserved for his Government to accomplish. Mr. J. R. Sutherland was book-keeper; he was brother of Mr. Hugh Sutherland, who was Superintendent. Mr. Hugh Sutherland drew, not long ago, five years pay as Superintendent of that work, amounting to the round sum of \$12,000. His brother was employed at a salary of \$1,000 a year. The captain of the steamer was employed at a salary of \$600 a year; a forwarding agent at \$780; an engineer at \$480; a foreman at \$1,200; a paymaster at \$1,000; a physician at \$800; a clerk at \$480; another clerk at \$600; several carpenters at \$480 each; a timekeeper at \$480; and several blacksmiths at from \$480 to \$600 each. The salaries of this overworked staff, whose entire disbursements averaged about

\$65,000 a year, were some \$13,000 a year, besides their board—altogether say about \$20,000 a year, or 30 per cent. of the whole outlay, and I may say here that the paymaster's office seems to have been at first wholly a sinecure, as must have been many of the others. It was a case where Jack did nothing and Tom helped Jack. I do not think they went so far as to employ a chaplain, but, I presume, the Superintendent might have read prayers.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Superintendent contented himself with preying upon the Government.

MR. PLUMB: I have glanced at some of the accounts, and I find that \$102.88 was paid for telegraphing from the month of December, 1877, to the month of March, 1878, and I commend the investigation of the items of this little bill to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) who has shown great acuteness in that direction. There were also in the employ of this model establishment fifty-five Indians, besides a great number of labourers and artisans of all kinds. The supplies for feeding this army, who were boarded at the Government boarding-house, were bought, not in Canada, but mainly from a shopkeeper living in Grand Rapids. Large sums were paid the Superintendent for travelling expenses; \$372.50 was paid him for board allowances, whatever that may mean. The disbursement on this flagrant folly, up to the last dates in the Public Accounts, were \$253,622.29. We have ascertained that the cost of the construction of the two ends of the road, with which it was to have been connected, will be about \$10,000,000. At 5 per cent., that would involve an annual charge upon the country of \$511,000 for interest alone. Assuming that they could utilise this Fort Frances detour at all—which is denied by Mr. Fleming—at its utmost capacity it would have been so entirely unprofitable that if the whole amount of wheat that passed over it had paid \$1 per bushel, it would have been cheaper for the Government to have bought the wheat and have burned it up and allowed the road to be idle, than to have been at the expense of working the route for the purpose of transporting it. This is the great work of which we

heard so much boasting in days gone by, before, as the hon. gentleman said, we understood geography. Everybody knows that the hon. member for Lambton does not like to hear the story of his achievements in connection with this work. We all remember that when he was in power, every allusion of an unfavourable character to any of his projects was met with a storm of indignation. It was the servile manner in which he was always sustained, by the unreasoning majority that stood at his back, that contributed to his irretrievable downfall. There is such a thing as being too powerful; and when my hon. friend found a mechanical majority behind him, ready to support any measure he brought forward, the hon. gentleman was carried away by the idea that his power would last for ever. I have no doubt he sincerely regrets now many things he did in the flush of his success, but his repentance comes too late. We, on this side, who were in the forlorn hope of 1874-78, have been treated, from time to time, with tirades of abuse from that hon. gentleman and his backers, here and elsewhere, because we ventured to question anything he did while in power. Not long ago that hon. gentleman rose in his place in the Committee of Public Accounts, when he was omnipotent there, and openly charged me with having made, behind the backs of my political opponents, charges which I dare not utter before their faces. He said, I was perambulating the country and slandering the hon. gentlemen who were then in power. I told him then, that it was not my habit to say anything in the absence of a political opponent that I would not say in his presence. I told him I was doing what I had a perfect right to do in criticising the political acts and political motives of those with whom I was in Opposition. My offence at that particular moment was, that I discovered an entry in some papers that I had asked for, which proved that a certain favourite of the hon. gentleman had been employed as a solicitor for the Government Valuers of the Fort William Town Plot, who was himself largely interested in the town lots to be valued. My hon. friend naturally was riled; his temper is not always saintly. But, Sir, from the time I entered public life until this day, I have never descended to make a personal attack upon

any man, although I have been sorely provoked by the hon. gentleman himself. I disdain to take that kind of advantage, although I believe I might be justified if I did take it, and that I might be able to reply to that hon. gentleman in quite as good terms as he has used towards me on numberless occasions. The hon. gentleman has called me a partisan. What is he? What are his supporters? Are they not, many of them, most violent and unscrupulous partisans? Have we forgotten the tyrannous use those gentlemen made of their power when they had it? Did they not taunt us with being in a beggarly minority, with being but a baker's dozen, shrinking and trembling behind the dishonoured member for Kingston? Those courteous and kindly terms were often used by the hon. member for West Durham himself, and we can fancy the licence that he gave to his less fastidious followers. We have not forgotten that, neither have we retaliated. We have used the greatest forbearance, in permitting hon. gentlemen in Opposition to go on from day to day, in discussing subjects which have been long ago exhausted. I would like to know, in the old days of 1875, how long an hon. gentleman sitting where they sit now, and are likely to sit for many years to come, would have been tolerated if he had conducted himself as hon. gentlemen in the Opposition now conduct themselves? How long would it have been before the Ross's and the Goudge's and the Chevals, and gentlemen of that intelligent kind, whose places now know them no more for ever, would have risen and howled down the offender? I believe the Conservative party disdain to take advantage of their strength. They are willing hon. gentlemen shall have their say, and they console themselves with the reflection that if they give them rope enough that thing will happen to them which usually occurs.

Motion agreed to.

TORONTO CUSTOM-HOUSE EMPLOYÉS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. LITTLE, in moving for an Order of the House, for a statement from the Customs Department, showing the class and salary of all parties engaged in the Customs, Toronto, the date of their respective appointments and prefer-

MR. PLUMB.

ments, if any, as well as the duty or duties each such official is called upon to perform, said: The object I have in asking for this return I will briefly state. Some time ago I was informed that certain irregularities existed in the Customs Department at Toronto. In the year 1873, a party was appointed as landing-waiter in Her Majesty's Customs at Toronto, and so well, so efficiently did he perform the duties of that office, that he was called upon to serve in the higher grade or position of searcher, as well; but, strange to say, though performing the duties of the position, his pay still remained the same, \$600 per annum, as when he first entered the service. But this is not all the injustice. Two or three parties who were appointed by the late Government to similar positions, have received, and still receive, \$100 or \$200 a year more, though not even performing the duties of the higher superior class, that the person I have reference to is still undertaking. A year ago I called the attention of the Minister of Customs to this strange anomaly. Since that time several letters have passed between us on this subject, but to no effect; and again, at the commencement of this Session, I ventured to remonstrate with the Minister of Customs at the injustice still remaining, and the hon. Minister told me that he was powerless to act in the matter. He acknowledged the case to be unjust, but said that the late Government was to blame, that it inaugurated the evil. Mr. Speaker, I felt humiliated at such a statement. That because the late Government committed an error was that any reason why the Minister of Customs of the present Government should not endeavour to remove it; it was a bad plea, a wretched argument. What was the present Government here for? Entrusted with the affairs of Canada, is it not to endeavour to do better than their predecessors, or otherwise. If the present Minister of Customs cannot endeavour to remove the complaint, it would be better for the ex-Minister of Customs to come back to his former old position, for who knows that if attention had been drawn to him to rectify the error that he would have removed it. And again, the hon. the Minister of Customs informed me that there were no funds at his disposal. Sir,

where there is a will there is always a way. Look at the high offices in his Department, so lucrative, that directly there is a vacancy, lawgivers, legislators, ex-M.P.'s and members of both Chambers are very anxious to obtain and fill the position. There is a general scramble for such. Why not apply the pruning knife to these fat offices and make some reduction; or if this cannot be done, at least the Minister of Customs could apply the pruning knife to his own office, and find means then to cause justice to be done. Sir, I have waited more than a year for action to be taken, but the hon. the Minister of Customs is still in dream-land; I am afraid he will never wake up. I do not like to be continually taunted with the incapacity and lack of ability of any one member of the Government. I, as an independent member, generally support it; and I must admit I see vitality and activity in all the Departments, saving in that under the supervision of the hon. the Minister of Customs. I ask for this return so that the public may judge for themselves, and I respectfully request that the Government, as a Government, will counsel their honourable yet erring colleague, to act more wisely, more ably and more justly in the future.

MR. BOWELL: My hon. friend has scarcely represented the facts as they exist. With reference to the statement that some officers receive larger salaries than others in similar positions is correct. The late Government made appointments of landing-waiters, lockers, etc., at salaries from \$100 to \$200 per annum more than others received, who had been there a number of years. In regard to the officer my hon. friend refers to, and my statement that I had no money with which to increase his salary, I said further: that if I increased his salary it would necessitate, also, the increasing of the salary of some twenty or thirty other officials, who had been in the employ of the Government a longer period than the gentleman in question, who have the larger salaries. I do not now see my way clear, and I told him so, to recommend to my colleagues or the House, considering the financial condition of the country, a general increase of salary which would have to be done, if the question were opened. If equality in salaries were desired, either a general rise in salaries

would have to be made, which at the present time could not be justified, or the salaries, or those who receive the larger salaries, would have to be reduced, which, after all, would perhaps be the best course to pursue. It is all very well to demand increases of salaries, and then cry out for retrenchment and economy. To meet the views and wishes of all those who have asked for an increase of salary would require some \$20,000 or \$30,000 added to the Customs Estimates, a request I do not believe the House would agree to.

MR. BURPEE (St. John): Referring to the complaints made by the hon. member opposite, regarding the discrimination as to salaries of officers in the Customs, Toronto, I may say that, a few years ago, the Customs Department at Toronto was thoroughly reorganized upon the Inspector's report, and it was thought that if there was any part in the Dominion where the salaries seemed to be equally distributed, it seemed to be Toronto. The hon. Minister of Customs states that favours were granted to certain officers. I do not remember any particular cases, but that may be so, because it has been so ever since Confederation, and these may be old appointments, etc.; but in Toronto, particularly, I maintain that the salaries were more equally arranged than in any other city. It is possible that some of the officers having combined duties, such as lockers and landing-waiters, may get a little more than lockers alone or landing-waiters alone. I know that great care was taken to assimilate the salaries as near as possible, and I believe such will be found to be the case.

MR. JONES: I think the case under consideration is one of peculiar hardship, and my hon. friend has presented the facts connected with it in a clear and concise manner; and I am of opinion that when new men are placed over the heads of other men, without reason, that these cases should be taken into consideration, and the old officers restored to the position to which they are entitled.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL CUSTOMS' HARDWARE
VALUATOR.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. COURSOL, in moving for an

Order of the House for copies of Correspondence between the Minister of Customs and the Collector of Customs at the Port of Montreal, in relation to the appointment of a successor to the late Mr. Bryson, valuator of hardware at that Port, said: My object in making this motion is this: The late Mr. Bryson was a most valuable officer, and one who had been appointed at the suggestion of the late Mr. Holton. Shortly after Mr. Bryson's demise, as a member of the city, I received a notification by letter to suggest the name of a successor. I enquired into the facts, and got them from Mr. Simpson, the Collector of the Port. I found that the deputy had been appointed eleven or twelve years ago, and had performed his duties without any complaint in writing against him. I recommended that if the officer or assistant was able to perform the duties of chief, he should be appointed. I submitted the name of the deputy, and, to my surprise, a few days after, I was informed that the deputy had been set aside, and another party appointed to be the valuator of hardware. I had to keep silent until now, when I could make my voice heard in this House. A few weeks ago, I placed a motion on the paper to enquire whether a successor had been appointed to Mr. Bryson, and whether the appointment, if made, was temporary or permanent. The answer that came from the Minister of Customs was that the appointment made was temporary, so as to give the appointee a trial before making his appointment permanent. Now, Sir, why was not the deputy so appointed, temporarily, so as to test his ability to perform the duties of the office? I think it only fair-play that he should be tried. Why should he be passed over? I should be sorry to recommend anyone not qualified or undeserving, but, if not unqualified, whether he be a French-Canadian, or of any other nationality, the next man in position to that made vacant, as in this case, by death, should be promoted to the position. On the instigation of men who were jealous, and those who had something to gain by it, influence has been brought to bear against the deputy in this case. Whether the new man has been since appointed permanently, I know not; but I think it very wrong that a good

officer, who has performed his duties efficiently for eleven or twelve years, should be set aside, and another put over his head, for there are no grounds of complaint. If there were any they should have been placed on record; they should not be merely put forward by mere verbal assertions of a few parties who may have been interested.

MR. BOWELL: Very little correspondence has taken place in connection with this appointment, between the Collector of Customs and the Department; and such portions as are proper to bring down shall be brought down. My hon. friend for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol), will excuse me for saying that he has scarcely told the House all he knows in connection with this appointment. It has been my desire, since I have had the honour of occupying the position of Minister of Customs, to make appointments to any vacancies by promotion. In all cases in the Montreal Customs Department, in which where it was possible this has been done. There has not been a vacancy in the Customs house at Montreal, during my term of office, to which I have not promoted some one in the Department. I may say here that in any appointment made since the present Government came into power, this course has been followed where practicable. In the present instance, I found it necessary to depart from this theory, and make enquiry as to the fitness of the assistant to fill the position of hardware appraiser, and I found that he was not fit to be the head of the hardware department in so important a port as that of Montreal. My hon. friend says, that I refused to appoint him temporarily, so as to test his qualifications. Now the hon. gentleman admits that the deputy has been in office eleven or twelve years; if after that the Collector reported to me that he was not fit to fill properly and efficiently the position of Chief Appraiser, though he might be competent to perform the duties of assistant under another, I am satisfied that the House and the country will admit that further trial was unnecessary, and will justify his not being promoted to the office for which he had been reported as not qualified. As my hon. predecessor—who has had more experience than I have—knows, one of the

greatest difficulties of a Minister of Customs has been in the appointment of appraisers. Many have been appointed who were not qualified, and who have allowed invoices to pass improperly, because of not having a knowledge of the goods, and who have allowed other invoices to pass which had upon their face an under valuation of the goods; all which has caused constant complaints from merchants who presented correct invoices. Before the late appraiser, Mr. Bryson, died, he called upon me to ask for superannuation, on account of ill-health. After agreeing to represent his claim to superannuation to my colleagues, I took the opportunity to question him regarding his assistant. I said: "Mr. Bryson, is your assistant qualified for the position you hold?" Mr. Simpson was present at the time. I added, "You know that in no case have I made an appointment in Montreal, except by promoting the next man in order, and I intend to carry out the same principle in this case, provided your assistant is fit for the position." Mr. Bryson then told me, distinctly and positively, that his assistant was not fit for the position of Chief Appraiser. Mr. Simpson, who, as I have said, was present, went further, and said that they had taken steps, years before, to obtain an assistant better qualified than the person then filling that position, by asking for the appointment of another assistant. Mr. Bryson had wanted an assistant long previously, of superior qualities, one on whom he could rely when he was obliged to be absent, as he was on many occasions, through ill-health. I wish the hon. gentleman and this House to understand that I have no other object than to secure the appointment of a well-qualified person as Chief Appraiser, one in whom the trade and the Government could have the most implicit confidence. I have no desire, and the Government have no desire, to say one word against the faithfulness, in the performance of the duties of the present appraiser or against his qualifications for the position he now holds; but as the House will see, from my explanation, he is not fit for the position of Chief Appraiser. If I had any evidence whatever of his being qualified, my hon.

friend would have had no cause to complain, or to bring this motion before the House. As I have before said, when an appraiser is to be appointed, he should be one of unqualified business habits. A clerk could learn the duties of his office in a short time, so could a locker; but in the case of an appraiser he should have long experience and special qualifications and knowledge of business to fill the position of Chief Appraiser. After this statement my hon. friend from Montreal East will not suppose, for a moment, that the Government had any other reasons for seeking another man other than the assistant, for this chief position as hardware appraiser than the desire to have an efficient officer. My hon. friend must see that three or four month's test of this assistant's qualifications would be of no use, after he had been in the position of assistant for eleven or twelve years, without giving any evidence of having the necessary qualifications. I am sorry my hon. friend has imputed to the Collector of Montreal, motives of an improper character. I have no knowledge of anything of the kind, and I do not think that if any of his officers were qualified for the position in question, he would object; nor do I see any reason why Mr. Bryson himself should make the same representations as the Collector had done against the assistant, if the latter were really qualified. I say, in justice to his memory, that he very unwillingly made the representation he did. He declined at first expressing an opinion, and not until I impressed upon him that it was his duty to inform me, he gave me the information very reluctantly. I was told that in important matters, when Mr. Bryson was ill, the assistant had to carry the invoices to his sick-bed for instructions. I trust I may never have any greater sin to answer for than my endeavour, on behalf of the Government, to strictly adhere to the principle of appointing no man to a position unless he is fully qualified to perform the duties of that position.

MR. COURSOL: Notwithstanding the explanation given by the hon. the Minister of Customs, his fiery and unreasoning language as Minister, I must persist in saying that I sincerely believe that a gross injustice has been done to the deputy-appraiser in Montreal. It is all very well now, after Mr. Bryson's death, to cite

words that he may have said before he died. Has the hon. gentleman any letter of Mr. Bryson's, or any writing whatever, of his charging the deputy with incapacity or with any dereliction of duty during his eleven years' service? If he did not perform his duties efficiently and properly, surely Mr. Bryson would have reported against him. As to his taking invoices to Mr. Bryson's bedside when the latter was sick, it is the duty of every deputy, however competent and well qualified, to ask and submit to the advice of his superior. This only proves him to have been a diligent and obedient and most efficient deputy. If the latter's duties were improperly performed, where are the proofs? or, are they only the result of conversations of parties? I know I have the assurance of a great many persons in Montreal that Mr. Fauteux performed his duties very efficiently. The Collector of Customs at Montreal is not a judge of what should be a valuator of hardware. He had it from *ipse dixit*. I defy the Minister of Customs to show that he has one single letter to prove that Mr. Fauteux is not qualified. If I speak and feel warmly in the matter it is because I know there has been an injustice done, and that it cannot be remedied now, except the right hon. the leader of the Government takes it up. Mr. Hilton, I understand, has not been permanently appointed, therefore, I hope something will be done by giving Mr. Fauteux a fair trial. It is not in a spirit of fanaticism that I move in this matter. I did not know, when this case was first brought under my notice, of an outsider having been temporarily appointed to the position. I do not wish to make any such matters a question of nationality; those officers should be appointed by their merits. Mr. Fauteux went to Mr. Simpson, who refused him in the most rude manner, and then Mr. Fauteux told him if he had not been a French-Canadian he would have been appointed. In so doing Mr. Fauteux may have acted in an imprudent manner; but he felt warmly on the subject, and the events have proved that he had struck the right note.

MR. BOWELL: I desire to say in reference to the insinuation of improper feeling on account of nationality, that

MR. COURSOL.

there are some seven or nine appraisers in the Montreal Customs-house, four French-Canadians, one Chief appraiser and three assistants. I repudiate, in the strongest possible language, that a feeling of nationality ever entered my mind in this matter. I know that in one of the town-hips I promoted a French-Canadian to a position which had been held by an Englishman; and I did it because he was next in order for promotion and was fit for the position. I have a petition, from nearly all the hardware merchants of all political creeds, recommending Mr. Hilton. He has not been appointed permanently, but if he continues as he has been doing, I shall recommend him for the position. I have generally been found fault with in Lower Canada, for having appointed French-Canadians in place of Englishmen; and now, because I refuse one who, by all the information put before me, is shown to be unfit for this particular position, I am blamed by the hon. gentleman who makes this motion. The hon. gentleman seems to insinuate that, because I have no letter from Mr. Bryson, I have taken advantage of the fact that that gentleman is dead, and cannot, therefore, be called as a witness to misrepresent what was said by him or to state what was not true in reference to his assistant. If he means to say that, I hurl it back with the contempt it deserves.

MR. COURSOL: I maintain all I have said so far as the Montreal Customs-house is concerned, and when the matter comes up, I shall charge the hon. gentleman with not doing his duty to French-Canadians in the matter of appointments at the port of Montreal.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read *th*: third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 16) To authorise and provide for the winding up of the Stadacona Bank.—(Mr. Vallee.)

Bill (No. 50) To amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 73) To amend an Act respecting the

Port Whitby Harbour Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the President, Directors and Company of the Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Burpee, St. John.)

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER LEGALISATION BILL.

[BILL 30]

(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

THIRD READING.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) :

It will not be out of interest at the present stage of the debate on this Bill, to review its history before this House and answer a few of the objections which have been made against it; and in doing so I intend to be as brief as the importance of the subject will permit. On the 16th February last I had the honour of introducing the following Bill :

"1. Marriage is permitted between a man and the sister of his deceased wife, or the widow of his deceased brother, provided there be no impediment by reason of affinity between them, according to the rules and customs of the church, congregation, priest, minister or officer celebrating such marriage.

"2. All such marriages thus contracted in the past are hereby declared valid, cases (if any) pending in Courts of Justice alone excepted."

It was objected that under this enactment, the members of the Church of England would be in a worse position than under the existing laws, which, at least in Ontario and the Maritime Provinces, declare marriage contracted between brothers and sisters-in-law only voidable during the lifetime of the parties. It was contended, and it must be confessed not without reason, that the marriage in question, being contrary to the Confession of Faith of that Church, would be absolutely prohibited under that Bill. At the request, therefore, of some Protestant members, and more particularly of those belonging to the Church of England, the Bill was withdrawn, with the intention of introducing in its stead another Bill where no reservation as to Church discipline or regulations would be made, except in favour of the Catholic Church, and the Bill which was introduced subsequently, to wit, on the 27th of February, read as follows :—

"1. Marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife, or the widow of his deceased brother, shall be legal and valid. Provided always, that if in any church or religious body, whose ministers are authorised to

celebrate marriages, any previous dispensation, by reason of such affinity between the parties, be required to give validity to such marriage, the said dispensation shall be first obtained according to the rules and customs of the said church or religious body. Provided also, that it shall not be compulsory for any officiating minister to celebrate such marriage.

"2. All such marriages heretofore contracted as aforesaid, are hereby declared valid, cases (if any) pending in Courts of Justice alone excepted."

During the debate, both the hon. members for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), expressed it to be their clear opinion that this Federal Parliament had no power to pass the proviso as to any dispensation to be obtained according to the rules of the Catholic Church. These learned jurists stated that the subject matter belongs to the solemnization of marriage, and consequently comes within the exclusive jurisdiction of Local Legislatures. It must be borne in mind that the Federal Parliament and Provincial Legislatures have not a concurrent jurisdiction over the subject of marriage, or in fact any other subject; the jurisdiction of the one is exclusive of the other, and what can be done by the one cannot be done by the other. The British North America Act of 1867, declares at section 91, par. 26, "That the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada shall extend to the following classes of subjects," that is to say: "Marriage and Divorce," and at section 92, par. 12, that the Provincial Legislature "may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects" following, and among others "the solemnization of marriage in the Province." Under these enactments of our Canadian Constitution, it is plain, it seems to me, that this Parliament has alone jurisdiction—of course I am speaking from a legal and not ecclesiastical point of view—over the whole subject of marriage, solemnization of marriage only being excepted, and that Local Legislatures have no jurisdiction whatever beyond anything not pertaining to the solemnization of marriage. This Parliament alone, therefore, can declare who shall or who shall not contract marriage in the eyes of the civil law, and for this reason there cannot be any doubt, and there is but one opinion in this House, that the Parliament of Canada and not the Provincial Legislatures can

enact that marriage shall or shall not be permitted between brothers and sisters-in-law; of course, I am always arguing from a legal point of view and in the eyes of the constitutional law of this country. I have already expressed the opinion that the "dispensation" clause of the Marriage Bill was constitutional, that it had reference, not to the celebration of marriage, but to a legal impediment which can be removed only by this Parliament. However, as I have already remarked, a contrary view was entertained and strongly expressed by the two learned jurists above named, and that view was shared by what we all consider the best authority on any constitutional question, the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir John A. Macdonald). Prominent members of this House, well-known for their devotion to the rights and interests of the Province of Quebec, both religious and civil, and among others the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and member for Three Rivers (Mr. Langevin), likewise raised the constitutionality of the "dispensation" proviso; and at their special instance and request, it was struck out in Committee of the Whole, and the Bill, as reported by that Committee, and, as it now stands, reads as follows:—

"1. Marriage between a man and a sister of his deceased wife, or the widow of his deceased brother shall be legal.

"2. All such marriages heretofore contracted, the parties whereof are living as husband and wife at the time of the passing of this Act, shall be held to have been lawfully contracted."

Now, what are the objections against the Bill? First, as far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, a single newspaper has written editorially against it. I refer to the *Journal des Trois Rivières*, a paper generally well-informed on ecclesiastical matters, but not, perhaps, so accurate on constitutional questions. In its issue of the 5th instant, it denounced the Bill, deprived as it is of its "dispensation" proviso, as simply "immoral." The Hon. T. J. J. Loranger, the pensioned but not retired Judge of Sorel, has also lately assailed the Marriage Bill, with all the learning, energy and great talent at his command, in several communications published in *La Minerve*. Finally, the high position of His Lordship Mgr. Lafleche, Bishop of Three Rivers, as one of the most dis-

tinguished dignitaries of the Catholic Church in Canada, and one of its ablest theologians, forces me to mention the fact that in a letter addressed to me, His Lordship formally withdraws his former adhesion to the Bill and protests against its passing, unless the "dispensation" clause be restored. Both His Lordship and ex-Judge Loranger fear that, under the Bill, Catholics will be allowed to marry their sisters-in-law without first obtaining the previous dispensation from the Pope. I would understand this objection if the Bill intended to do away with Church discipline and regulations. But there was no such intention, I am sure, on the part of the hon. members who demanded the striking out of the "dispensation" clause, and such is not and cannot be the effect of the Bill. In the first place, it is well-known that in the Province of Quebec, at least, Catholics must be married before their priest or curate, *leur propre curé*; this point is not susceptible of controversy, and it has been recognised by law writers and courts of justice. Of course the *Curé* will not proceed to celebrate the marriage without the required dispensation, and it must be borne in mind that in the Province of Quebec, at least, no priest or minister can be forced to celebrate a marriage against his conscience. Article 129 of the Civil Code, says:

"All priests, rectors, ministers and other officers authorised by law to keep registers of acts of civil status are competent to solemnise marriage.

"But none of the officers thus authorised can be compelled to solemnise a marriage to which any impediment exists according to the doctrines and belief of his religion, and the discipline of the Church to which he belongs."

But there is more. I respectfully submit that Article 125 of the Code being amended, as it will be, by this Bill, the "dispensation" power will be sufficiently recognised by Article 127; but even if it is not, it will indeed be easy to define it more expressly by an Act of the Quebec Legislature. Article 125 says:

"In the collateral line marriage is prohibited between brother and sister, legitimate or natural; and between those connected in the same degree by alliance, whether they are legitimate or natural."

After the passing of the Bill, it will read as follows:—

"125. In the collateral line, marriage is prohibited between brother and sister, legitimate or natural; but it is permitted between a man and the sister of his deceased wife, or the widow of his brother."

The following articles need only be quoted:—

"127. Marriage is also prohibited between uncle and niece, aunt and nephew.

"127. The other impediments recognised according to the different religious persuasions, as resulting from relationship or affinity, or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different Churches and religious communities. The right, likewise, of granting dispensations from such impediments appertains, as heretofore, to those who have hitherto enjoyed it."

Such was the opinion of His Lordship the Bishop of Three Rivers, himself, and of all the Catholic Bishops of the Province of Quebec, a fact which the following letters already published will show beyond doubt:—

(Translation.)

MONTREAL, 28th February, 1880.

MY LORD,—The discussion on the Bill to render legal marriages between brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law began last night, as your Lordship will have seen from to-day's newspapers. The point meeting with most opposition is the recognition by the State of the right to give dispensations in the case of the impediment resulting from affinity.

Would your Lordship be content to see Article 125 of the Code repealed in order to legalize such a marriage without further ado? Do you think that in that case the right of giving dispensations would be sufficiently protected by Article 127?

An answer addressed to me at Ottawa will oblige

Your obedient servant,
D. GIROUARD.

(Translation.)

BISHOPRIC OF THREE RIVERS,
5th March, 1880.

D. GIROUARD, Esq., M.P.

MY DEAR SIR,—I regret that your Bill for the legal recognition of marriages between brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law cannot pass as it was brought forward. Nevertheless, the repeal of that prohibition in Article 125 of the C. C. being favourable to the liberty of the Church, I have no objection to its simple repeal, leaving the dispensation of that impediment, as well of the other impediments, to the authorities designated in Article 127.

I remain, etc.,
†L. F., Bishop of Three Rivers.

(Translation.)

MONTREAL TELEGRAPH Co., March 2, 1880.
By telegraph from Rimouski to D. GIROUARD.

Letter received this morning. What you propose will suffice and satisfies me.

† BISHOP OF RIMOUSKI.

(Translation.)

SHERBROOKE, 1st March, 1880.

D. GIROUARD, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

SIR,—I think it is sufficient to repeal Article 125 of the Code in order to legalize the marriage now before Parliament. I am also of opinion that the right to grant dispensations is sufficiently safe-guarded by Article 127.

But would it not also be *apropos* to repeal at the same time Article 126, which prohibits marriage between uncle and niece, aunt and nephew?

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
†ANTOINE, Bishop of Sherbrooke.

(Translation.)

MONTREAL, 29th February, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR,—I certainly think that Article 127 sufficiently establishes the right to grant dispensations, and that your plan to legalize the marriages in question by amending Article 125, will be for the best.

I wish you every success.

Yours faithfully,
†EDOUARD CHS., Bishop of Montreal.

(Translation.)

ST. HYACINTHE, February 23, 1880.

D. GIROUARD, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

SIR,—I have the honour to inform you, in answer to your yesterday's letter, that I would be content to see disappear from our Code, not only Article 125, but also Article 126, which, in many cases, are very embarrassing for us Catholics. Bishops and priests oppose with all their might, as is imposed upon them by the Church, marriages contracted by such close relations, but there are circumstances when, for the welfare of the parties interested, and the honour of families as well as the safeguard of public morals, they are obliged to solemnise such marriages, after having obtained from the Pope all the dispensations required in a similar case. A real service would thus be done us, were those two Articles, which, in my opinion, should never have been introduced into it, eliminated therefrom.

Article 127 might be retained, but worded as follows:—"The impediments to the marriage being admitted according to, etc." The rules of the Catholic Church concerning our impediments to marriages and our right to grant dispensation thereof, are therein sufficiently recognised and safeguarded. I do not, therefore, see any reason for not maintaining that Article after making in it the slight change suggested by me. Wishing you success,

I remain most sincerely,
Your obedient servant,
†L. Z. Bp. of St. Hyacinthe.

(Translation.)

ARCHBISHOPRIC OF QUEBEC,
 QUEBEC, March 1, 1880.

D. GIROUARD, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

SIR,—Replying to your letter of 28th February: 1. It is most desirable that the Bill concerning the marriage of brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law should pass, such as amended by you, for it would be of service not only to the Province of Quebec, but to the whole of Canada as well. 2. By contenting yourself with repealing the second part of Art. 125 of the Civil Code of Lower Canada, you will no doubt provide in a satisfactory manner for the legalisation of these marriages in our Province, but not in the other Provinces, and each one of them will in turn ask for the passing of a law more or less contrary to the rules of the Catholic ecclesiastical discipline. With us, Article 127 maintains the impediment until removed by a dispensation, but will the same be the case in the other Provinces?

I have the honour to be, Sir,
 Your obedient servant,
 † E. A., Archbp. of Quebec.

(Translation.)

QUEBEC, April 1st, 1880.

C. RINFREIT, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

SIR,—In reply to your letter of yesterday, I profoundly regret that Mr. Girouard's Bill has no chance of passing with the clauses which I suggested to that gentleman and to Mr. Vallée in various letters which I have written them on this subject. However, in default of a better, I think there would be still less inconvenience in adopting the Bill, as amended in Committee of the Whole than to leave this delicate question in the state of uncertainty in which Articles 125 and 127 of our Civil Code of Lower Canada place it.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
 Your very obedient servant,
 (Signed,) E. A.,
 Archbishop of Quebec.

The Bill has also the support of the Roman Catholic clergy of the Province of Ontario, as the following correspondence, which has likewise appeared in the public press, will show:—

OTTAWA, 2nd March, 1880.

MY LORD,—Your Lordship has undoubtedly noticed by the reports of the debates on my Bill to legalise the marriage with a deceased wife's sister, that the opposition to the same is principally confined to that proviso which acknowledges the right of the Catholic Church to grant previous dispensation from the Pope. Without that proviso, the Bill has a fair chance of being carried. Several Catholic members of your Province desire to know whether they should vote or not for the legalisation of such marriages pure and simple, without insisting on any reservation as to Church discipline or regulations.

An answer will oblige,
 My Lord,
 Your obedient servant,
 D. GIROUARD.

MR. GIROUARD.

BRACEBRIDGE, Ont., 5th March, 1880.

D. GIROUARD, Esq., M.P.

DEAR SIR,—Although the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister is prohibited in the Catholic Church as a general rule, still we are sometimes under the necessity of applying to the Holy See for a dispensation for such marriages. So I consider that it will be a satisfaction to know that the State recognises the validity of such unions. I highly approve of the tenor of your Bill. I hope that it will pass such as it is. But if the first proviso cannot pass, try to have the second.

I have the honour to be,
 Your obedient servant,
 † JOHN FRANCIS JAMOT,
 Bishop of Sarepta.
 Vicar Apostolic of Northern Canada.

TORONTO, March 4, 1880.

D. GIROUARD, Esq., M. P., Ottawa:

DEAR SIR,—I think that a Catholic can vote for the Bill in question, inasmuch as the Catholic Church grants, for grave reasons, a dispensation to marry a deceased wife's sister, &c.

The inconvenience is very serious in the case when a dispensation is granted by the Church and not by the State. The State looks upon, as invalid, a marriage which the Church holds as valid, on account of the dispensation, and the State holds as illegitimate the children, and that they are disqualified to inherit the property of their parents.

Respecting the clause about the dispensation I think in a Parliament like yours, at Ottawa, the Catholic members might overlook that, as it is supposed that a Catholic will always obtain such a dispensation when necessary from his Bishop or from the Pope.

The proviso may be retained that no clergyman is to be compelled to officiate at a marriage against the rules of his Church. If a Catholic member has a scruple to vote for this Bill, he may abstain from voting.

I have the honour to be,
 Your devoted servant,
 † JOHN JOSEPH LYNCH,
 Archbishop of Toronto.

(Translation.)

OTTAWA, 16th March, 1880.

D. GIROUARD, Esq., M. P.

SIR,—As the Catholic Church permits, under special circumstances, for grave reasons, marriages between brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, your Bill, as amended by Committee of the whole House, to legalise these marriages meets my views, in the absence of something better.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
 Your humble servant,
 † J. THOMAS, Bishop of Ottawa.

Now, let us see what is the state of public opinion among the Protestants of this country. Is it against the Bill or in favour of it? Where are the petitioners

for the same, said some of the opponents of the Bill. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Jones), said the other evening, that the Bill "was brought forward in the interest of individuals, the endeavour being made to push it hurriedly through the House." Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to tell him that as far as I am personally concerned, I have no interest whatever in the Bill; I will even tell my hon. friend if this information will tend to remove his opposition or quiet his mind, that I have no sister-in-law to marry; I may confess that I cannot conceive how a man can have for his sister-in-law that love and affection which are necessary to make marriage happy. But, Sir, what we do not feel ourselves, others might, and as a matter of fact, do. Hundreds of these prohibited marriages have been contracted during the last fifteen or twenty years. If the necessary dispensation be obtained, the Catholic priest does not hesitate to perform the ceremony, and if among Protestants, no minister can be found willing to do the same, the parties cross the line, where they are always certain of finding relief. This Bill is brought solely in the interest of the people of this country, more as a beneficial measure in the future than a relief for the past, inasmuch as the marriage where one of the parties have died, are not to be affected by its provisions. I exceedingly regret that the hard case of the unfortunate lady, which I referred when I introduced the Bill, and deserved so much attention and sympathy from the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright), is not covered by the Bill as amended and reported by the Committee. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Jones), promised us some four or five weeks ago that if an opportunity was given, the Church of England would protest. That opportunity has been given and what have we seen? An agitation against the Bill? No, Sir, on the contrary, an agitation in favour of it. Hardly one newspaper can be cited against it, and it was, indeed, pleasing to see all the leading journals of the Dominion, both French and English, Catholic and Protestant, pronounce in most unequivocal terms in favour of the measure. I challenge the hon. members opposing it to quote one single editorial from any of the independent papers in favour of the

ungenerous course they are pursuing. However, this failure of sympathy was not for want of proper exertions and efforts. Lengthy and learned pamphlets and papers have been written by most eminent dignitaries of the Church, and, no doubt, the pamphlet of His Lordship Bishop Binney, of Nova Scotia, showing, in the strongest language possible, the "reasons for rejecting the proposed alterations in the marriage law of the Dominion," was calculated to produce a great effect. Sheets were also printed and circulated by the thousand, containing a very convincing report of the speeches delivered at a meeting, one would suppose, expressly called to influence the proceedings of this Parliament, and held in London, England, on the 26th of February last, to oppose "the Bill to legalise marriage (not with a deceased brother's wife, but only) with a deceased wife's sister." Petitions were also carefully prepared, printed, and distributed for signatures, by the various congregations spread all over the country. And what has been the result of this great canvassing? Petitions came, not from towns and cities, but from thirty-one small and obscure parishes of the Church of England, in Nova Scotia; one from St. Paul's Church, Chatham, New Brunswick; three from Prince Edward Island, that is from Milton, Summerside, and Crapaud. One came from some of the clergy and laymen of the Church of England, in Kingston, Ontario. We are still waiting for one from Gananoque, the important town where the hon. leader of the opposition to this Bill resides, and also from all the other towns and cities of Ontario and of the Dominion. None came from Quebec, or any other Province, except from the Church of England. It must be observed that these "parish" petitions are alike, in printed, or rather circular form; they do not emanate from the parishes or congregations as bodies, but only from a few individuals, in some cases five or six altogether in number, whose occupation, or position, is not given, who often cannot read nor write, and who, finally, are not always headed by their incumbent. To do, however, ample justice to these petitioners, it is, perhaps, better to lay the full text of their protest before the House:

To the Honourable the House of Commons of the
Dominion of Canada :

The petition of the undersigned members of
the Church of England, in the Parish (or
Mission) of

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

That your petitioners have been much
alarmed by the introduction into your Honour-
able House of a Bill to effect serious changes in
the Marriage Laws legalising the marriage of a
man with his deceased wife's sister, and of a
woman with her deceased husband's brother.
That your petitioners are persuaded that any
such interference with the table of prohibited
degrees will materially affect the welfare of the
community and the comfort and happiness of
many households in which persons connected
together by affinity have been accustomed to
regard each other in the same light as though
they were connected by the ties of consan-
guinity, and enjoy the same happy intercourse
as brothers and sisters without suspicion or
thought of evil.

Your petitioners believe that one of the mar-
riages to be legalised is expressly forbidden by
Holy Scripture, and that the prohibition of the
other is implied, and they cannot admit that
any authority, ecclesiastical or civil, is em-
powered to dispense with such such a pro-
hibition.

That your petitioners especially object to the
proviso of the Bill making a distinction between
marriages where the parties are members of one
religious body, and other cases, as introducing
an element of confusion and uncertainty, and
they hold that all such marriages ought either
to be legal or illegal in every case, without
reference to the peculiarities of any Branch of
the Church.

That on behalf of the children who may be
deprived of their mother, your petitioners pray
that the present position of the surviving sister
with relation to the widower may not be alter-
ed, as such alteration must necessarily deprive
the motherless children of the loving care of the
aunt at the time when it would be most espe-
cially beneficial, and under the present law is
commonly enjoyed.

Finally, your petitioners submit that before
any alteration is made in the Marriage Laws,
ample opportunity should be afforded for the
full consideration of a subject in which all per-
sons are more or less interested, and for the
presentation of their objections by those who
are opposed to any change; that no such
opportunity has been afforded with respect to
the Bill now before your Honourable House,
and that for this as well as the other reasons
herein set forth it should be rejected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us show to this
House how the Protestant clergy stands.
On the one side we find the Bishops of
the Church of England being almost
unanimously against the Bill. Their
joint petition is in these terms:—

That your petitioners have heard with sur-
prise and alarm that a Bill has been introduced
into your Honourable House to legalise marriage
with the sister of a deceased wife, and also to

legalise the marriage of a woman with the
brother of her deceased husband.

Your petitioners submit, that many serious
evils would arise from thus tampering with the
fundamental law of marriage, which has de-
clared that the two become by marriage one
flesh, and with the immemorial custom founded
upon this law, that the prohibited degrees of
affinity and consanguinity should be identical.

Your petitioners further submit that there is
no more fruitful source of corruption of morals
in a State than laxity on the subject of mar-
riage; and they have great reason to fear that
if the proposed Bill should pass into an Act,
other cases of unlawful union will speedily
arise, which it will be difficult, if not impos-
sible, to reject; and that general immorality will be
promoted. For these and other grave reasons
which your petitioners forbear to urge, your
petitioners earnestly pray your Honourable
House not to consent that the proposed Bill
should become law, and your petitioners will
ever pray, etc.

JOHN FREDERICTON, Metropolitan of Canada;
H. Nova Scotia, J. T. Ontario, J. W.
Quebec, T. B. Niagara, W. B. Montreal,
A. Toronto.

These Bishops have further sent in their
respective petitions, in which the same
grounds are set forth more fully. The
Bishop of Huron has also forwarded his
individual protest. But against these
representations, not from the whole
clergy or laity of the Church of England,
not from this important branch of Chris-
tianity as a body, but from the Episcopate
of that Church only a large number
of favourable testimonials came from all
shades of the Protestant faith. It must not
be forgotten that the Presbytery of Lon-
don, Ontario, was sitting at the time of
the introduction of the Bill, and had this
religious body been against its provisions,
it would, no doubt, have petitioned
against it. True, the Presbytery of Mon-
treal has just asked Parliament to
delay its proceedings until the next annual
meeting of the General Assembly of the
Presbyterian Church of Canada, in June
next, but from the wording of the petition
one would suppose that the cause of their
action seems to be that portion of the
Bill which legalises marriage with the
widow of a brother. On the other hand,
we do not know who formed this Presby-
tery of Montreal; who were present at
the meeting where this petition was
decided upon; when the meeting was
held; and finally, we are not even told
that the petition was duly authorised.
We also find that the Ministerial Protes-
tant Association of Montreal, open to all
Protestant ministers, at a meeting where

several Presbyterian ministers were present, unanimsly pronounced in favour of the Bill. The Methodist clergy of Toronto have made a similar declaration. One of its first advocates was the Rev. Gavin Lang, minister of St. Andrew's Church (Church of Scotland), Montreal. His letter to the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault), as well as other similar letters from other Protestant clergymen, will, no doubt, be read with interest. Only yesterday a petition was presented to this Parliament, signed by all or nearly all the Protestant ministers of Montreal belonging to the Church of England, thirty-two in number, praying that the Bill do pass and become law. These favourable testimonials should be preserved, and I hope I will be excused for inserting them here for future reference :

The Rev. Gavin Lang (Church of Scotland) writes :

MONTREAL, February 27th, 1880.

DEAR MR. GAULT,—I thank you very much for sending me a copy of Mr. Girouard's Bill for legalising marriages with a deceased wife's sister, etc. For one, I heartily approve of its principle, and hope it will pass and become law.

It occurred to me that I would mention to you that, to the astonishment of most people, the United Presbyterian Body of Dissenters in Scotland declared, last year, that they could no longer regard such marriages as Mr. Girouard's Bill contemplated as un-Christian. Their ministers are permitted to solemnise these, and to admit the parties to them to the privileges of their communion. The importance and significance of this action on the part of a severely Evangelical body cannot be exaggerated.

The attitude of your own Church and of mine, both national Churches and the only State Churches of the Empire, must necessarily be determined by the position taken up by the law makers. When Parliament sanctions marriages with deceased wives' sisters, so must we. I speak for the Church of Scotland, to which I belong, when I say that we are quite ripe for the ready performance of these marriages. In my first parish in Scotland, I had a couple who took that step in (ecclesiastically viewed) an irregular way "furth of the kingdom" and came back to live in the parish. I had no hesitation in regarding them as parishioners of mine in good standing.

The Church of Rome, of course, takes up a different position in this matter, but Mr. Girouard fully provides against any infringement of its rules and rights; and it is entitled to hold and assert its own opinions and views.

I would be very glad if you offered our

mutual friend, Mr. Girouard, my warm and sincere wishes for the success of his measure. Its adoption and enactment by the Parliament of Canada will give wider and greater relief than any of us imagine, and would not in any wise conflict with the teachings of the Word of God as interpreted by either Roman Catholics or Protestants.

With repeated thanks for your courtesy in sending me a copy of this important Bill, and with kind regards, as also deep sympathy with you in your recent heavy affliction,

Believe me,

Yours very sincerely,

GAVIN LANG.

M. H. GAULT, Esq., M. P.

The Rev. J. Cordner, D.D., of the Unitarian Church, writes :—

MONTREAL, February 2nd, 1880.

M. H. GAULT, Esq., M. P.

DEAR SIR,—I thank you for copy of Bill to "legalise marriage with, etc." In my judgment it would be in the interest of good morals and sound public policy to pass such a measure. I would omit the two provisos, however, as likely to lead to complications. But rather than have the measure fail I would accept them.

Very truly yours,

J. CORDNER.

The Montreal Ministerial Association endorse the Bill, in the following letter :—

MONTREAL, 922 Dorchester street, }
March 22nd, 1880. }

DEAR SIR,—There is a society in this city called the "Montreal Ministerial Association," open to all the Protestant Ministers of Montreal, to which, moreover, a large number of them testify good will by attending its meetings. The Association met this morning, and discussed the subject of the lawfulness of marriage with a sister of a deceased wife. After an interesting conversation, it was resolved that those present could see no Scriptural inhibition against such marriages, and further, that the approved of the Bill now before Parliament for rendering them legal. This view was taken quite unanimously, as to those present at our meeting this morning, and the subject had been duly announced beforehand. Had the meeting been larger than it was, I have no doubt a result substantially similar would have followed, although in that case there might have been one or two dissentients.

Among those present at the meeting and fully concurring in the view I have given, were the following clergymen :—Rev. Gavin Lang, St. Andrew's Church (Church of Scotland); Rev. J. S. Black, Erskine Church (Presbyterian); Rev. J. H. Wells, American Presbyterian Church; Rev. J. Roy, Wesley Church (Congregational); Rev. J. Nichols, St. Mark's (Presbyterian), and myself.

I am permitted and authorised to communicate this result to you.

One would think from the opposition raised

to the proposal, that it was one to compel marriage with a former wife's sister. It is wonderful that people should be unwilling to leave a question on which the highest exegetical and ecclesiastical authorities are so divided, to the judgment and conscience of individuals who may be interested, and to the laws of the several Churches.

I am, dear Sir,

Very truly yours,

J. FREDERICK STEVENSON,

Emmanuel Church (Congregational).

M. H. GAULT, Esq., M.P.

The Rev. James Roy (Wesleyan), writes :

1464 ST. CATHERINE STREET,

MONTREAL, April 2nd, 1880.

M. H. GAULT, Esq., M.P.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have to thank you for a copy of the *Ottawa Citizen*, of Wednesday last, and for the printed letters enclosed.

The testimony of Dr. de Sala is very valuable. I hope you will be successful in removing from Canada all such obstacles to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, as those aimed at by Mr. Girouard's Bill.

I am, my dear Sir,

Yours truly,

JAMES ROY.

The following is the Petition of the Methodist Ministers of Toronto :

To the Honourable the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada :

The petition of the undersigned clergymen of the Methodist Church of Canada, resident in the city of Toronto, humbly sheweth :—That, whereas a Bill for the purpose of legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister, has been presented for the consideration and legislative sanction of both Houses of the Dominion Parliament; your petitioners are satisfied of the wisdom and expediency of such a measure, and the invalidity of the objections which are urged against it, and therefore respectfully request your honourable House to enact the principle of the Bill in a Statute, so as to give the formal authority and protection of the law to the marriage of a widower with the sister of his deceased wife.

In presenting this request to your honourable House, your petitioners may be permitted briefly to state some of the reasons by which they have been compelled to take a position so different from that which has been taken by petitioners belonging to some other Christian denominations in respect to the said Bill.

There are no ties of blood or relationship, which would make such marriages immoral or improper. There are numerous cases where they are eminently expedient, and, beyond doubt, promote the best interests of all the parties concerned.

Hitherto, there has been no law upon our Canadian Statute-book against such marriages; although we are aware they are regarded as

illegal in Britain. Under these circumstances, believing that they were acting in a legal and proper manner, some of our worthiest and most respected Canadian citizens have formed such marriages. It would be a cruel and ill-advised thing for our highest legislative courts to take any course that would appear to place these excellent persons in a position of inferiority and outlawry. There is no good reason why such marriages should not have the formal sanction of law. No interest of social order, property, or morality would be injuriously affected by the enactment of such a law; while, in many cases, the legal denial of this privilege would be a very great hardship to innocent and worthy persons, whose interests should not be disregarded by those to whom the making of our laws is committed.

Apart from ecclesiastical law, which creates an artificial morality that has no general Christian obligation, the only feasible ground of objection to the proposed measure is obtained by a strained and unwarrantable interpretation of a passage in the 18th chapter of the Book of Leviticus; which says nothing about marrying, or not marrying, a deceased wife's sister.

The passage in dispute seems simply to forbid the taking of a wife's sister, as an additional wife, during the lifetime of the first wife. The fact that the Mosaic law made it the duty of a man, in certain cases, to marry his deceased brother's wife, is wholly inconsistent with the interpretation which some have put upon this passage. So is the fact that such marriages were customary among the Jews; which is unaccountable, if they understood this passage to forbid what they practised. Mr. Hirschfelder, the learned Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature, in University College, Toronto, has shown in his pamphlet, "A Wife to her Sister, that both the Septuagint version and the Chaldee paraphrase render the passage in Leviticus in such a manner as to leave no doubt that such marriages were allowed; also, that there is no evidence that, while Hebrew was a living language, this text was understood to prohibit such marriages; and that the Mishna and the writings of the learned Philo show that no such meaning, as modern writers attach to this passage, was formerly given to it by Hebrew scholars.

It seems to your petitioners somewhat singular, therefore, to see the representatives of Christian Churches, on the strength of such a forced interpretation of what is admittedly not a plain prohibition, attempting to prevent the enactment of a law that commends itself to reason; which has repeatedly received the sanction of the House of Commons of England, and which would now be the law of the Mother Country, only for the opposition of the House of Lords, mainly caused by the powerful ecclesiastical influence in that body. The idea of building a prohibition for whole communities on so doubtful a foundation is a remarkable illustration of the tenacity with which people cling to the side of a question that has the prestige of ecclesiastical authority and prejudice in its favour.

In view of the considerations herein named, and other weighty reasons, your petitioners

earnestly request your honourable House to accede to the prayer of this memorial, and enact a measure that shall duly legalise a marriage contracted between a widower and his deceased wife's sister.

E. HARTLEY DEWART, D.D., Editor *Christian Guardian*.

JOHN POTTS, Metropolitan Church.

GEORGE COCHRANE, Chairman of the Toronto District.

S. D. HUNTER, Pastor of Elm street Church.

WM. BRIGGS, Book Steward, Methodist Book Room.

J. POVELL, Pastor Richmond street Church.

S. ROSE, D.D.

W. S. BLACKSLOCK, pastor of Beethley street Church.

THOS. W. CAMPBELL B.D.

A. SUTHERLAND, D.D., General Secretary Methodist Missionary Society.

W. J. HUNTER, D.D., Pastor Bloor street Methodist Church.

W. H. WITHROW, Sunday School Editor, M. C. of Canada.

JOHN B. BLACKSON, M.A., Pastor Sherb. St. Church.

J. E. SANDERSON, M.A., Pastor of Wood. Church.

The following is the petition of the Protestant Ministers of Montreal:—

Unto the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, in Parliament assembled:

The petition of the undersigned Protestant Ministers, of different denominations, in the city of Montreal, humbly sheweth,

1st. That a Bill has been introduced into your Honourable House, whose object is to legalise marriage with a deceased wife's sister, etc.

2nd. That it is expedient that the proposed Bill should become law, it being understood that all ministers of religion who have conscientious objections to such marriages, have full liberty to decline to perform them.

Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray your Honourable House to pass the said Bill.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

HENRY WILKES, D.D., LL.D., Principal Cong. College of B.N.A.

GEO. DOUGLASS, LL.D., Principal of W. M. College.

J. CORDNER, LL.D., Pastor Em. Metropolitan Church.

A. DE SOLA, LL.D., Minister of Synagogue, Chenneville street.

J. S. BLACK, Erskine Church, Can. Presbyterian.

HUGH JOHNSTON.

A. H. MUNRO, Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Montreal.

D. V. LUCAS.

GEORGE CORNISH, LL.D., Cong. Minister.

WILLIAM HALL, M.A.

E. BOTTERELL.

J. W. SPARLING, M.A., B.D.

A. J. BRAY, Zion Cong. Church.

H. F. BLAND.

J. F. STEPHENSON, LL.B., Emmanuel Cong. Church.

JOHN NICHOLS.

J. L. FORSTER, Calvary Cong. Church.

B. B. USHER, D.D., Rector of St. Bartholomew Reformed Episcopal Church.

GEORGE H. WELLS, A.M., Presbyterian Church.

JAMES ROY, Wesley Church, Congregational.

WM. J. SHAW, Professor Wesleyan Theo. College

WM. S. BARNES, Church of the Messiah.

SAMUEL MASSEY, Salem Church.

EDWARD WILSON, D.D., St. Bartholomew Reformed Episcopal Church.

GAVIN LANG, St. Andrew's Church, Church of Scotland.

LOUIS N. BEAUDRY, Pastor of First French Methodist Church.

REV. H. ROSENVURG, Minister of St. Constant street Synagogue.

DR. H. SUMNER, Lutheran Minister of the Perm. Evangelical Protestant Church in Montreal.

K. M. FENWICK, Professor Cong. College. Montreal.

H. L. MACFADYEN, B.A., Inspector of the street Church.

JAMES ALLEN, Pastor of Sherbrooke street Methodist Church.

EDWARD A. WARD, Pastor of Point St. Charles Methodist Church, Montreal.

Montreal, April 10th, 1880.

Mr. T. M. Hirschfelder, Professor of Hebrew in the University of Toronto, writes the following letter to the *Globe*—

To the Editor of the Globe:

SIR,—I perceived in yesterday's *Globe* a letter from the Rev. Provost Whitaker on the subject of "Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister," in which the rev. gentleman moralises on the consequences that may result from the abrogation of that law, it being presumably based on the Mosaic marriage-law recorded in Lev. xviii., 18.

Now, Mr. Editor, it appears to me that it would have been more in accordance with sound criticism to have first proved that such a law actually has a place among the Mosaic marriage laws. Of course, the Legislature of any country has a perfect right to establish any law that may be conducive to morality, but it is quite another matter to maintain that such a law is founded upon the Divine teaching of the Scriptures.

In my treatise on this subject, I carefully traced this question from the very first institution of marriage, Gen. ii., 24, and afterwards fully examined the passage in Lev. xviii., 18, on which the law in question is supposed to be founded, and have, I think, shown beyond a shadow of doubt that it is utterly impossible to construe that passage as prohibiting such a marriage. There are many who feel very deeply on this subject, and I think that they have a right to look to those who profess to be well informed on the subject to prove distinctly to them that they have transgressed, even if unknowingly, such an important law.

Would Mr. Provost Whitaker, therefore, kindly answer the following questions:—

1. How are the words, "to cause jealousy

(or enmity) * * beside her," (the above is a literal translation) to be understood? What do these words mean if the first sister is in her grave?

2. What do the words "in her lifetime" mean, and why are they in the text at all if they do not intend to imply that such a marriage was only prohibited during the life of the first wife?

3. Why should the sacred writer have couched a command which was necessary to be understood by the ignorant as well as by the learned, in such ambiguous language if he intended positively to forbid "the marriage with a deceased wife's sister"? Experience has proved that 99 out of 100 critics interpreted the passage that such a marriage is only forbidden during the life of the first wife.

4. Why did the sacred writer not express it in the same simple manner as he expressed the law forbidding the marriage with a deceased brother's wife? There is no mistaking that language. See Lev. xviii, 16.

5. How is it that not the least trace of any such law can be discovered among the ancient Jews, but that, on the contrary, special provisions are made in respect to such laws in the Mishna, which contains the oral laws of the Jews, and which are by most Jews regarded of equal importance as the Mosaic laws? I will here subjoin, for the benefit of your readers, two of the many provisions laid down in the Mishna. The following is a literal translation, made by myself from the work in the University library:—"If a man whose wife is gone to a country beyond the sea, is informed that his wife is dead, and he marries her sister, and after that his wife comes back, she may return to him. . . . After the death of the first wife he may, however, marry again the second wife." And again:—"If, on being told of the death of his wife, he had married her sister, but being afterwards informed that she had been alive at the time (he had married the sister), but is dead now, then any child born before the death of the first wife is illegitimate, but not those born after her death." (See Babylonian Talmud Treatise Zebamoth, Tam. v., p. 94, Amsterdam Ed.)

In this treatise, which chiefly treats on questions of marriage, there are found even passages where such marriages are encouraged, as for example, cap. iv., sec. 13, p. 49.

As this subject is now attracting a great deal of attention both here and in England, you will oblige me by inserting the above remarks in your widely circulated journal.

I am, Sir,

Yours truly,

J. M. HIRSCHFELDER.

Toronto, April 10, 1880.

But what must be astonishing to those Christians who advocated that the Bill in question is against the Old Testament will be found in the fact that the Jews believe in it and act in accordance with its principles. This is established in a most remarkable letter addressed by the learned Rabbi of the Jews of Montreal, Rev. Mr.

de Sola, and also Professor of Hebrew in McGill University. He writes:

"MONTREAL, March 19, 1880.

DEAR MR. GIROUARD,

I reply to your favour of yesterday, I have much pleasure in stating that your Bill, intended to legalise marriage with the sister of a deceased wife, or the widow of a deceased brother, has my most decided approval. As regards Jewish authoritative opinion, this, unquestionably, has always been in favour of such marriages, because the Synagogue (the *ecclesia docens* of Judaism) from the time of Moses to our own day, has always regarded them as in accordance with the will of God, and as instituted in the law which he commanded Moses, his servant. The propriety of such marriages has, therefore, never been questioned by Jewish teachers, ancient or modern. The marriage with the widow of a deceased brother *was childless*, has always been authoritatively declared obligatory, except when exemption acquired by the means indicated in the Levitical Law, and more fully explained in the Talmud Treatise "Yebamoth." I shall, therefore, add nothing in respect to this kind of marriage. As regards marriage with a deceased wife's sister, this has always been permitted by the Jewish Church and practised by the Jewish people. The passage in Leviticus xviii., 18 sometimes appealed to as prohibiting such marriages, according to received Jewish interpretation, and also in accordance with strict grammatical analysis, should read thus: "And a wife to her sister shalt thou not take to vex her, by uncovering her nakedness beside her, during her life time." Putting aside Jewish interpretation for the nounce, and bearing in mind that polygamy, although not originating in, or recommended by, the law of Moses, was yet tolerated by it, we may legitimately infer that the words "during her life time" are used simply to limit the period during which such a marriage might not take place, and at the same time, to indicate when it might; to wit, after the wife's death. In this sense has the passage been rendered in the Chaldaic Targumim (translations or paraphrases of the biblical text), in that of Onkelos, written before the commencement of the Christian era, and in that of Jonathan, for which even a greater antiquity is claimed. The Talmud, as old as the Gospel and which contains not merely the orally received laws and precepts regarded as obligatory by the Hebrew people, but also their system of jurisprudence and traditional, or historical, exposition of the Hebrew Scriptures, while prohibiting (Treatise Yebamoth iv. 13) the marriage with a wife's sister, even "though he may have divorced his wife," most explicitly states, at the same time, that there is no prohibition of such a marriage, no objection thereto, after the death of his wife, but that it may then be celebrated. Throughout all the writings of the later Casuists, the same doctrine is taught, and, as a consequence, marriage with a deceased wife's sister has ever been, and is yet, practised by the Jewish people everywhere.

The Hebrew commentators all unite in giving

MR. GIROUARD.

glosses in accordance with the teachings of the Synagogue. They point out to us that the expression "during her life time" limits the prohibition of such a marriage to the wife's life time only, but does not extend beyond it. They also point out to us (*inter alia* Rashi) that the term "Litsror" (to vex her) is a word, the primary acceptation of which is to trouble, to annoy, and, in a secondary sense, means to create or produce trouble or vexation through jealousy—so in the kindred dialects also,—and they add that the limitation to these marriages was instituted because it is neither natural nor proper that sisters, who ought to love each other, should be placed in a position where jealousy or enmity would probably be excited. And, in this connection, I may note that the Mishna (the text of the Talmud), applies a word derived from the very same root, to the polygamist's additional wives, which it styles "tsaroth," or troubles. As a *résumé* of the Hebrew exposition of this text, I will quote from the eloquent and philosophical Don Isaac Abarbanel. He aptly remarks: "The reason assigned for the prohibition is the 'vexation' which the first wife would suffer, but there can be no such vexation in the case of her death, and, therefore, is the marriage with the sister then allowed. It is not allowed, however, if he divorce his wife, because, as she still lived, her vexation would be the same. From the use of the expression, 'during her life time,' we see that all the other prohibited kinds of intercourse are of a permanent and unconditional character, but not the marriage with a wife's sister, respecting which, according to the analogy of the language employed in the other prohibited unions, the expression here should be: 'The nakedness of the sister of thy wife shalt thou not uncover,' which is not used, but in exceptional form employed. But the truth is that the design of the text is merely to prohibit the 'vexing' or afflicting his wife by exhibiting a preference for her sister, and hence again is marriage allowed after the wife's decease."

With this quotation, I think enough has been now written to show what are the views and practice of the Jewish Church in respect to the marriages you desire to legalise in Canada. My best wishes are for the success of your Bill, which I regard as calculated to subserve the cause of civil and religious liberty, which underlies it, and of morality, which it is calculated to promote. When a similar measure of relief, for many worthy and pious persons under the ban of illegal union, was brought forward by Mr. Stuart Wortley, in the Imperial Parliament, during the year 1850, the measure was denounced by an opponent as "scandalous, immoral, and mischievous." But I believe that you will find but few inclined to go thus far in opposing your Bill, especially in view of the fact that many dignitaries of the Christian Church, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, have pronounced in its favor.

You are fully at liberty to publish this, as you request.

Very truly yours,
ABRAHAM DE SOLA.

D GIROUARD, Esq., M.P.

I believe that, under the circumstances, I can affirm with certainty that the prohibition to marry the sister of a deceased wife, or the widow of a brother, is not against the Scriptures, as the majority of Christians understand them. There is no doubt, moreover, that the Law of Moses is not always a safe guide for Christians. Polygamy, or plurality of wives, was admitted, or at least tolerated, among the Jews. We are assured that Solomon was allowed seven hundred legitimate wives.

MR. BOULTBEE: And he was called Solomon the Wise.

MR. GIROUARD: Mormonism can be defended upon the Leviticus, as well as the prohibition to marry a deceased wife's sister and even better. No one, not even the gallant member for Leeds (Mr. Jones), would dream of introducing Mormonism into our Christian community, because it is to be found in the Old Testament. Finally, it cannot be contended that the restriction in question, which the opponents of the Bill desire to perpetuate and make permanent, is not based upon reason, morality or natural law; there is no blood relationship or consanguinity between the parties. And if the Bill were to make these marriages obligatory as it was sometimes the case under the laws of Moses, one would account for the opposition of the Church of England. But hereafter no more than in the past, do we intend to interfere with the liberty civil or religious of the subject, and the members of the Church of England, whose conscience and faith would forbid those unions, will not in the least be prevented from abstaining from the same. It has been observed that the Bill in its present form introduces into this country civil marriage. It has no such effect, I always understood that the character of the marriage law always depends from the character of the celebrating officer, and so long as this officer shall be the priest or minister of the parties, there cannot exist any reasonable fear that that the marriage shall be civil and not religious. This was the reason which induced the fathers of our Federal constitution to place the solemnization of marriage under the exclusive control of Provincial Legislatures. This great concession was made to quiet the mind of the Catholic population of the Province of Quebec, who,

as a consequence have not much to fear from the marriage laws of the Dominion Parliament, the law of divorce excepted; but it is to be hoped that this Parliament will never follow the example of the British Parliament which, to use the language of an eminent Protestant legal writer (Dr. Redfield) "has degraded the solemnisation of that sacred relation to the level of a mere civil contract, allowing its solemnisation before the civil magistrate, and practically abandoning the former claim of its indissolubility." Now, one word with regard to the social objections raised by the opponents of the Bill. It is said that it will upset happy social relations and would destroy the relations between brothers and sisters-in-law, the free, truthful and pure feelings with which a man regards the sister of his wife. This objection exists to-day under the prohibitory laws, for these marriages are almost daily contracted; public feeling is decidedly in their favour and they are socially recognised. Why then maintain a restriction which has only the effect of branding the issue of such marriages with the mark of illegitimacy before the law of the land. One of the leading journals of London, England, (the *Telegraph*, 7th May, 1879) answers the objection in this spirited manner:—"A man's feelings in such matters are wholly unaffected by Statutes, for as yet no human legislature has ever discovered how to modify or control the domestic affections by Acts of Parliament. The Bishop of London's reasoning seems to rest on the assumption, which is really as insulting as it is gratuitous, that but for the law which prohibits a man marrying his deceased wife's sister, everybody would try to taint with impurity this now spotless relationship. The way of dealing with such a question is to treat it in the spirit of those whose solvent for all social and political difficulties is liberty." Lastly, Mr. Speaker, and I conclude with this point, an effort was made to bring the great influence of the fair sex against the Bill. But what a failure! One or two women only from the isolated sea coast of Cape Breton, acting, no doubt, under the pressure and restraint of unmerciful husbands, appended their names to the petitions already alluded to. On the other side what have we seen? A lady under the *non de*

guerre "Gunhilda" in the columns of the leading journal of Ottawa (the *Citizen*), rushing into the *melée* and displaying such an amount of learning and ingenuity that she forced her antagonist, the valiant Bishop of Ontario, to withdraw from the contest. The brilliant success is not surprising; we all know that the ladies have a style of putting their arguments, which is simply irresistible. The following language of the Countess of Charlemont is a fair sample of it:—"There is one argument," and Lady Charlemont considers it a strong one, in favour of such marriages, which is, "that now the foolish opponents thereof say that a woman would never feel safe in admitting her sister to her house as a resident, if after the wife's death, a marriage between the widower and the sister were possible. This is sheer folly," continues this noble lady, "Why such a degrading idea would prevent a woman of having a cousin, often as dear as a sister, or a friend to stay with her. Now, if a kind girl goes to nurse and comfort her dead sister's children, for whom she must have a natural affection, old gossips shake their heads and malign her, though as the law stands (not, we hope, for long) she is in her brother's house. Who would cherish the motherless things like her? A stranger? Well, the kind aunt would be thrust aside for some giddy girl, who would have no love for them, perhaps, even a feeling of repulsion."

Mr. JONES: I must congratulate the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), on the very able legal manner in which he has brought this matter before the House. We all know the ability and the energy of that hon. gentleman when he takes anything in hand. I think ever since the 16th of February, when he first brought this matter before the House, he has been sleeping over it and thinking over it, and he has made up a brief, which might be placed before any Court in this Dominion. It is a regular legal brief. But I do not look at this matter from either a legal or civil point of view. I take a different ground. It is contrary to the law of God; it will cause disturbance, trouble, and jealousies in many a household, when otherwise all would be peace and quiet. The hon. gentleman has said that numerous petitions have been presented in

favour of this Bill. Now, how have these petitions been got up? Have they not been written for? Have they not been sought for? Has not the hon. gentleman written to almost every clergyman in his Church; written to every Bishop, to get up these petitions in favour of his Bill? Were there any petitions presented to this House before the 16th of February, in its favour? The hon. gentleman has stated that he had no interest whatever in it. Who are his friends, then, in whose behalf he has brought up this Bill? He must have many friends, many sympathisers, in different parts of the country, for whom he has taken all this trouble, and yet he coolly tells the House that he has done it from purely sympathetic and philanthropic motives, and that it is for the general welfare of the world. The hon. gentleman says that only the Church of England opposes it. As regards the Church of England, were that the only body which oppose it, is a very large and influential body in this country. And when we see all the Bishops of the Church of England in this Dominion, with the exception of those in Manitoba and British Columbia, who had not sufficient time to send petitions, have petitioned against the Bill, I think it is only reasonable that the delay that is asked for should be accorded. The hon. gentleman says the Presbyterian body are in favour of it. But on the 3rd of March last, a large meeting of Presbyterians was held in England, opposed to a Bill of this kind. We have also seen ministers of the Presbyterian Church in Montreal holding a meeting opposed to this Bill; and when we see other bodies in the country opposed to the Bill, I think it only right that some delay should be granted, and not rush the Bill; through the House in this manner. I think the Conservatives in this House, and on the Treasury Benches, should grant the delay asked for. I am very sorry to see that there is a disposition in this House to pass this Bill. We were taken by surprise in regard to it, and by some hon. members the Bill has been regarded with great levity. I protest against the measure as a member of the Church of England, because I think the Synods, which will meet during the summer, should have an opportunity of

considering it. There is no difference of opinion amongst the Bishops of the Church of England on the subject. I beg to move:

“That the Bill be read a third time this day six months.”

MR. GAULT: I have seen no reason to change my view in regard to this measure, and I see no reason whatever why this Bill should not become law.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria): The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Jones) has ventured to speak on behalf of the Church of England, as being opposed to this Bill. As a member of the Church of England, I deny that that Church, as a body, is opposed to this Bill. It is true that those bishops who have thought fit to petition this House on the subject, are opposed to the Bill, but there are some English bishops who have voted in favour of this measure on one or two occasions. The basis of the objections to this measure is only to be found in the Prayer-book, and I do not coincide with the party who considers that the Prayer book is superior in point of sanctity and obligation to the Bible. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Leeds speak of the measure as having been regarded as a huge joke. I do not think that we can consider a Bill of this importance as a joke, in view of the past history of the question in England. There is only an unsupported assertion that the law of God is against the Bill, and there is no social reason against it, and, therefore, I venture to think that the third reading of this Bill ought to be carried.

MR. CHARLTON: I think there is a good deal of force in the observation made by my hon. friend from Leeds, that there was no agitation in favour of this Bill. It is certainly a very radical change, and if we pass the Bill this Session, I am of opinion that we will be guilty of precipitancy. It is a matter of great importance, and one in regard to which we should ascertain more fully the feeling of the religious bodies in the country. Therefore, I hope the further consideration of the measure will be deferred until another Session.

MR. PLUMB: I was pained to hear the manner in which the hon. member for Victoria spoke of the Prayer-book, which is not at all under discussion here. I do

not think this is the place to bring up questions of that kind, and it does not seem to me to be the proper way of advocating the passage of this Bill. I avow myself in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Leeds.

MR. WELDON: As one of the few who are opposed to this Bill, I am not willing to give a silent vote. I understood my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, on the second reading of the Bill, to state that this was a similar measure to the one introduced into the House of Commons, England, with the exception of the provisos which he added. I have, however, been unable to find in that Bill any provision legalizing marriage with a deceased husband's brother, and Sir Thomas Chambers, who was the introducer of the Bill in the House of Commons, never introduced such a proposition in his Bill. We look for light in legislation, to the Mother Country, where we find the question agitated in that country, that petitions were presented, that an association was formed and cases of hardship brought forward. But in this instance here, not one instance of hardship, not a single petition, not even the slightest agitation, until the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), brought his Bill forward. I regret that he has brought it forward. As to the religious phase of the matter, that is a question which men should settle by their own consciences. The unanimous voice of Christendom has been against such marriages. We know that, until 1550, no dispensation by the Popes was granted. I will read an extract from a speech of Lord O'Hagan on the subject, delivered by him in the House of Lords. He says:

"This principle has unquestionably been maintained at all times since the earliest days of Christianity. It was proclaimed in the Apostolic Constitution before the Nicene Council. It became a part of that great system of jurisprudence which was generated when the Christian civilisation rose on the ruins of the effete and corrupt Imperialism of Rome, basing the hope of the world on the strictness and continency of the family relations, and raising up woman from her low estate to soften and purify the rude society round her. The Theodosian code condemned the practice which we are asked to approve, and declared marriage with a deceased wife's sister to be unlawful, and thenceforth, for many a century, down even to our time, the doctrine of that code has been held intact by

famous theologians and solemn councils. It was the doctrine of Basil and Ambrose and Augustine. It was the doctrine equally of the East and West. It was affirmed by ecclesiastical assemblages in the various countries of Christendom, as they were successively comprehended within the fold of the Church, and it commanded the assent of all them. The dispensing power claimed by the Popes was at first resisted and denied, on the ground that the prohibition was absolute and mandatory by the law of God. The Greek Church, whatever may have been its decadence and shortcomings, is a venerable witness to the discipline of Christian antiquity, and we find that the unlawfulness of such a marriage was asserted equally by the Lutherans and Calvinists in Scotland, Geneva and in France."

That is the opinion of an Irish Lord who stood very high in legal circles and who was a Roman Catholic.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Question question.

MR. CASEY: I rise to order. This is something, Sir, that I am sure you will not allow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WELDON: The cause which relies upon disturbance and uproar to put down opposition must be a poor cause indeed. I think it is well for us, in such a great social and religious question as this, that we should consider the opinion of the religious bodies, and particularly the expression of opinion expressed by the Church of England. That Church should be listened to, and other religious bodies have requested that the matter should stand over, and I do not not see why such an important matter, both in its religious and social aspect, should not stand over another Session to give time for fuller discussion and deliberation, and ascertain fully the public opinion. I shall feel it my duty to support the amendment of the hon. member for Leeds.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand): The petition that I had the honour to present was forwarded by the Bishop of Nova Scotia, and was, so far as I know, voluntary on his part. There have been other petitions besides this indicating that more time should be given; there have been no petitions from the people asking for this Bill, and I think it premature to pass it. Other denominations wish to obtain time in order to present their views fully to this House, because it will involve a great change. The Presbytery of Toronto passed a resolution, resolving:

MR. PLUMB.

"That the Moderator, Dr. Reid, Principal Caven, Dr. Gregg (convener), and Prof. McLaren, be appointed a Committee to prepare petitions to the Governor-General and both Houses of Parliament, deprecating their giving assent to the Bill now before Parliament, which proposes to give legal sanction to marriage between a man and his deceased wife's sister or his deceased brother's wife. The petition to be submitted for approval at next meeting of Presbytery."

And they ask for delay, and I think it right to give them time to fully present their views to this House. I would ask the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill, to be content with it, and withdraw further proceedings upon it, so that the House may be able to pass upon it another year.

MR. HOUDE: I understand that a certain portion of the public would prefer to see this Bill undergo a slight change in its wording, so as to make it read that laws prohibiting such marriage are repealed, instead of saying that these marriages will be legal. Some hon. members will, perhaps, remark that there is not much difference between the two expressions; but persons whose opinion deserves deference, even eminent jurists, pretend that, so far the Province of Quebec is concerned, especially, there exists a difference worthy of notice. My object is to leave no doubt as to the possibility of applying the 127th clause of the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec to marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife or the widow of his deceased brother, as it applies, for instance, to marriage between a man and his cousin. By the amendment I am going to move, if it were adopted, the 125th clause would read as if marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife, or the widow of his deceased brother, had never existed any more than between a man and his cousin; whilst this Bill says that such marriage shall be legal. Therefore, I move in amendment to the amendment, seconded by Mr. Hurteau, that all the words "that" in the main motion be struck out and replaced by the following:

"The report of the Committee be not now concurred in, but that the Bill be referred again to the Committee of the Whole, with instruction to replace the first and the second clauses by the following:

1. All laws prohibiting marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife or the widow of his deceased brother, are hereby repealed.

2. This Act shall also apply, as if laws hereby repealed had never existed, to marriages hereafter contracted, the parties whereof are living as husband and wife at the time of the passing of this Act.

MR. MACKENZIE: What laws will be repealed? There are no such laws.

MR. HOUDE: In the Provinces other than that of Quebec, there is the Common Law of England.

MR. MACKENZIE: We have no power to deal with the Laws of England.

MR. HOUDE: I say the common law of England, which has become law in the Provinces of this Dominion, except that of Quebec. In the Province of Quebec there exists a statutory law positively prohibiting such marriages. In the other Provinces they are only voidable, but in ours they are absolutely void. It is these laws I propose to repeal. Where there is no such law, well, nothing will have to be repealed.

MR. CASEY: I do not intend to go into the question of the sentiments of His Lordship of Three Rivers, but I wish to call attention to the form of this resolution. I am in doubt whether the House can possibly entertain this motion. It is one in words to repeal the laws which make such marriages as these illegal. There are no laws in Canada which make them illegal, and I do not think we can undertake to repeal any laws except the laws of Canada. We cannot repeal any ecclesiastical law which makes these marriages illegal, neither can we repeal the Common Law of England in respect to such marriages.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I wish to say a few words on this question before a vote is taken, so that if I am called to vote upon it next Session I may not be considered inconsistent. This is a very important question, but I do not think the country will suffer by its being delayed twelve months, in order that it may be more carefully considered than at present. If this Bill is not carried, and comes up next Session, I will feel bound to sustain the principles of the Bill.

Motion made:

That the Bill, as amended in Committee of the Whole, be now taken into consideration.—
(*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.*)

Motion in amendment made:

That the said Bill, as amended in Committee of the Whole, be not now considered, but that

it be considered this day six months.—(Mr. Jones.)

Motion in amendment to the proposed amendment *made* and question *proposed*:

That all the words after "that" in the said motion be expunged, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"The Report be not now concurred in, but that the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole with an instruction that they have power to insert, instead of Clauses 1 and 2, the following:

"1. All laws prohibiting marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife, or the widow of his deceased brother, are hereby repealed. 2. This Act shall also apply, as if the laws hereby repealed had not existed, to such marriages heretofore contracted, the parties whereof are living as husband and wife at the time of the passing of this Act."

The House *divided*. Yeas, 10; nays, 130.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin	Hurteau
Bourbeau	Langevin
Cimon	Méthot
Desaulniers	Montplaisir
Houde	Vanasse.—10

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	LaRue
Allison	Longley
Angers	McDonald (Pictou)
Arnell	Macdonell (N. Lanark)
Baby	Macdougall
Beauchesne	Mackenzie
Béchar	Macmillan
Benoit	McCallum
Bergeron	McCuaig
Bill	McGreevy
Blake	McInnes
Bolduc	McIsaac
Bourassa	McKay
Bowell	McLennan
Brooks	McLeod
Brown	McQuade
Bunster	McRory
Burnham	Malouin
Burpee (Sunbury)	Massue
Cameron (South Huron)	Merner
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Mousseau
Carling	Muttart
Caron	O'Connor
Cartwright	Ogden
Casey	Oliver
Charlton	Olivier
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Orton
Colby	Ouimet
Coughlin	Patterson (South Brant)
Coupal	Patterson (Essex)
Coursol	Perrault
Currier	Pinsonneault
Daoust	Plumb
DeCosmos	Pope (Compton)
Desjardins	Poupore
Doull	Rinfret
Dugas	Robertson (Shelburne)

Dumont	Rochester
Elliott	Rogers
Farrow	Ross (Dundas)
Ferguson	Ross (West Middlesex)
Fiset	Rouleau
Fitzsimmons	Routhier
Fleming	Royal
Fortin	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Geoffrion	Rykert
Gillies	Schultz
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Scrifer
Grandbois	Shaw
Gunn	Smith (Selkirk)
Hackett	Stephenson
Haggart	Strange
Hay	Tellier
Hesson	Thompson (Cariboo)
Hilliard	Thompson (Haldimand)
Hooper	Tilley
Huntington	Vallée
Ives	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Jackson	Weldon
Jones	White (Cardwell)
Killam	White (East Hastings)
King	White (North Renfrew)
Kirkpatrick	Williams
Kranz	Wright
Landry	Yeo.—130

Motion *resolved* in the negative.

Question *proposed* on the amendment—(Mr. Jones):

The House *divided*:—Yeas, 34; nays, 108.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bourbeau	McLeod
Bowell	McQuade
Brooks	Montplaisir
Charlton	O'Connor
Coughlin	Olivier
Desaulniers	tterson (Essex)
Doull	umb
Farrow	Pope (Compton)
Fleming	Rou.eau
Geoffrion	Schultz
Houde	Stephenson
Jones	Thompson (Haldimand)
Kirkpatrick	Tilley
Langevin	Vanasse
McCuaig	Weldon
McIsaac	White (North Renfrew)
McKay	Williams.—34.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott	Jackson
Allison	Killam
Angers	King
Anglin	Kranz
Arnell	Landry
Baby	LaRue
Beauchesne	Longley
Béchar	McDonald (Pictou)
Benoit	Macdonell (N. Lanark)
Bergeron	Macdougall
Bill	Mackenzie
Blake	Macmillan
Bolduc	McCallum
Bourassa	McGreevy
Brown	McInnes

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

Bunster	McLennan
Burnham	McRory
Burpee (Sunbury)	Malouin
Cameron (South Huron)	Massue
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Merner
Carling	Méthot
Caron	Mousseau
Cartwright	Muttart
Casey	Ogden
Cimon	Oliver
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Orton
Colby	Ouimet
Costigan	Paterson (South Brant)
Coupal	Perrault
Coursol	Pinsoaneault
Currier	Poupore
Daoust	Rinfret
DeCosmos	Robertson (Shelburne)
Desjardins	Rochester
Dugas	Rogers
Dumont	Ross (Dundas)
Elliott	Ross (West Middlesex)
Fiset	Routhier
Fitzsimmons	Royal
Fortin	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Gigault	Rykert
Gillies	Scriver
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Shaw
Grandbois	Skinner
Gunn	Smith (Selkirk)
Hackett	Strange
Haggart	Tellier
Hay	Thompson (Cariboo)
Hesson	Vallée
Hilliard	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Hooper	White (Cardwell)
Huntington	White (East Hastings)
Hurteau	Wright
Ives	Yeo.—108.

Motion resolved in the negative.

Bill, as amended, concurred in, on a division.

Motion made :

That the said Bill be now read the third time.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

Motion in amendment made, and question proposed :

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole with an instruction that they have power, to expunge Clause 1 permitting marriage with the deceased brother's widow.

The House divided :—Yeas, 40 ; nays, 102.

YEAS :
Messieurs

Blake	McLeod
Boultbee	McQuade
Bourbeau	Montplaisir
Brooks	O'Connor
Cartwright	Ogden
Charlton	Oliver
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Patterson (Essex)
Coughlin	Plumb

Desaulniers	Pope (Compton)
Farrow	Rouleau
Fleming	Schultz
Gillies	Smith (Selkirk)
Gunn	Stephenson
Houde	Thompson (Haldimand)
Huntington	Tilley
Jones	Vanasse
Kirkpatrick	Welton
Langevin	White (North Renfrew)
McCaig	Williams
McKay	Yeo.—40.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Abbott	Killam
Allison	King
Angers	Kranz
Anglin	Landry
Arkell	Lane
Baby	LaRue
Beauchesne	Longley
Bécharé	McDonald (Pictou)
Benoit	Ma'donell (N. Lanark)
Bergeron	Macdougall
Bill	Mackenzie
Bolduc	Macmillan
Bourassa	McCallum
Bowell	McGreevy
Brown	McInnes
Bunster	McLennan
Burnham	McRory
Burpee (Sunbury)	Malouin
Cameron (South Huron)	Massue
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Merner
Carling	Méthot
Caron	Mousseau
Casey	Muttart
Cimon	Oliver
Colby	Orton
Costigan	Ouimet
Coupal	Paterson (South Brant)
Coursol	Perrault
Currier	Pinsonneault
Daoust	Poupore
Desjardins	Rinfret
Doull	Robertson (Shelburne)
Dugas	Rochester
Dumont	Rogers
Elliott	Ross (Dundas)
Fiset	Ross (West Middlesex)
Fitzsimmons	Routhier
Fortin	Royal
Fulton	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Gigault	Rykert
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Scriver
Grandbois	Shaw
Hackett	Skinner
Haggart	Strange
Hay	Tellier
Hesson	Thompson (Cariboo)
Hilliard	Vallée
Hooper	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Hurteau	White (Cardwell)
Ives	White (E. Hastings)
Jackson	Wright.—102.

Motion resolved in the negative.

Bill read the third time and passed, on a division.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS
ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 37.]

(Mr. McCarthy.)

THIRD READING.

Bill again considered in Committee of the Whole, amended, reported, agreed to, read the third time and passed.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following Motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Order of the House—Detailed statement of the expenditure of the sum of \$4,500, granted for the relief of the Indians of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Gillmor.)

Order of the House—Copies of all reports made by the Commissioner for the trial of Disputed Land Claims in Manitoba, upon Claims Numbers 223 to 252, which were referred to said Commissioner by the Department of the Interior, and by him advertised for trial on the 12th day of January last past; together with an account of all moneys paid to said Commissioner for his services and expenses from date of first appointment to the 1st day of January, 1880.—(Mr. Ryan, Marquette.)

Order of the House—Statement showing the quantity and the price of various materials bought in order to complete the wharf at Matane; what has become of these materials; whether they have been used for any other purpose than for the construction of the wharf, or whether they have been sold; if they have been sold, the price received for the timber per foot, and the price for the iron per pound; and also, copies of all correspondence, returns, etc., respecting these materials.—(Mr. Fiset.)

Order of the House—Copies of the petition and of all correspondence since 1874 in relation to the necessity of providing for the requirements of navigation, by placing a floating light on the Great Shoal of St. Thomas, in the county of Montmagny.—(Mr. Landry.)

Order of the House—Copies of all correspondence in relation to the leasing of the arable land belonging to the Government, at Grosse Isle, in the county of Montmagny; and of the report of the survey of the said property, made or to have been made in the course of the past summer, in fulfilment of the promise given by the Government during the Session of 1879.—(Mr. Landry.)

Order of the House—Copies of all correspondence in reference to the closing of the Carnegie Post Office, in June last.—(Mr. Gillies.)

Order of the House—Copy of the petition of the inhabitants of the parish of St. Charles de Caplan, county of Bonaventure, praying that the Post-office of that locality may be kept in the vicinity of the Church; of the petition of the Mayor and Councillors of the said parish, praying that the said Post-office may remain where it is now; of the report of the Post Office Inspector on the said two petitions.—(Mr. Beauchesne.)

Order of the House—Copies of reports of surveys made at Saint Francis Harbour, Guys-

borough, N. S., previous to 1879.—(Mr. Ogden.)

Order of the House—Copies of reports of surveys made at New Harbour, Guysborough, N. S., previous to 1879.—(Mr. Ogden.)

Order of the House—Copies of reports of surveys made at River Sainte Mary's, in Guysborough County, N. S., in 1879.—(Mr. Ogden.)

Order of the House—Copies of reports of surveys made at Indian Harbour, Guysborough County, N. S., in 1879.—(Mr. Ogden.)

Order of the House—Copies of reports of surveys made at Brennan's Cove, Guysborough County, N. S., in 1879.—(Mr. Ogden.)

Order of the House—Return of all correspondence between Major C. Wilson, of the 33rd Battalion, and the Militia, or any other Department, in reference to a return of certain duties paid upon rifles imported for the use of the Rifle Association of the 33rd Battalion.—(Sir Richard J. Cartwright.)

Order of the House—Copies of all petitions and correspondence respecting the shooting of cattle at Prince Albert, North-West Territories, by Indians acting under the direction of a sergeant of the Mounted Police.—(Mr. Drew.)

Order of the House—Copies of all applications for patents in the Settlement Belt, part of the parish of Saint Peter, in Manitoba; all evidence taken in reference to the title of the late Chief Pemin to lands in said parish, together with all reports of Surveyors and Indian Agents, in reference to the St. Peter Reserve.—(Mr. Ryan, Marquette.)

Order of the House—List of persons in the Province of Manitoba who have been paid for lands expropriated for the Canadian Pacific Railway and its Pembina Branch, with the sums paid; together with a list of all persons who have had their land expropriated, but who have not been paid, and copies of all communications from such persons.—(Mr. Ryan, Marquette.)

Order of the House—Copies of advertisements for tenders for Mounted Police and Indian supplies, for delivery during the coming summer, together with all tenders made in response to said advertisements.—(Mr. Ryan, Marquette.)

Order of the House—Statements showing the sums of money given to the various Judges appointed in the district of Kamouraska since 1873, in addition to their annual salary, to enable them to hold in the *chef lieu* of the said district, regular or special terms of the Circuit Court, the Superior Court, the Criminal Court as well as to despatch business in Chambers.—(Mr. Landry.)

Order of the House—Statements showing the amounts claimed for expenses by the several persons who acted as Returning Officers in the county of Bellechasse, during the elections of 1872, 1873, 1875 and 1878; the amount paid, and the details of the several payments.—(Mr. Landry.)

Order of the House—Copies of all correspondence in relation to the issue of a license in favour of Mr. James Quinn, to keep the ferry on the River Restigouche, between Cross Point in the Province of Quebec, and Campbellton, in the Province of New Brunswick; also copies of the resolutions transmitted to the Department of Inland Revenue by the Municipal

Council of the township of Mann, county of Bonaventure, in relation to the said ferry on the River Restigouche.—(*Mr. Beauchesne.*)

Address—Praying that His Excellency will cause such means to be taken as will secure, for the information of this House, a copy of the report of a Select Committee of the Legislature of Ontario, on the subject of the hydraulic lift lock that is proposed to be used on the projected canal to connect the waters of Lakes Huron and Ontario, and all correspondence and petitions relating thereto.—(*Mr. Boulbee.*)

Order of the House—Return of all sums paid during the year 1879 for the maintenance of telegraph lines between the Red River and Battleford; the persons to whom such sums were paid, and the number of days said lines were in thorough working order.—(*Mr. Schultz.*)

Address—Copies of all correspondence, reports to Council and Orders in Council touching any legislation of any of the Provinces, not already brought down; and for copies of like papers touching any legislation of Canada not already brought down.—(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)

Order of the House—Statement showing, in so many separate columns, the names of the several persons employed at the Quarantine Station at Grosse Isle, in the county of Montmagny, on the 17th September, 1878; the nature of their duties, the amount of their salaries at that time, the date at which they entered the service, the amount of their present salaries, the cause of their leaving the service (in cases where parties have ceased to remain in the service since that date), the amount of superannuation allowance or bonus given on leaving the service; the christian and surnames of these who have been appointed since the 17th September, 1878, of the persons whom they succeeded in office, and of the persons on whose recommendation they were appointed, and the amount of their yearly salary, together with all papers and documents relating to appointments, or to the recommendation of appointments, made by the Government at Grosse Isle, since 1878.—(*Mr. Landry.*)

Order of the House—Comparative statement of sugar imported into Canada from the West Indies, United States and Great Britain, showing quantities and values for the years 1877, 1878 and 1879.—(*Mr. Domville.*)

Order of the House—Statement showing the quantity of iron ore exported from Ontario from 1st January, 1880, to 1st April, 1880.—(*Mr. Domville.*)

Order of the House—Copies of all entries made and all sums paid for import duties at York Factory on Hudson's Bay, and at points where entries are made in the North-West Territory, during the summer of 1879.—(*Mr. Schultz.*)

Order of the House—Copy of the report of the engineer who made surveys at Bonaventure, in the Baie des Chaleurs, with the object of building a breakwater there.—(*Mr. Beauchesne.*)

Order of the House—Copies of all correspondence, petitions, reports and papers in relation to the dismissal of G. T. Tremblay, as post-

master of St. John's Suburb (City of Quebec), and the appointment of his successor.—(*Mr. Laurier.*)

Order of the House—Copies of all enquiries reports and papers of every description connected with the dismissal of Francois Xavier Dulac, as postmaster of Lanaudiers, in the county of Beauce, and the closing of the said office.—(*Mr. Laurier.*)

Order of the House—Copies of notice of expropriation, by the Government of the property of James Taylor, on the west side of the Red River, in the parish of St. Clements, Manitoba, for the purposes of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all correspondence, orders and reports on the subject.—(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes before

Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 15th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Order for the Speaker to leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, read.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I had intended to submit to the House the Resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, required by the circumstances that have occurred between the period at which the Resolutions were carried, last Session, and the present time, but I do not intend to pursue that course because it might be thought more convenient, that, as arranged, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), should have an opportunity upon the conclusion of my statement, of making the motion of which he has given notice, and which he would be precluded from doing, if I were to submit at this moment the Resolutions I shall, at a later period, ask the House to concur in. On rising to address the House, on one of the most important questions that can engage its attention, I propose, on the present, as on the last occasion on which I addressed the House on this subject last Session, to avoid, in the fair and candid criticism to which I shall be obliged to subject the proceedings and policy of the hon. gentleman opposite, the use of a single remark, in the least degree calculated to turn the current of this debate from the

channel in which it is desirable it should run. I feel that if there is any question that could be brought under the consideration of the House, that it is requisite to deal with in the calmest, most dispassionate and judicial manner, it is the great question of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will be, however, necessary, in the somewhat changed attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, as foreshadowed by the promised Resolution of the hon. member for West Durham, that I should as briefly as is possible describe the position that, in my judgment, the two parties in this House occupy in relation to this question. The House will remember that when this Government was in power, in 1871, and British Columbia was brought into the Confederation, it was decided that we should grapple with the great question of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by which all the various Provinces would be brought into more rapid and easy communication. When in a position to submit a formal proposition to the House, in 1872, by which it was hoped to accomplish the construction of that work, the Government submitted a proposal to grant \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land in order to cover the expenditure connected with it. At the time that policy was resolved upon, a Resolution, in order to meet the apprehension which existed in and out of the House, as to the very serious responsibility the Government was about to incur, was proposed and carried, and it became substantially a part of the Terms of Union with British Columbia, that that work should be constructed, not by the Government, but by private enterprise, aided by a grant of lands and money to that extent. But even that was limited by the declaration placed before the House, that the progress of that work should not involve an increase in the then rate of taxation.

MR. BLAKE: Hear, hear.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Now, I am a little surprised to find the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) taking exception to the statement I have made, that it formed a part of the Terms of Union with British Columbia, because the Government of which that hon. gentleman was a member, at a later date, found it convenient to fall back upon that Resolution, and embodied it in a Minute

of Council which they offered to British Columbia, and to the Imperial Government as well, as a reason for qualifying the engagement that was entered into. I am safe, I think, in saying that there is no man in this House, there is no intelligent man in this country, that would not heartily concur in the accuracy of the statement, that it would be greatly in the interest of Canada if it had been possible to accomplish the construction of that work upon those terms. Hon. gentlemen opposite took exception, on many occasions, to the efficiency of the means that were thus provided for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), when the leader of the Government, at a public meeting at Whitby, committed himself to the statement that we might as well have offered \$10, as \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land for the purpose of securing the construction of that work, so strongly did he feel the entire inadequacy of the means proposed. Now, it will not be at all necessary for me to discuss the circumstances under which the Government found itself unable to accomplish the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway upon those terms. We are sufficiently familiar with that view of the question to render that entirely unnecessary. But we went out of office, and the duty and responsibility of dealing with this great question devolved upon the gentleman, who, during the subsequent five years, led the Government of this country. Now, I think, we must all admit that successive Governments must pay great deference to, and must hold themselves to a large extent responsible—for carrying out the policy of their predecessors. I am satisfied we all agree in the opinion that it is only under the gravest circumstances that a new Administration is in a position to repudiate, if I may so speak, the engagements in relation to a great public question, to which their predecessors have committed the country under the authority of Parliament. But I quite admit it was in the power of the hon. gentleman, who was then called upon to form an Administration, to say that since, in Parliament, he had opposed the policy of attempting to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway, that he believed this

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

country could not engage in a work of such gigantic magnitude without seriously injuring the financial position of the country—that, under those circumstances, he must decline to hold himself responsible for the engagement into which his predecessors had entered. The hon. gentleman had that course open to him, because Parliament, having declared that the work should only be constructed, provided a company could be found, aided to the extent before stated, to accomplish it as a private undertaking, and the effort to obtain the construction of the work under the terms sanctioned by Parliament having failed, it was open to him, I say, frankly to state to the House, that he was unable to carry out the policy to which his predecessors had committed the country. The hon. gentleman did not adopt that course. Soon after his accession to power he visited his constituents for the purpose of declaring, as Prime Minister, what the policy of his Government was in relation to this great question. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman, much to the surprise of many of his friends, and greatly to the astonishment of those with whom he had formerly been in controversy upon the question, committed himself in the most unqualified manner to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said, and I am quoting from the organ of his party in this city :

“ I have always thought that speedy means of communication across the continent were necessary for settlement, and for the purpose of opening up the district where we have great riches undeveloped in the bosom of the earth. Without that communication their development cannot take place, and emigration cannot be expected.”

Now, with the Great North-West in our possession to be peopled, and a declaration that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was essential to the development of the great resources of Canada—referring, undoubtedly, to the mineral resources of British Columbia—a declaration that emigration to this country could not be hoped for, unless that work was undertaken, committed, on the grounds of the broadest considerations of public policy, the hon. gentleman, to the construction of that work. But he went much further. He stated, in that address, that it was his intention to proceed with this great work in an entirely different manner from that which his

predecessors had propounded, and which Parliament had authorised, and that was as a Government work. He gave, on that occasion, the very substantial reason that, if it was constructed as a Government work, the people would receive the profit instead of the contractors. The hon. gentleman, consistent with that declaration, came down to Parliament with a measure for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He has frequently referred to the fact that one of the first clauses of that Act provided that it must not increase the existing rate of taxation ; that he had adhered to the policy propounded by the previous Government and sanctioned by Parliament ; that there must be no increase of taxation connected with the undertaking. But he did not recount that which Parliament had committed itself to and sanctioned, and that was the declaration that it should not be done by the Government, a declaration that the hon. gentleman himself had voted for, and that his friends and supporters had supported, but that it must be done by a private company, aided by a grant of lands and money. That provision was swept away. It is true, however, that he provided in his Bill for the prosecution of the work in very much the same manner as that propounded by his predecessors, provided the parties could be found to take it up. I think those who have not recently read that Act, will be a little surprised to learn that he went further than his predecessors in the means which he provided from the public resources for the purpose of prosecuting the work. The hon. gentleman covered the whole ground in his Bill. He said :

“ 1. A railway, to be called the ‘ Canadian Pacific Railway,’ shall be made from some point near to and south of Lake Nipissing to some point in British Columbia, on the Pacific Ocean ; both the said points to be determined, and the course and line of the said railway to be approved of by the Governor-in-Council.”

Even the sanction of Parliament was not necessary to the adoption of a line, and that line was to extend from a point on Lake Nipissing to a point in British Columbia, on the Pacific Coast. The hon. gentleman then went on to provide what should be given to the Company undertaking it. He provided in section four :

“ 4. That a quantity of land, not exceeding

twenty thousand acres for each mile of the section or sub-section contracted for, shall be appropriated in alternate sections of twenty square miles each, along the line of the said railway, or at a convenient distance therefrom, each section having a frontage of not less than three miles, nor more than six miles on the line of the said Railway, and that two-thirds of the quantity of land so appropriated shall be sold by the Government at such prices as may be from time to time agreed upon between the Governor-in-Council, and the contractors, and the proceeds thereof accounted for and paid half yearly to the contractors, free from any charge of administration or management; the remaining third to be conveyed to the contractors. The said lands to be of fair average quality, and not to include any land already granted or occupied under any patent, license of occupation or preemption right; and when a sufficient quantity cannot be found in the immediate vicinity of the railway, then the same quantity, or as much as may be required to complete such quantity, shall be appropriated at such other places as may be determined by the Governor-in-Council."

Now, I call the attention of the hon. member for North Norfolk to this act, to which, I think, he was kind enough to give his hearty support when it was submitted to Parliament. I call his attention to this as indicating that the hon. gentleman, at that time, had not the same abhorrence of a large section of land along the line of the Pacific Railway being in the hands of contractors. The late Government went further than the previous Government had gone, because while we proposed to give 50,000,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000, we never proposed to assume the cost and responsibility of administering and selling two-thirds of the land, and relieving the contractors from that charge. So here is Parliament authorising hon. gentlemen to give 50,000,000 acres and \$30,000,000 in money, and providing for the expenditure necessary to administer and sell two-thirds of the land owned, that was the property of the contractors. Then there was the question of the surveys, while, under our contract, the company with whom we made the contract for the work, were obliged to cover all cost incurred in connection with work up to that time. It is provided :

"7. That the cost of surveys, and of locating the line of the several sections and sub-sections of the said Railway, shall be part of the subsidy or consideration allowed to the contractors, or not, as may be determined by the Governor-in-Council, and agreed upon in

the contract entered into with the contractors."

So the Government not only proposed to give all the land we proposed to give, but to bear the expense of the administration of two-thirds of the land, and to relieve the contractors of the cost of any surveys or location of any portion of this road. The hon. gentleman did not stop here. Having changed the position of Parliament altogether, in relation to the great obligation of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, by providing that the Government themselves should either have the power to give the contract to the company who would construct the road on the conditions contained in the measure, or take up that work, as a Government work, and carry it to completion, the hon. gentleman did not stop there. Great as had been the fears he had exhibited with reference to the enormous burden we were placing on the shoulders of the people, he sought to make the Government directly responsible for the expenditure of all this money in the construction of the line from Lake Nipissing to the shores of the Pacific. But the hon. gentleman, over and above the expenditure we proposed, committed the country to a vast extension of the liability of the previous Government. The previous Government assumed that, if they brought the Pacific Railway to Nipissing, it would be a sufficient inducement for the lines in Ontario and Quebec, running easterly to Quebec and southerly to Toronto, to make a connection at that point. At the same time, my hon. predecessor submitted to Parliament a measure providing for the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch, and to give a subsidy to the Canada Central Railway of \$1,440,000. Although the Georgian Bay Branch was through a *terra incognita*, the line unsurveyed, and eminent engineers maintained it to be impracticable, without any survey or any location the hon. gentleman pledged himself, as the leader of the Government, and he committed the Government and the country to the construction of the line from the terminus of the Canada Central east of Lake Nipissing to the mouth of French River, at an expense moderately put at \$2,560,000. That makes \$4,000,000 of money, which he proposed to expend outside of, and over and above, the libil-

ity for the Canadian Pacific Railway before reaching the eastern terminus, where it had been fixed by Parliament on the south and east of Lake Nipissing. He may say, "but this is all subject to the limitation that is provided for in this Bill, with reference to not increasing the then rate of taxation." Unfortunately for him, and unfortunately for the hon. gentleman who sits behind him—and who now seems—I will not say ready to repudiate the policy of his own leader—but to take a prominent part in a proposal that, I fear, will be regarded in the light of a repudiation by them of their obligations, and which will have the effect of sweeping from under their feet any standing ground. The hon. the then Minister of Finance submitted to Parliament a declaration to the effect that, in order to meet the expenditure he would have to ask Parliament to impose an additional taxation of \$3,000,000; and then and there the hon. gentleman did impose that additional taxation. When the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made his famous speech in Ontario, at a subsequent date, he said that British Columbia had nothing to complain of, as Parliament had not only pledged itself to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but had provided \$3,000,000, had levied \$3,000,000 additional taxation to meet their obligations, and notably for the Canadian Pacific Railway. When the hon. gentleman imposed that additional taxation, this Bill was, at the same time, placed upon the Statute-book, saying that the undertaking should not involve an increase in the existing rate of taxation. The hon. gentleman, therefore, stands in this position: either he must give up that clause as not having any binding obligation or effect, or stand before Parliament and the country in the position of having violated the law in the expenditure of every dollar spent from the first hour that he began to expend any money on the Pacific Railway, because there is clear and undeniable evidence that the rate of taxation was then increased. Every single dollar of the \$11,000,000 spent in the construction of the Railway so far had been spent by the hon. gentleman in the teeth of the Statute, and also the balance of the \$28,000,000 of money required to complete the expenditure he had begun—for,

without that completion, all the \$11,000,000 would be wasted—had been expended contrary to the declaration of that Act. The hon. gentleman, when in Opposition, had exhibited such a spirit of antagonism—as hon. gentlemen opposite are, I am afraid, inclined to exhibit—to the policy proposed on this side of the House.

MR. BLAKE: Which hon. gentleman?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: When I have the pleasure to look in the face at this moment of the hon. gentleman, and hold this friendly discussion on so very important a question, I am reminded that when he was before in Opposition; and when we then proposed a scheme for constructing the Pacific Railway, which we felt quite possible, and which we knew to be in the interest of the country to complete as quickly as possible, he and his colleagues derided that proposal or the advisability of going on with the work, but when brought into power, upon this side of the House they did not shrink back; they found that the dismal vista that they had seen before had vanished; and the hon. gentleman went to the extent of adding \$4,000,000 to the amount we proposed for the construction of the Pacific Railway at the eastern end of the line. But what did he do on the other end of the line? He went into a deliberate negotiation with British Columbia and the Imperial Government, and for fear that the hon. gentlemen may forget these little inconsistencies, I will ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to one of the most important state papers, one of the most important documents that forms a portion of the Archives of Canada, I mean the treaty made between the Government of Canada and British Columbia, and the Imperial Government. Although I would like to condense the passage I am going to read, I am afraid I shall have to read it at length. What I am going to read now will be found at page 511, of the *Hansard* of 1875. On that page will be found a *verbatim* statement of the treaty, showing the obligations imposed by the then First Minister now sitting on the other side of the House. Lord Carnarvon said:

"Adhering then to the same order in which, on the 16th August, I stated the principle points on which it appears to me that a better

understanding should be defined, I now proceed to announce the conclusions at which I have arrived. They are :

"1. That the Railway from Esquimaux to Nanaimo shall be commenced as soon as possible, and completed with all practicable despatch.

"2. That the surveys on the mainland shall be pushed on with the utmost vigour. On this point, after considering the representations of your Ministers, I feel that I have no alternative but to rely, as I do most fully and readily, upon their assurances that no legitimate effort or expense will be spared, first to determine the best route for the line, and secondly to proceed with the details of the engineering work. It would be distasteful to me, if indeed, it were not impossible to prescribe strictly any minimum of time or expenditure with regard to work of so uncertain a nature ; but, happily, it is equally impossible for me to doubt that your Government will loyally do its best in every way to accelerate the completion of a duty left freely to its sense of honour and justice.

"3. That the waggon road and telegraph line shall be immediately constructed. There seems here to be some difference of opinion as to the special value to the Province of the undertaking to complete these two works ; but, after considering what has been said, I am of opinion that they should both be proceeded with at once, as indeed is suggested by your Ministers.

"4. That \$2,000,000 a year, and not \$1,500,000, shall be the minimum expenditure on railway works within the Province from the date at which the surveys are sufficiently completed to enable that amount to be expended on construction. In naming this amount I understand that, it being alike the interest and the wish of the Dominion Government to urge on with all speed the completion of the works now to be undertaken, the annual expenditure will be as much in excess of the minimum of \$2,000,000 as in any year may be found practicable.

"5. Lastly, that on or before the 31st of December, 1890, the Railway shall be completed and open for traffic on the Pacific seaboard to a point at the western end of Lake Superior at which it will fall into connection with existing lines of railway through a portion of the United States, and also with the navigation on Canadian waters."

This is Lord Carnarvon's decision, or the conclusions at which he had arrived as a mediator between British Columbia and the First Minister of that day. It will be seen that the late Government here pledged themselves to build the line from Esquimaux to Nanaimo without delay. What did that mean in the first place ? I am quite certain that my hon. predecessor will not question the calculation I have made when I say that, at the very lowest estimate, it would cost \$4,000,000. It is simply adding \$4,000,000 upon the

Western end of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the \$4,000,000 he had already added to the eastern end. But that is by far the least grave portion of this matter. However much the hon. gentleman disregarded, in his own action, the clause of the Bill which provided that the work should not proceed so as to involve an increase in the taxation of the country, by this negotiation and engagement with Lord Carnarvon, he left himself entirely unprotected. I should like to ask what it would cost to construct a waggon road for 400 miles through the Rocky Mountains. Is not that an enormous addition to the contract to construct as rapidly as possible the Canadian Pacific Railway ? I trust that the hon. member for West Durham will read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest these statements, which received the ready and hearty concurrence and endorsement of the late Minister of Public Works. I am aware that the hon. member for West Durham was a little restive under those terms. At any rate, sitting upon this side of the House, he exhibited a little of that restiveness which characterises him when he is not in the Cabinet. The hon. member for West Durham put a question on the Notice Paper on this subject, and what was the answer of the hon. First Minister of that day ? Feeling strong in the integrity of his position and in the consciousness that he was grappling with the construction of a great national work, he said :

"With respect to the question raised by my hon. friend, the member for South Bruce, I may say I have nothing to ask from Parliament. We have no authority to obtain, but have merely to communicate this decision and rest upon the House supporting us in accepting the terms that have been made through the intervention or mediation of Lord Carnarvon, and that support I do not doubt will be cheerfully accorded."

Have we not a right to ask those gentlemen who were ready to accord support to the leader of the late Government, when he proposed, not only to pledge this country to build the Canadian Pacific Railway from end to end, but to add \$8,000,000 to any expenditure which had ever been proposed by his predecessors, and add the cost of the waggon road and of the administration of two-thirds of the land these people were to receive, to consider fairly our position ? That hon. gen-

tleman was prepared to rely on the gentlemen sustaining him for their assured support, because he believed he was acting in the interest of the country. Have we not a right with our much more modest proposition—with the burden hon. gentlemen opposite proposed to place on this country, rendered so much lighter by us—to ask for some of that assured support which the member for Lambton so confidently relied upon when standing where I now have the honour to stand? The hon. member for West Durham was not prepared to go so far as this proposition of the late Government. It is but just to him to say that he gave expression to his dissent in perhaps the most marked manner that an independent member could do so, when he refused his vote for the construction of the Esquimault and Nanaimo Railway. But though the faith and honour of the Government and country had been irrevocably pledged to this undertaking, when it was removed out of the way by the other branch of Parliament, the hon. gentleman himself assumed the responsibility of every word and act of that Government, by accepting a place in it. He did more. He not only entered the Cabinet, committed and bound as it was to this policy, beyond recall, and without qualification as to the resources of the country, without raising the question as to whether the Railway should be completed by 1890, from end to end, thus giving practical evidence of his being in accord with its views, but showed he was prepared to take out of the coffers of Canada \$750,000 to compensate British Columbia for having generously relinquished the immediate expenditure of the \$4,000,000 on the Nanaimo and Esquimault Railway. Under those circumstances, the last source from which this Government might have anticipated obstruction was from gentlemen opposite in adopting the present policy. The late Government committed itself to the construction of this great work regardless of the cost. At the end of five years the former Government came back to power. What did we find had been accomplished in the meantime? Hon. gentlemen may be surprised to learn that one of our first duties was to lay the rails upon the Pembina Branch Railway, the contract for which was given out among the first acts of the late Government. They also early

undertook the construction of the Railway from Fort William to Shebandowan, and to develop the policy known as the use of the water stretches. There was, besides, to be a road in the west, from the Lake of the Woods to Winnipeg. To the credit of the hon. member for Lambton he is sometimes open for argument. After two or three years' discussion in this House, we were enabled finally to convince him of the folly of his course—that every dollar he expended on the road to Shebandowan on the east, and on the road beyond the Lake of the Woods on the west, would be wasted, while there was the Duluth Railway within a comparatively short distance to carry all the passengers and traffic westward, and prevent either one or the other ever going by the mixed rail and water-stretches route, the amphibious line, after it was constructed. I will credit him with practically admitting, at least, that he was wrong and we were right.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I know he is unwilling to admit it, but history will establish the truth of my statements. I cannot absolve the hon. gentleman for the folly of having undertaken the construction of the through line by this route, and letting two contracts, one running to English River on the east, and the other to Rat Portage on the west, without previous surveys, without the slightest knowledge of those sections or what the road would cost, or whether he could connect the two ends at all. It can be proved those ends had never been connected by surveys, and that there was no means of knowing whether, at any reasonable cost, the road could be completed. The result has been an enormous expenditure, largely due to the precipitate commencement of the work, and without sufficient information as to the character of the country. On attaining office we found a large amount had been expended on those two sections of 227 miles; one running east from Red River 114 miles, and the other 113 miles running west from Lake Superior. We found that the money thus expended might as well be thrown into Lake Superior, and was utterly useless for any purpose of value, there being a gap of 185 miles between those sections. The hon. gentleman had

become convinced of the uselessness of this expenditure, without the completion of the intervening section; and shortly previous to the General Elections he advertised for contracts for the road over those 185 miles. I am not going to find any fault with that step. I gave him credit for it before, but must withdraw it now, as he stated the other night that he had not at all decided to construct those 185 miles—had not decided whether he would allow the enormous expenditure to lie dead while he paid interest on it, without accomplishing anything by it. I can readily understand why the hon. gentleman did not let the contracts before the election. He had stated, in and out of the House, as a ground of his claim to public confidence, that he was building the Canadian Pacific Railway at a cost of \$24,500 a mile, and he had learned that if the contracts for the intervening 185 miles were let, it would become apparent he had made an enormous miscalculation as to the cost of the road, the contracts for portions of which he had given out without any surveys or information to warrant that action; so the ground for his appeal for the public confidence in this matter would be swept from under his feet. On the Georgian Bay Branch, Canada Central, the Pembina Branch, and the line between Thunder Bay and Red River, we found, when we came into power, that over \$11,000,000 had been spent; and to make that outlay of any practical value would involve the proper completion of those works, and I stated a year ago the expenditure involved could not be estimated at less than \$28,000,000. I am now able to take something like a million off that estimate, as by pursuing a different policy from that of the late Government, in letting the contracts, and in their supervision after being let, we expect to effect a great reduction in the cost undertaken. Before I had been a week in the office which the hon. member for Lambton vacated, I called on Mr. Marcus Smith for a statement of the work done upon those 228 miles, an estimate upon which the contracts had been framed, and a statement of how much had been paid, and how much was required to complete the work. I was astounded to discover that the additional expense had to be counted, I may say, by millions. I

called the attention of Mr. Fleming to the same matter as soon as he returned from England. Mr. Fleming said that, so far as Section 5 was concerned, it could be the difference accounted for as the character of the work had been changed; but with respect to the other portions that there had been no location surveys—no sufficiently accurate estimates made—no knowledge of details acquired when those contracts were let to enable a close estimate to be formed. He had no means of accounting for this great disproportion between what they supposed the cost of the work would be, and what it was now evident it would cost. Mr. Fleming sent for the engineers who had been in charge of the works, both east and west, and they were unable to give a satisfactory account of so much money having been spent, and, in consequence, a careful remeasurement has been made to ascertain where the discrepancy was. With regard to Section 15, Mr. Smith and Mr. Fleming said that we could account for the great disproportion between the cost and the estimate because the plan had been changed. The contract was originally invited for that section of the road, but the amount asked by the tenderers was so enormous that the moment the then First Minister saw them he discovered it would not do to let the contract on those figures, or he would have to add something like 50 per cent. to the cost which he had stated he was building the Pacific Railway at per mile. The contract was not let. It was subsequently let upon a system of trestle-work for embankments; and after the work had proceeded in that way for a length of time, a report was made by the Engineer in charge that the wood in that country was of a very inferior description, and that so soon as the road was completed it would probably be either all burnt up, and if not burned the wood was of such an inferior quality that we should have to commence rebuilding it at an early day, and he therefore advised that embankments should be substituted for trestle-work. That report was referred to Mr. Fleming, who was here on a brief visit from England. He entirely concurred in the proposition that the work should be changed from trestle-work to embankments, and he discussed that matter with the then Minister of Public Works, who also concurred in

the propriety of the change of which he still approves. The hon. gentleman took that report to the Council, where it remained.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is a little overstating the fact. I agreed that the road would be much better built that way than the former way; but I did not concur in the wisdom of making the change just then.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The hon. gentleman ought to have done one thing or the other. The Chief Engineer having gone the next day to England, after discussing the matter with the hon. gentleman, and having left his report in favour of the change, with the assurance of that hon. gentleman that he agreed with it, he ought to have either obtained the decision of the Council for the proposition or against it, or, at all events, should have taken care to know that the change was not made under the assumption that that which the Chief Engineer had recommended, and which met with the approval of the hon. the Minister of Public Works—

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Was not to be pursued. That was the position in which I found the work. Notwithstanding the increased cost, I have no hesitation in saying that the change was a wise one; and I recommended it to the present Government, especially when I found that the contract had been carried on by the Engineer under the impression that the change had been adopted, and that the contractor had expended over \$100,000 for plant that would not have been required if there had been no intention of a change. We were careful, under these circumstances, that no more contracts should be let in the loose, irregular, and improper manner prevailing up to that time. We required a full statement of all the work that was required on the sections of the Railway, before we would commit ourselves to their construction, and I postponed action twice upon the advertisement which the hon. member for Lambton had himself put into the papers for the 185 miles, because the Department was not ready with the careful calculations based upon surveys and examinations and cross-sections which had been prepared to enable us to know

exactly what the amount of the work would be. I am happy to say that we have changed the mode of letting the contracts, instead of basing them on mere guess work, we based them on maximum quantities that cannot be exceeded; the contracts require the amount of work should be done, if required, but that it may be reduced to any extent. I am happy to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that I have already reduced the distance, or rather that Mr. Caddy, the Engineer in charge of Section 41, has been enabled, since that contract was let, to reduce the distance on forty-seven miles of it by three and three-fourths miles, a saving to the country of \$319,000 by that reduction, and by lessening the amount of work to be done on that forty-seven miles. The same process is going on on Section 42, and these two contracts will be completed within the time stated in the contract—a great novelty—the hon. gentleman will admit, considering the inordinate time he has taken in similar cases. Under that system we shall not only be enabled to construct these works within the time stated in the contract, but by a reduction of the cost by over half a million dollars. I give this to the hon. gentleman as an evidence of the value of having a careful examination of the work before the contracts are let, instead of rushing into it blindly. That was our first duty; and finding that this expenditure had been made, we had no alternative but to go forward and carry it out. Moreover, we had the responsibility thrown upon us of dealing with the question of the construction of the Railway as a whole; we did not find it left a legacy to us as the hon. gentleman found it left to him. It was open to him, in the position in which we left the question, as I have already stated, to say he was not prepared to adopt the policy of the construction of the Railway, at all events, in the manner that was indicated. He adopted a different course; he not only provided for the construction of the work directly by the Government, but he entered into a binding treaty and obligation with Lord Carnarvon, on behalf of the Imperial Government and British Columbia, that this work should be completed by 1890 from the shores of Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean. That was the legacy we inherited from the hon.

gentleman; and carrying out the pledge he had made to Lord Carnarvon, he caused these further surveys to be made with a view to the location of the line, and having satisfied himself that the best line that could be adopted was the line to Burrard Inlet, the hon. gentleman proceeded to put an advertisement in the papers calling for tenders for the construction of 125 miles from Kamloops to Yale. I heard with amazement, the other night, a statement from the hon. gentleman that he had not decided to do that work, that he had not fully made up his mind to do it. I am perfectly aware that it is legitimate for a Government going to the country, under the great discouragement which the hon. gentleman was compelled to go to the country—I am quite aware that it is legitimate for them to present a programme as attractive as they can for the consideration of the country; but I am astonished that the hon. the then First Minister of the Crown should deliberately, in his own Department, call for tenders involving the expenditure of large sums of money by intending contractors, for the construction of 125 miles of railway through the canyons of the Fraser, a most difficult and inaccessible locality, and afterwards state to this House that he did it deliberately, on the eve of an election, without the intention of carrying it on to completion. The hon. gentleman stated that he was upholding the honour and integrity of Canada; that this work should be carried on to completion as vigorously as possible, and that he had pledged himself to Lord Carnarvon that the surveys should be prosecuted as rapidly as possible, and that, as soon as they were completed, the road should be located, and not less than \$2,000,000 per annum should be expended. With that pledge he asks for tenders for 125 miles of Railway. That was the hon. gentleman's obligation, from which there was no escape; and there was the additional pledge to British Columbia that that work was to be immediately undertaken. I ask the hon. gentleman to tell this House, if he had not finally made up his mind to proceed with the construction of the Railway from Yale to Kamloops, why he made the contract involving a payment of \$32,400 to a contractor to carry rails from Victoria to Yale? Does the hon. gentleman mean to

say that, not content with holding out to the people of British Columbia that he was going to build the Railway, he was absolutely going to take out of the public coffers \$32,400 to remove those rails from Victoria to Yale, without having satisfied himself that he ever intended to strike a blow? That is a proposition, I am satisfied, the hon. gentleman, on reflection, will see is utterly untenable, and he will find himself in a position that no possible argument on his part could justify. Well, under these circumstances, the Government found themselves brought face to face with the great question of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway forced upon them. The course which had been pursued by the late Government, and by the late Finance Minister, was that of holding up to the country the enormous and gigantic obligation that this work would involve, and the hon. gentleman felt it his duty to give the contractors all over the world, who might be invited to construct this line upon favourable terms, to understand that it was a work involving enormous expenditure, and that it would be disastrous to any contractor to touch it. We were under the necessity of dealing with this difficulty as a commercial undertaking, when it was in an entirely different position from that which it occupied when we were deprived of power. When we found ourselves brought face to face with this very serious question what did we do? We reverted back, as far as possible, under the changed circumstances to our former policy. Our policy was this: That the lands of the North-West ought to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the principal plank in our platform. The late First Minister in his address at Sarnia, covered the whole ground when he said "that it was impossible ever to draw emigration into that great country and settle it without the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway." We held that opinion, and we felt that, inasmuch as that great fertile North-West must remain a barren waste until the Railway was constructed, and that inasmuch as those lands were the most fair and fertile, and the richest to be found on the face of the globe, and that they must remain useless to Canada unless the Railway was constructed, we felt warranted in adopting the policy

which we have adopted. But seeing that this great work ought to be and should be constructed by utilizing those lands to which the road itself is going to give such enormously increased value, we came down with that policy, and we supposed that these hon. gentlemen opposite, having committed the Government, having pledged the faith of Canada, as they pledged it in relation to this question, that they would have been the first men in this House to congratulate us upon the policy we had propounded, and give us their most hearty support, but we discovered that we were altogether mistaken. What was the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition last winter, when we propounded that policy. He said the land was good for nothing.

MR. MACKENZIE: I did not say so.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The whole success of our scheme depended upon our being able to convince the world that these lands were fertile and of enormous value; that they would largely repay any person who undertook their settlement, that it was the most inviting field for emigrants that was to be found in the world. But how did the hon. gentleman meet us? He met us first with the declaration that it is a bad policy to lock up the land.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Hear, hear, he says? Yet I ask him what he said to the people of Sarnia when he told them that without the Canadian Pacific Railway these lands were valueless. I ask him how he reconciles that statement with the statement that it is a bad policy to utilise these lands for the purpose of constructing the Railway through them? What more did the hon. gentleman say when he knew that the whole success of our policy rested upon our success in convincing the world of the great value of these lands, and the safety of investing money in their purchase, in order to give us the means of constructing this Railway without imposing an enormous burden upon the people of the country. The hon. gentleman took upon himself the responsibility of endeavouring to defeat the success of this policy. The hon. gentleman told the people of England, from the floor of this House, that we could not give our lands away in Canada.

MR. MACKENZIE: I did not.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I ask the hon. gentleman to read his speech. Turn up the *Hansard*, and the hon. gentleman will see that when we talked of building the Canadian Pacific Railway with these lands, and selling them to get the money, he said we could not get people to settle on the lands in Canada when we gave them away.

AN HON. MEMBER: Texas.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am not going to say anything about Texas, as the hon. gentleman has been pressed sufficiently on that point; for he was on the horns of a dilemma and ready to fly to Texas or anywhere else to escape from the difficulty. The hon. gentleman followed us to England. After the House had adopted the policy that gave us the authority to dispose of 100,000,000 acres of land for the purpose of constructing this great work, and had authorised the mission to England for the purpose of endeavouring to enlist capitalists abroad, and the Government of England to aid in the prosecution of this work, the hon. gentleman not only denounced the policy of using the lands, he not only declared that they were worthless—

MR. MACKENZIE: I said nothing of the kind.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: He said we could not settle them when we gave them away.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said nothing of the kind.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: If the hon. gentleman will read his speech in the *Hansard*, he will find it there; if not, I will acknowledge I misapprehended what he said. The hon. gentleman followed us to England, he followed that mission which this Government sent to England for the purpose of obtaining aid in the construction of this work. Immediately upon our arrival in England, a long article appeared in one of the leading journals, declaring that there was a reaction in this country, that the Government had lost their popularity; and so the hon. gentleman followed us, step by step, and used every argument that could be used in order to defeat and render abortive the mission in which we were engaged. The passage I was referring to in the hon. gentleman's speech of last year has been kindly turned up for me.

I will read from the speech of the hon. gentleman, on page 1,905 of the *Hansard* :

“If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is proceeding on the hypothesis that in Canada alone is there any land available, he will find himself greatly mistaken. We have found it very difficult indeed, in Canada, to promote settlement, even where the land was given away by the Government. It is still more difficult to send settlers to the far-off western country, where they have the initial difficulties of a new country to contend with, not less in amount though different in kind, than the settlers of our own wooded districts.”

MR. MACKENZIE : Where is the place I said the land was worth nothing?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : I said the hon. gentleman undervalued the character of our lands.

MR. MACKENZIE : I have taken down the hon. gentleman's words ; he stated I said the lands were good for nothing. Read the passage.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : I will tell him where I find it ; I find it in the statement that you cannot promote settlement where you give the lands away. If that does not sustain my assertion, then I know nothing about the meaning of the English language. But not content with saying that we could not promote settlement where the lands were given away, that in the North-West the difficulties are greater than in any other part of Canada, the hon. gentleman went on with this lugubrious account of our country :

“They have a long winter, absence of lumber and building materials, and difficulties of transportation. We must, therefore, make up our minds, if we are to settle that country, that it will be done only at the expenditure of a large amount of money to aid settlers in going in and in giving them land free after they get in. That is my conviction.”

You not only cannot get them to go and settle the lands when you give them away, but if you do you have to pay them for doing it. If we did that where was the \$100,000,000 to come from on which we were asking the House to sustain us in the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway? Suppose we had failed under these circumstances, would it have been very surprising? As has been already stated by the hon. the First Minister, the communications with the Imperial Government were confidential, but I may say this, that after the most friendly and frank discussion of the sub-

ject with the Imperial Government, and especially with the Colonial Minister, concerning the construction of a Canadian Pacific Railway—we found, and for reasons I think the hon. gentlemen opposite will quite appreciate, the time was not the most propitious for the purpose of pressing them for a definite answer—we came away with the impression that, at no distant day, we would be in a position to obtain from the Imperial Government the most favourable consideration of our proposals. That this is a question in which Lord Beaconsfield's Government felt the greatest interest, we can have no possible reason to doubt. If the hon. gentleman opposite was about making an appeal to the country he would not like to be handicapped any more heavily than was absolutely necessary for the time being ; but there is another reason why we did not think it necessary to press very strongly the Imperial Government in relation to that matter. It is this : after the discussion, not only with members of the Imperial Cabinet and with the Colonial Minister—after discussion with the first minds among the Opposition to the present Government in England—after having discussed this question exhaustively with the first capitalists in England, we found we were in a position, without any fear or doubt, to go steadily forward in the prosecution of this work—knowing that the funds required could be obtained on most favourable terms by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and would be forthcoming as fast as he would require them, independently of any guarantee. I may still add that our mission was not altogether fruitless from another point of view. If we were to go on with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was not desirable that we should lose the opportunity of obtaining, at a reduced rate, a quantity of steel rails for that Railway ; and I am able to tell the hon. gentleman that we were more fortunate than himself—we had the good fortune to be there just at the time when iron and freights had fallen to their lowest point, and we were successful in making a purchase of 50,000 tons of steel rails, at a million and a-half dollars less than the hon. gentleman paid for them, and at a million and a-half less than what they could be purchased for since.

Mr. ANGLIN: Why did you not purchase more?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER: I am afraid that hon. gentlemen are very hard to satisfy. All I can say is that if we had not been on the spot, and the negotiations had not been managed as they were, we would not have been able to have purchased a quarter of that quantity at the price. It was the last purchase made at that price, because when it was known that there was a contract for 50,000 tons of steel rails on the market, the price went up at a bound. I am afraid it will be a very long time before we, or our successors, will meet with the same good fortune in relation to this matter. I may say to some hon. gentleman, who seemed to think that owing to the defeat of the Beaconsfield Administration, all hope of this Government obtaining anything from England, is gone, that we have no reason to distrust a Liberal Administration any more than a Conservative Administration, and I would ask any person who knows anything of the political principles propounded by gentlemen on this side of the House, whether there is any Liberal party in England, or any man likely to be in a Liberal Cabinet in England—under Mr. Gladstone, Lord Granville, or Lord Hartington—who is more advanced in Liberal principles than the hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. There has no doubt been a great change of parties in England, and if the Conservative party have lost power there, it has been the means of bringing into power an Administration who are no more committed to Liberal principles and a Liberal policy than the hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House.

Mr. RYMAL: I suppose you will hardly rejoice at the change.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER: I may tell the hon. gentleman who interposed, that I am not dismayed at the change. I believed the interests of Canada are just as safe in the hands of Lord Cardwell, as Colonial Minister, as they were in the hands of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach. Who was Mr. Cardwell? He was the man who took up and went heart and soul into the great question of the Confederation of British North America. He discharged that duty in the most able and

energetic manner, and his successors had merely to carry out what had really been accomplished by the Liberal Administration. The Prime Minister of this Government, when in England had a highly satisfactory conversation with the gentleman who is not unlikely to hold the seals of the Colonial Office, Mr. Forster. That gentleman, the other day, in his speech delivered at the Colonial Institute, said:

“His friend, Sir John Macdonald, came over to this country not long ago to get a guarantee for the Pacific Railway, and he (Mr. Forster) was not at all sure that it would not be advisable if the Mother Country were to be very liberal in these matters.”

It will be seen, therefore, that notwithstanding the fall of the Beaconsfield Administration, there is every prospect of the Government of Canada being sustained and upheld in this great national enterprise. We have here evidence that in the great country to which we owe a loyal allegiance, there is in both political parties a keen appreciation of the importance of our obtaining the great national highway now under consideration. I ventured, last year, to express the belief that the Imperial Government would feel that, in the opening up of the great Canadian North-West to the settlement of inhabitants of the Mother Country, a policy would be propounded that would meet with the approval of Imperial statesmen. That idea was laughed to scorn by the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was to them a matter of derision, but subsequently Lord Beaconsfield came out in an elaborate eulogium on the great national resources of British North America, and he declared to the people of England the vital importance it was to the Empire that her sons, who were obliged to expatriate themselves for the purpose of bettering their condition, could seek a home in the fertile lands of British North America, under the same flag beneath which they had formerly lived. I must now turn the attention of the House, for a few moments, to the authority that was given to the Government at the last Session of Parliament, in relation to this great work, and the duty that was imposed on us. I think I will convince the House (and the hon. member for West Durham—I do not even despair of convincing him) that during

the Recess of Parliament the Government were engaged in discharging the duty confided in them by Parliament, and which they directed them to carry out. The first Resolution reads as follows:

"1. Resolved,—That engagements have been entered into with British Columbia, as a condition of Union with Canada, that a line of railway to connect the Atlantic with the Pacific shall be constructed with all practicable speed."

"6. Resolved,—That in view of the importance of keeping good faith with British Columbia, and completing the consolidation of the Confederation of Provinces in British North America, and for the purpose of extending relief to the unemployed working classes of Great Britain, and affording them permanent homes on British soil; and in view of the national character of the undertaking, the Government of Canada is authorised and directed to use its best efforts to secure the co-operation of the Imperial Government in this great undertaking, and obtain further aid, by guarantee or otherwise, in the construction of this great national work."

This Resolution refers to the importance of securing the cooperation of the Imperial Government by guarantee or otherwise, and all I can say is that the Government did the best they could in that direction, and I think I have given the House some evidence that the seed sown is likely to bear fruit in due time. The seventh Resolution reads:

"7. That it is further expedient to provide:—That 100,000,000 acres of land, and all the minerals they contain be appropriated for the purposes of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway."

This was appropriated, and I need say nothing further in relation to the matter, after the exhaustive argument of the member for North Norfolk, who attacked the policy of the Government as to the mode in which they proposed to appropriate and utilise that hundred millions of acres of land; and the able and exhaustive reply he received from the right hon. the First Minister, who, I believe, convinced this House, as he must have convinced this country, that we have every reason to believe that that policy will be eminently successful. I need not discuss the question further, but say, that before Parliament rises it will be necessary to submit a Resolution confirming the mode in which it is decided by the Government to administer these lands a little more concisely than these Resolutions provide. It is not proposed, however, to depart from the policy

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

we believe has been wisely adopted, and which will be found sufficient to thoroughly accomplish this work. The 10th Resolution reads:

"10. Resolved,—That the Government be authorised and directed to locate a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the Red River, westerly, running to the south of Lake Manitoba, with a branch to Winnipeg. And, if they deem it advisable, to enter into contract for expending a sum not exceeding \$1,000,000 in constructing the said Railway without previously submitting the contracts to Parliament."

That power has been used, and before I sit down, I shall have occasion to explain to the House the position in which that matter stands. The 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th read:

"11. Resolved,—That it is expedient to make further explorations in the Peace and Pine River districts and other sections of the country not yet examined, in order to ascertain the feasibility of a line through the largest extent of fertile territory, before beginning the work of construction in British Columbia."

"12. Resolved,—That in the opinion of this House, the selection of the Burrard Inlet terminus was premature."

"13. Resolved,—That it is necessary to keep good faith with British Columbia, and commence the construction of the Railway in that Province as early as is practicable."

"14. Resolved—That the Government be authorised and directed to make such further explorations as they may deem necessary for the said purpose, and so soon as they have finally selected and located the line, to enter into contracts for constructing a portion of the same, not exceeding 125 miles, without the further sanction of Parliament, so that the work of construction may, at latest, be commenced during the present season, and thereafter be vigorously prosecuted."

I may say to the House that we fully appreciate the enormous expenditure involved in the construction of the line of railway to the Pacific coast by the Burrard Inlet route. All we asked was authority to make explorations with the view of seeing if we could not connect the Pacific shores with the fertile district of the North-West, by passing through a more hospitable country.

MR. BLAKE: Not inhospitable.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I will recall that, as I have a vivid recollection of what the hon. gentleman has been made to suffer for having used that word before. The Government, acting in good faith, and believing that if they could facilitate the progress of the work in British Columbia, and find a shorter and easier line

of communication with the fertile valleys of the North-West, it would largely assist in solving the great difficulty that lays in the way of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, directed itself as vigorously to that question as possible. They obtained the services of an active and energetic navigator to report on Port Simpson. After receiving his report, I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, no such port is to be found on the Pacific coast as Port Simpson. It is easy of access, and well sheltered within, and all that can be desired in every respect. But we found, on having the three routes examined, from Port Simpson to Peace River, Pine River, and Fort George, that the route to Burrard Inlet was 150 miles shorter than that to Port Simpson, and we found that the country through British Columbia, *via* the Peace River or Pine River, was not more favourable for settlement, than the Burrard Inlet route, but that, in addition to its being 500 miles north of Victoria, we had to encounter a very unfavourable climate. The rain-fall was very incessant on the coast, and there was no extent of country fit for settlement between the coast and five or six hundred miles where we would strike the Peace River Pass. Mr. Fleming pointed out in his report the great advantages it possessed as a line easier of construction, but, after full deliberation, we come to the conclusion that we would not be acting in the interests of the country if we rejected the Burrard Inlet route, which had been adopted by the late Government. The fact that the hon. gentleman, after careful consideration, had adopted that route, was greatly in its favour, and we had no hesitation in adopting it. The Burrard Inlet route has this advantage: It has a good harbour, and only thirty miles across the Narrows are the valuable coal mines of Nanaimo. Within thirty miles you have great coal deposits, and in close proximity abundant quantities of iron ore, sufficient, I hope, to induce enterprising capitalists to undertake the manufacture of the iron rails required in British Columbia. You have a most valuable fishery on those coasts, and, as is well known, you have splendid forests of timber. You have, from Burrard Inlet up toward Yale from fifty to one

hundred miles of land valuable for settlement. The width is large enough to provide homes for a large and thriving population. I fully acknowledged, last year, that Kamloops district was a superior one. Yale is at the head of the tide water, and you can reach it easily from the shores of the Pacific. Steamers go daily from Victoria to Yale, and by the construction of 125 miles of rail you can reach the Kamloops district, which gives us communication with the great central plateau of the Rocky Mountains, through which 150 miles of the line will run, extending 140 miles south to the United States, and 200 miles running northward, with a fine climate and luxurious vegetation. The country is the most important and the most suitable for settlers to be found in the whole of the Province of British Columbia. I am sorry to detain hon. gentlemen opposite, while I read a few words from the "Guide to British Columbia," in which this country is described.

MR. MACKENZIE: Who wrote the description?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am not able to say who it was written by, because I do not find the name of the author given; but I am happy to tell hon. gentlemen opposite if they are at all sceptical as to the value of the authority, they will find a similar description in the able report of Mr. Dawson, of the Geological Survey of 1877, which affords abundant confirmation of what I shall here read. Speaking of the New Westminster district we find the following:—

"The Fraser River does not come from the Cascade range, but from the Rocky range. It is the only river in British Columbia (except in the far northwest of the Province) which has strength to cross the dry country between the Rocky and Cascade ranges, and get through the latter range to the sea. It is fed in its course by streams running from every point of the compass—a noble river, but navigable only for considerable stretches, owing to rapids. Yale is the head of steamboat navigation from the sea. After bursting through the mountain passes at Yale and Hope, the Fraser is a tranquil, steady, clay-coloured stream for the latter part of its course."

"This country, on the lower portion of the Fraser, is what I may call the New Westminster district. It is in general a wooded district, but has large tracts of open, arable, and grazing land, delicious atmosphere—no malaria or ague—water carriage, facilities for shipment. Snow begins in January, and is gone by March; not continuous; plenty of

fish and game in the district; will raise anything Vancouver Island will raise, and more; three large saw mills, employing 600 people; a grist mill, distillery, Farmers' Society, etc. About 200 settlers located themselves in this district during 1874.

"The *Mainland Guardian* (New Westminster Journal) said, in March, 1872: A minimum yield of from thirty to forty bushels of wheat to the acre is the ordinary average yield in the districts of Kamloops, Okanagan, Nicola, Sumass, Chilliwack, and the Lower Fraser. Between the town of New Westminster and the mouth of the river, a yield very much exceeding this is often obtained, not because of better or more suitable soil, but solely due to more careful cultivation; 50 bushels of oats, and an equal yield of barley, per acre, are commonly reached. Indian corn yields per acre 60 or 70 bushels. The yield of roots and green crops is generally encouraging, being unsurpassed by any in the world.

"On one farm the yield of potatoes was seven tons, on another as high as fifteen tons per acre. Not a few specimens reached the enormous weight of 2½ and even 3lbs. Turnips give 25 tons to the acre. Onions from four to six tons; while carrots, cabbages, beets, cauliflowers, etc., grow to a size which may, without exaggeration, be described as enormous.

"Of fruits it may be enough to state, that the ordinary kinds (apples, pears, plums, cherries, currants, gooseberries, strawberries, etc.,) found in the eastern part of the Dominion and in England, grow luxuriantly and yield plentifully."

NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT.—SPECIAL DESCRIPTION.

"I will describe the New Westminster district, beginning at the mouth of the River Fraser:—

"We find there extensive, low, rich, 'tidelands or flats,' free from timber, with patches of willows, rose bushes, and, about the border of higher ground, crab-apples. A coarse grass called 'swamp hay' is plentiful. There are a good many salt water sloughs, which add to the difficulty of dyking.

"Farm after farm is being occupied in this section, and there is room for settlers. There are 29,000 acres of very good land in an island between the north and south arm of the Fraser.

"On the north arm, a small settlement of about twenty farmers; 500 acres cultivated; samples of white and red wheat, described as 5½ ft. high, yielding 50 bushels to the acre; average, of course, less. Two potatoes ('Breeley Prolific') yielded 67lbs. Timothy hay, barley, oats, peas, etc., good."

"A district exactly like the mouth of Fraser district, indeed part of it, within the United States territory, near the mouth of the Lummi, and back from Semiahmoo, is filling up with population rapidly.

"Ascending the Fraser, we in no long time come to forests on each side; giant pine; cedars, alders, maple, cottonwood; real agricultural value of land cannot be seen. Luxuriant vegetation in the forest—berry bushes of all kinds, also ferns, ground-creepers, moss

—the sweet scented white flowers of the wild apple tree shine among the green foliage of summer. Scenery and products altogether on a grand scale. But let the settler take heart; he is beside the sea here, no railway carriage to the seaboard? there is much good land requiring little clearing, plenty well worth the clearing. There are in parts extensive flats covered with wild hay, also fine prairies with fertile soil, excellent crops and dairy yield, thriving farms near the town of New Westminster, and settlements also at Pitt River, Keatsey, Langley, Matsqui, etc. For instance, at Pitt River 20,000 acres of good arable land, requiring no clearing—the part of it subject to freshets is good now for grazing."

"At Larg'ey, a newspaper correspondent (*Daily Standard*, Victoria, November, 1872) describes farms with 'several hundred acres of alluvial soil, black mould with clay bottom; at your feet several square miles of green meadow land, the gleaming river beyond, and across it the dark Cascade range; a stream, full of trout, meandering through the meadow.' Another farm of '100 acres, every part cultivated, drained, and laid off into large parks of thirty to forty acres each; the steading in the form of a square; a fine mansion house.' Another of '800 acres, 200 cultivated, fine black soil, all fit for the plough, drained by a stream which skirts it.' Again, '600 acre grass dairy farm; cows, Durham breed; farmer cures butter.' The next, '300 acres, the stock and crop owned by the blacksmith. Good public school; neat Presbyterian Church.' The writer ascribes an extraordinary production to these farms."

"Higher up the river still, where the rivers Sumass and Chilliwack join the Fraser, are rising settlements—Sumass Prairie, 25,000 acres. Prime beef, choice butter and cheese, fine cereals, wide-spreading fertile prairies and valleys here, thinly peopled yet; sixty to eighty farms; good dwellings, barns, stables, churches, schools, shops, grist-mill; 600 acres wheat raised last year, forty to fifty bushels an acre; 200 acres oats; also potatoes, peas, beans, hops, fruit and even tobacco; supply beef to Yale and Hope (Yale gets some beef also from Nicola); extent of prairies great; much good land also on the Chilliwack above the valley that would do well when cleared."

OKANAGAN COUNTRY.

"Very fine stock country, and will also produce grain; yield fall wheat only without irrigation; also profusely oats, barely, Indian corn, potatoes, tomatoes, musk-melons, water-melons, grape-vines, tobacco. Summer warm, has shown 93° in the shade, cold is sharp in winter, but weather clear and sunny, snow seldom deep, and never lies long, cattle, horses and sheep as a rule, unboxed in winter; moderate preparation, however, recommended.

"The lake, seventy miles long by one and a-half miles wide; country to the east of it a fair sample of the best districts between Rocky and Cascade ranges; open, grassy hills, dotted with trees like English parks, successive hills and dales; lakes, ponds, and streams full

of fish; soil much the same general character as the Similkameen; rich sandy loam, substratum of clay in some valleys, stretches of 'bottom' land, some alkali patches; some settlers coming in fast, and taking up land, since Canadian Pacific Railway began. Those who would have 'soid out' a year ago are now tilling and improving their land. It is said that in Okanagan and adjoining districts there is room for a farming population of 10,000 souls (allowing 160 acres for nine persons.) Roman Catholic mission post (1,100 feet above sea level) on the east side of the lake; fine country behind it. On the west side of the lake, a little distance back, runs a low mountain range, from which detached spurs press upon the lake, and rise above the waters in precipitous bluffs; excellent pasture, particularly on small spits jutting into the lake. The Cherry Creek silver mine has been abandoned for the present.

"Near the north end of the lake is an Indian reserve of very choice land."

KAMLOOPS-SHUSWAP DISTRICT.

"Let us enter the district from the east. Columbia River is forty-four miles from Shuswap Lake, via Eagle Pass. Three Valley Lake (altitude 1,912 feet), is about thirty-four miles from Shuswap Lake. Directly south from Three Valley Lake is a long, wide, grassy valley, which leads across a low 'divide' to the head waters of the Shuswap or Spillimeechene River. This is a gentle river, flowing through a large valley, much of which has clay sub-soil; fine fall wheat without irrigation; very good and heavy crops here; large farm buildings; well fenced fields; Indians at work on farms; fine bunch grass on the high land, round which the river makes a southern bend.

"A farmer on the Shuswap Prairie thrashed out eighty tons of wheat in 1879; two other farmers forty tons each. Prices here of very superior extra flour, \$12 (48s. English) per barrel of 19½ lbs.; choice bacon, 25 cents (1s. 0½d. English) per lb.; juicy beef, 10 cents (5d. English) per lb.

"Leaving the Shuswap or Spillimeechene River at a point, say beyond where Cherry Creek joins it, there is between that point and the head of the Okanagan Lake a district of open prairie and sparsely timbered land, abounding in rich pasturage and dotted with a few farming settlements.

"From the head of Okanagan Lake to the Thompson River (South branch) is about 45 miles northwest. Leaving the open, rolling, bunch-grass valleys of Okanagan, you first ascend for about twenty miles through timber land; reach Grand Prairie—fine soil; luxuriant bunch-grass, dotted with cattle; the prairie sixteen miles by two miles, bounded by hills; a river between; elevation (1,450 feet) causes some danger from night frost. Grand Prairie to Thompson River—glittering stream through valley, bordered by alders and willows, green meadows, clumps of trees, small lakes; good soil, ready for cultivation.

"There is an open, or lightly timbered bunch grass country along the banks of the North Thompson River, and north of Kamloops Lake for 130 miles.

"Several English gentlemen, from the American side, have taken a prairie of 2,000 acres on the North Thompson, a short distance from Kamloops, and are making a long ditch for irrigation.

"In 1871, the yield of grain on the Tranquil and north and south branches of the Thompson River, was a million and a-quarter pounds.

"The whole Kamloops-Shuswap district is a district of table land, with considerable depressions—abundant pasture, generally free from forests, and only interspersed with timber; summer climate dry, great heat; winter frequently very cold for a day or two, but on the whole not very sharp; snow generally lies a short time only; cattle are driven here to winter, in severe seasons; Hudson's Bay Company used to 'winter out' 500 horses here, including brood mares and young horses. This district will doubtless become known again as a mineral district. The first gold found in quantity by the natives was found in this district, and fair wages are still made on the Thompson River. The Thompson, near its mouth, is too full, rapid, and rocky for mining."

NICOLA COUNTRY.

"Directly south from Kamloops, 30 miles, is Nicola Lake. The road at present from Kamloops is a sort of natural trail over gently undulating but high open country, with fine grass. First few miles no herbage; many ravines. At the first height, turn and survey the magnificent scenery of the Thompson River valleys; will give some idea of the grazing resources of the Province. Can bring a waggon with light load across from Kamloops to Nicola Lake, if you take a guide, an axe and a spade."

LILLOET-CLINTON DISTRICT.

"This district includes Cache Creek, Bonaparte, also William Lake, and up to Quesnel Mouth.

"The whole district is a very fine one, and at present shows what can be done by applying capital to the soil. It is farther to the north, and generally more elevated than some sections already described. The risks of crops from summer night frosts may be said to be very considerable in the entire country on the waggon-road north to Pavillion Mountain, unless farms have a south aspect or are protected from north blasts. The remark applies more particularly to farms farther north than Alexandria.

"The surface in so large a section of country is, of course, varied. It embraces within its area fertile river-benches (terraces), table-lands, large open valleys, immense plains and great rolling hills.

"The country near the Thompson, Bonaparte, and Hat Rivers is very attractive to the eye; miles of green hills, crowning slopes, and level meadows; hardly a bush or a tree; fine grass almost to the hill-tops. The climate very healthful and enjoyable; rather a want of timber in parts, also of rain generally, but there are many streams.

"For grazing, the country cannot be surpassed, and its agricultural capabilities, so far

as the soil is concerned, are in many parts very good. At Cache Creek and on the Bonaparte there is excellent arable land. The country through which the waggon-road passes to Williams Lake has some very good soil, with no more timber than is needed for farming purposes. The farming land is bounded by low hills, beyond which there are prairies and valleys. These hills are undulating and brightly green, and their grassy carpet is daisied over with countless wild flowers."

I have no doubt when my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has completed his improvements, we shall get 100 to 150 miles of navigation, up into the mineral regions, that will become available.

MR. BLAKE: Will it yield as much as Vancouver Island?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: He does not say anything about that.

MR. MACKENZIE: It ought to do that, I should think.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I do not think that hon. gentlemen should abuse Vancouver Island after agreeing to expend \$4,000,000 upon it. I may say that the horses owned by the Government are, in the Kamloops district, unhoused during the winter, and have been found to be in good condition in the spring. No part of British Columbia is better suited for settlement and cultivation than that of the Kamloops district.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is the best part of the country.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: There is no doubt of it; and that is one of the reasons for adopting it as the railway route. Hon. gentlemen opposite exercised a wise and sound discretion in committing the country to the construction of the 125 miles now put under contract, and which will bring us in communication with the navigation of the north and south Thompson, and render access to the rich mines of Cariboo comparatively easy. The gold and coal mines will be made accessible by easy and rapid communication, and promote, as the hon. gentleman said to his constituents at Sarnia, the opening up of the inaccessible parts where there are inexhaustible riches in the bosom of the earth. Well, Sir, we resolved not to waste time in surveys, but to make a rapid exploration of the route to Port Simpson, and undertake at once the construction in accordance with our pledge to Parliament. Upon determining that the line to Burrard Inlet was

the best, we should have been false to ourselves and obliged to sacrifice the best interests of the country if we did not act promptly and carry it out. In putting this section under contract I am glad to be able to say that the contracts will not be found to be fraught with the danger that hon. gentlemen might suppose, unless they take the trouble to read them. They have been let in maximum quantities: after putting in everything that could possibly be required, \$1,000,000 extra is added for any possible contingencies. The contracts themselves amount to \$9,167,000; \$1,000,000 of that is for contingencies. The contracts are let by the yard, but the Government have ascertained by proper evidence the very outside quantities possible required for the construction of a first-class road and the Government have reserved power to cut down the work to any extent that may be found practicable, and at the same time to construct a road of the cheapest description from Kamloops to Yale. By carefully laying out the work, by carefully watching its progress, by carefully reducing the work, by increasing the curvature and increasing the grades, if necessary and advisable, we may finish and equip the road below the actual amount, as stated in the contract; and we have also reserved the power to stop the work at any moment.

MR. BLAKE: Could you do it now?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I still hope to prove to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) that it would not be in the interest of the country to bring this work to a stand, to tarnish the fair fame of Canada by declaring that we were ready to repudiate solemn engagements, simply because they were entered into by our predecessors. We do not bind ourselves to build the road by 1890, as they did; we limited our obligation to build that road by the greater obligations that we owe to Canada, not to do anything that will materially interfere with the interests of the Dominion. We will not hold ourselves bound—although the hon. gentleman has pledged us to do it—to spend \$2,000,000 per annum. We do not expect to spend \$1,000,000 this year; and if we stop the contractor at any time, if, through any disturbance of the hon. the Minister of Finance's calculations or otherwise, it may be found expedient to

do so, we can stop the work without paying one dollar for loss, or for the profits the contractors might otherwise have made. If that stoppage is ordered for six months, we must make compensation by extending six months to the time allowed for the completion of the contract. I expect, with the utmost confidence, that that road will be finished and equipped with a moderate amount of rolling-stock in as cheap a manner as is compatible with safety in going over it, and that the whole of the cost will come within the \$9,000,000. I will now refer to the objections to the Burrard Inlet route made a year ago. First that it was too near the American frontier—

MR. MACKENZIE: Have you not shifted the frontier?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: We cannot prevent our line being exposed to having its traffic carried to a terminus in the United States; but there was a more important matter—that the Burrard Inlet could be commanded by guns on San Juan Island, and we considered how that difficulty could be met.

MR. BLAKE: It might be done by getting a big gun ourselves.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The hon. gentleman says by getting a big gun ourselves; but we have another mode of meeting the difficulty, namely, by the construction, when required, of eight miles of railroad, from the harbour of Esquimault to Sanwich Inlet, which will enable us to get to Burrard Inlet, and thus avoid one of the principle objections that I raised last year. The hon. gentleman will not have the opportunity, I think, to throw the taunt across the House that I carried out a policy to which I was opposed. I had the candour to say, last year, in the light of all that was then known, that I would select Burrard Inlet, and all we asked the House to say was that the location of that line was premature. The subsequent exploration and examination confirmed us in the course we adopted, and having made this examination, I think we disposed of the word "premature." Having pronounced the policy of the construction of this road by the appropriation of 100,000,000 acres of lands, the Government felt it was necessary to put before the world the most authentic information we could get in relation to that land, and,

notwithstanding that a large amount of money has been expended on surveys, I think it is not so large as we have been led to suppose. Some \$900,000 charged for surveys, should have gone towards construction, because it was really in relation to the location and construction of the road. But, as the hon. First Minister of that day told the House, this was no ordinary survey. We were exploring a country running from Nipissing to St. James' Bay, running from Vancouver Island to Fort Simpson, and running from the fifty-first to the fifty-sixth parallel of latitude across the continent. The Report I laid upon the Table of the House last year, was accompanied by a map giving the best information in possession of the Government in relation to the lands in the North-West. In this map the portions of the country about which we had no definite information as to its value for settlement, were indicated; and I am happy to be able to say that, from the explorations of the past season, we are now able to say that from the foot of the Rocky Mountains to the western boundary of Manitoba, we can find 150,000,000 acres of good land, and only 30,000,000 acres of land unfit for settlement.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is not the Railway belt.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes, it is. The hon. gentleman can see that for himself from the map.

MR. CHARLTON: Does it cover the Peace River district?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It does to some extent. I am happy to be able to state that the surveys will be completed on the first day of July this year, and that every dollar in the Estimates for the coming season will be expended in the construction of the road. Although, in connection with the diversion of the line south of Lake Manitoba, to run through a country valuable for settlement—the best country for the railroad to pass through and to promote colonisation as rapidly as possible—the length of the line was increased some twenty miles, nearly four miles were saved between Thunder Bay and the Red River. We have found a good line between Winnipeg and the Rocky Mountains, escaping the enormous gullies to the south of Edmonton Pass, which shortens the road by ten miles or more.

MR. MACKENZIE: This is not measured yet.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: No; we are obliged to deal with approximate measurements in order to discuss this question at all. I am also happy to be able to say that, so far from the second 100 miles being open to the criticisms of the hon. gentleman, we have not only got a good line, but we have just received tenders for the construction of probably as heavy a section of line as there is between Red River and the foot of the Rocky Mountains, under \$500,000 for 100 miles. The grades will not exceed those of the Grand Trunk or Great Western Railways. If there is any part of the line which it is important should have the best possible grade, it is that between the country from the Red River to Lake Superior. No person who heard the elaborate statement of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, the other night, can doubt but that the population will increase in the country as rapidly as he depicted.

MR. BLAKE: Hear, hear.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I will refer the hon. gentleman to the Grit Bible for evidence of the accuracy of those statements. I have here an extract from the *Globe* newspaper:

"It would not indicate extravagant hope to say that 1,000,000 people will be in the North-West Territories before the 1,400 miles already considered have been constructed. But let us say that only 500,000 people are then in the North-West. If they contribute to the Dominion Treasury in the same proportion as the people of the other Provinces, they will increase the Revenue by \$3,000,000 a year. The 1,300 miles of Railway we treat of will certainly cost more than \$30,000,000 when completed and equipped. That sum represents an annual payment of interest of \$1,200,000, so that no less than \$1,800,000 would remain to the good. Part of it would, of course, go in expenses of government and protection for the 500,000 people contributing the whole, but it is easy to see that the Dominion has nothing to lose by carrying the Pacific Railway to the Rocky Mountains at an early date."

This is a corroboration of the statement, that we will be able to build the whole road from the Customs duty alone of the 500,000 people that will shortly go into that country. Under the circumstances, I am astonished at hon. gentlemen opposite arraying themselves in an attitude of hostility to this work, on the ground that it is going to

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

plunge us into financial difficulties. Although I am not prepared to admit the accuracy of everything that appears in the *Globe*, I believe that the editor never penned a wiser or more patriotic article than the one I have just quoted. No man has been more unjustly assailed by that newspaper than myself, but after reading that article I am prepared to forgive that paper everything. I feel that at last, actuated by patriotic sentiments in a crisis like this, the editor feels bound to come forward and cast his great influence in favour of this important work, demanded alike by good faith and the best interests of Canada. The same article continues:

"We now come to the Lake Superior section, which is certainly a political necessity, but not required till the prairie line has been completed and connected with Thunder Bay. It is, as we have shown, reasonable to suppose that at least half a million people will be on the plains when the Pacific Railway reaches the Rocky Mountains. Every family going in afterward will increase the quantity of produce available for export. The population of the United States doubled itself in twenty-five years; in several western territories the population has been doubled in ten years. The Canadian North-West will gain by emigration continually, and—as always happens where fertile land can be easily procured—births will be very numerous. By the time the line to the Rocky Mountains has been completed it will be wise to push on the road around Lake Superior, because before it can be built at a fair rate of speed a large traffic will await its opening. The Lake Superior section, from the eastern terminus of the main Pacific to Fort William, will be 620 miles long, and when completed will offer to the traffic of the Canadian and to a large part of the American North-West the shortest all-rail-route to the seaboard. It is not needed till the prairies have been opened up by the line to the Rocky Mountains. After that has been built it may be safely completed as a commercial road, one that will pay better year by year, and will ultimately be a very valuable property."

What is our present position? On the 31st December last we had expended \$14,159,665. I will give the items: The expenditure on the lines from Lake Superior to Red River has been \$4,866,861; on telegraphs, \$505,039; Pembina Branch, exclusive of rails, \$511,214; on rails, bolts, and spikes for the road altogether, up to the 31st December, \$2,958,062.

MR. MACKENZIE: What has been done with the old rails?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Those are the old rails. I am not including any considerable amount of the rails purchased since, because the payments up to

the 31st December have not been made to any large extent. On the Canada Central there was spent \$563,715. I am glad to be able to say, in connection with the contract for the section west of Red River, that the contractor entertains no doubt of opening fifty miles by July, and of laying the track, and being able to carry passengers over the 100 miles by the end of the season. We also expect to be able to complete the first fifty miles of the second 100, west of Manitoba, by the July following, and the remainder during the year 1881. For engineering and miscellaneous expenditures in connection with construction, \$993,000; payments not under contract, including such as for land at the Kaministiquia, and dredging at Thunder Bay, etc., \$247,300. The total for construction, \$1,709,257, to the 31st December last. Explorations, preliminary surveys, and general examination of the whole country from Nipissing to James' Bay in the east, and in British Columbia* on the west, from Victoria, to Fort Simpson, extending throughout from the 49th parallel to the 56th parallel, \$3,119,618. Total expenditure upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, including the Pembina Branch, \$13,848,876. There is another item of Pacific Railway accounts of \$22,995, being a payment on the Dawson route in settlement with one of the contractors, and on the Fort Frances Locks, which cost \$287,795, which, being one hundred miles away from the line, I do not think ought to be charged to the Canadian Pacific Railway account. But including this it reaches the total to the end of the year of \$14,159,665.

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

After Recess.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Before six o'clock, I was about taking up the question of the expenditure that will be required to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway. I will now submit a calculation I believe to be an outside one, or above the probable outlay. This estimate has been prepared by a gentleman who has had the widest and best opportunity of forming a deliberate and dispassionate judgment on the subject—a gentleman whose ability, in my opinion, is only exceeded by his caution—Mr. Sandford

Fleming, Engineer-in-Chief of the Canada Pacific Railway. However much this estimate of expenditure may be reduced, I am sure it cannot be exceeded. The distance from Lake Superior to Burrard Inlet is 1,956 miles; that is adding twenty miles for the diversion of the line to the south of Lake Manitoba, and deducting three and three-quarters miles for the reduction in the distance between Lake Superior and Red River, and the shortening by the change of route passing north of Edmonton instead of south as before. That total includes the Fort William and Selkirk section of 406 miles as now reduced; and for that I submit an estimate for completion in the manner intended as a first-class road, and with a thorough equipment for the large traffic expected, and including terminal stations, \$17,000,000, or \$1,000,000 less for the reasons stated than my estimate of last year. The 1,000 from Selkirk to Jasper Valley, the dividing point just beyond the foot of the Rocky Mountains, including a light equipment—all that will be required for some years—Mr. Fleming estimates at \$13,000,000, that is \$3,000,000 more than the average estimate for the 200 miles west of Red River, in order to be entirely safe. We have 100 miles actually under contract, and have received tenders for the other 100 miles, and I do not expect the average cost to exceed that of the 100 miles just let.

MR. BLAKE: What is the amount estimated for the equipment per mile?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: A light equipment is all we shall require for some years.

MR. BLAKE: Will it be \$1,000 or \$2,000 per mile?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: When the traffic demands a heavier equipment there will be means for providing it.

MR. BLAKE: I only want to know your estimate in dollars.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It is \$13,000 per mile, as against an estimate we should be justified in giving of \$10,000 a mile, making \$3,000,000 more than the average of the amount probably needed to complete and supply with a fair equipment the 200 miles we have under contract on the prairies. From Jasper Valley to Port Moody the distance is 550 miles. From Jasper to Kamloops, in British Columbia, to which

the portion now under contract extends, is 335 miles, which can be constructed, I believe, for \$40,000 a mile. But Mr. Fleming, more cautious, has given an outside estimate of \$43,660 a mile. This is much heavier than the prairie district but is light compared to the section we have let in the canyons of the Fraser. That will give \$15,500,000 for the section from Jasper House to Kamloops. From Kamloops to Yale is 125 miles, which Mr. Fleming estimates at \$80,000 a mile, or \$10,000,000 to complete the road, with a fair equipment for any traffic likely to be required. In my opinion we may set down, instead of \$10,000,000, \$9,000,000 for that work. From Yale to Port Moody, 90 miles, he estimates at about \$38,888 a mile, or \$3,500,000. Those 550 miles foot up to \$29,000,000, to which, with his usual caution, Mr. Fleming adds \$1,000,000; this makes, with the \$17,000,000 for the road from Fort William to Red River, and \$13,000,000 from Red River to Jasper Valley, \$30,000,000 from that point to Burrard Inlet, a total of \$60,000,000. To that, add for surveys and explorations, not included in the cost of engineering and locations, and other operations, \$3,119,618. The House will be very much surprised to learn the lavish expenditure of the late Government in British Columbia, if, at the time, the then Premier did not intend to carry the work to completion. From June, 1871, to June, 1872, surveys in British Columbia cost \$182,216; from 1872 to 1873, \$315,000—the late Government, of course, not being responsible for that. From 1873 to 1874, \$118,000; from 1874 to 1875, \$191,241; from 1875 to 1876, \$330,162; from 1876 to 1877, no less than \$273,788, or \$600,000 for those two years; from 1877 to 1878, \$126,476; from 1878 to 1879, \$50,112; and from July, 1879, to December, \$25,000 more, making a total of \$1,611,997 for surveys in British Columbia. To that, add the expenditure between Lakes Nipissing and Superior, and between Lake Superior and Red River and the Rocky Mountains, in all \$1,507,621, making a total of \$3,119,618 to be added to the \$60,000,000, embracing all the other expenditures in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, except the Pembina Branch. The Pembina Branch is estimated to cost, when finished and

equipped, \$1,750,000, making in all, including the construction from Lake Superior to Burrard Inlet, and all the surveys, a sum of \$64,869,618. That completes the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the exception of 600 miles from Fort William to Nipissing, the terminal point.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is more than 600 miles.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: After the Canada Central Company extend their line to the Sault on the line I expect they will follow, it will be considerably less than 600 miles, because we will strike the Canada Central some sixty or seventy miles west of the southeast bay of Lake Nipissing. Therefore, my estimate is more likely to be over the mark than under it. I am inclined to think, from the surveys that have been prosecuted during the past year, from Nipigon to Fort William, and a good easy line can be obtained, so much so as to make it doubtful whether it may not be desirable to go to Fort William rather than to strike the line from Lake Superior to Red River, some fifty or sixty miles outside the present terminus. I have also had a survey made from Nipigon eastward to Long Lake, and the line there is much more favourable than was before supposed. The line from Nipissing towards the head of Lake Superior is also found to be an extremely favourable line, running through an even country, well timbered; so that I am happy to be able to say that the completion of our national through line of railway from Ottawa to the waters of the Pacific—I may say from Halifax, on the Atlantic, to the waters of the Pacific—will be attended with much less difficulty and expense than we have been led to suppose down to the present time. I need not say we do not propose to grapple with the whole of this work at the present moment, but I believe that with the prospect of the development of the great North-West and the increase of population, at a comparatively early day, the pressure for the construction of the through line will ere long become so great as to warrant and compel that work being undertaken as essential in the interests of Canada. Now, I believe we may safely put the cost of that work at \$30,000 a mile. In the first place, we will have

easy access to it by the Canada Central, at or near Sturgeon River, sixty or seventy miles west of the present terminus at South East Bay. From the head of Lake Superior at Nipigon we will again strike the line by water communication, and at Fort William we will have a railway for the purpose of reaching it at that end. Striking at these three points, I believe we may safely put that work at \$30,000 a mile, which would add \$18,000,000 to complete this great national highway. If we were to put it at \$30,000 a mile, an amount to which it may be safely reduced, we make a total of \$82,869,618. Mr. Fleming estimates this 600 miles at \$20,000,000, which would make \$84,869,618. When I remind the House that the land alone, according to the authority of the right hon. Minister of the Interior, upon the calculation which he believes to be sound, within the next ten years will give us \$38,000,000 in hand, and \$32,000,000 to receive on mortgages within the following ten years, or a total sum of \$70,000,000, it will be seen that we incur no risk. But suppose the land does not give us that, we have an authority with hon. gentlemen opposite will accept: that the Customs Revenue from the people, who will go into the country for the next ten years will furnish the interest on \$60,000,000. I have no hesitation in saying that the whole sentiment of the country has changed on this question. I am not at all ashamed to say that my own opinions have completely changed in relation to the character of this great work. I remember well that when the then First Minister brought in his Act in 1874, for the construction of this as a Government work, I felt that we were incurring too great a responsibility. I believed, at that time, it was an unsafe and unsound policy for the Government of this country to undertake the construction of this great national work from end to end as a Government work, and I did not hesitate to express my opinions as freely and as forcibly as I could on the occasion of the passage of that measure. But the whole condition of Canada has changed since then. There is not an intelligent man in this country who does not look upon the prospect of the settlement and development of the North-West with entirely different feelings from those

that were then entertained. Why, who could listen to the glowing statements of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he pictured the enormous tide of emigration into the North Western States, and pointed out that a similar tide was only waiting for an opportunity to pour into our own North-West; who could listen to the evidence the hon. gentleman gave that the investment of \$54,000,000 capitalised, would have given the United States all the money that had been received from those lands, and enable them to have disposed of them by free grants instead of by sale, without feeling that he was furnishing the strongest evidence of the safety of the course that this Government was adopting in grappling with this question. By our land regulations we present these fertile regions of our North-West Territory in a more attractive form for settlement than even the lands in the United States were offered, and, at the same time, held within our grasp, for sale, lands enough to more than recoup Canada for every dollar expended on this Railway. Let me again quote an opinion that is much stronger with hon. gentlemen opposite than anything I can utter, that is, an article in the great organ of their party, the *Globe*, which, after a most careful examination of this whole question, says:

“It is admitted by everyone that the plains of the North-West Territories are exceedingly fertile, and capable of sustaining, by agriculture, a population twice as numerous as the present population of the United States. It is also admitted that a railway from Selkirk to the Rocky Mountains will open up the country so rapidly that in a very few years the line will pay, as a commercial enterprise. There is nothing to be gained by constructing it much faster than a continuous westward settlement can be made on the adjacent belt of land. But no one can doubt that it will pay the Dominion well to build that piece of road. It will be 900 miles long, or over one-third of the whole Pacific Railway. * * * We find, then, that no less than 1,924 miles of the proposed Pacific Road may be fairly considered as a commercial enterprise. That it is also a national enterprise, is a very poor argument against the project. When the road has been carried from the eastern terminus to the Rocky Mountains, it is safe to say that the population of the North-West will be great enough to contribute to the Dominion Treasury a larger sum than will pay the interest on the loan, for which the older Provinces must first pledge their credit. We have taken no account of the land sales, which must, if well managed,

put every year, a large and continually increasing sum into the hands of the Government. * * * But there is a political side to the question. British Columbia will feel aggrieved unless some attempt is made to keep faith with her. To develop the resources of the Province in advance of the completion of the Pacific road, is not an unreasonable wish. There is a considerable tract of good Territory along the lakes and rivers of the proposed Yale-Kamloops section. That piece of road will cost perhaps \$12,000,000 when equipped, and it is proposed to finish it during the next five years. Canada is asked to spend \$2,400,000 a year for the purpose of colonizing and contending British Columbia. The interest on the money will be \$96,000 the first year, and \$480,000 in the last and each year thereafter. Now, it may be thought that this is not a large annual sum to pay for a piece of road, which, though not necessary to the older Provinces, must be built some time, and in the meantime will materially

INCREASE THE WEALTH AND POPULATION OF THE PACIFIC PROVINCE.

If 100,000 people settle in British Columbia during the construction of the road—and there is every reason why that number should go there in the course of a few years—the Dominion will receive from them a Revenue sufficient to pay the interest on the expenditure. It is no unimportant consideration that the people of the Pacific Province would rebel against the total abandonment of the line, and by clamoring for secession endanger the permanence of Confederation."

I trust these statements will relieve the hon. gentlemen opposite of any apprehension they may have as to the entire safety of at once undertaking the work, in the cautious manner the Government have adopted. Now, I must refer once more to that great authority in the estimation of the hon. gentlemen opposite. On the opening day of the Session, and long before that, at the time the Government were engaged in this exploration to Port Simpson, and investigating as to whether it were possible to find an easier line, what was the *Globe* telling British Columbia :

"If Mr. Mackenzie had not been deprived of power, that route, at this moment, would have been under construction, and being rapidly pushed to completion."

The *Globe*, no doubt, when it found the hon. gentleman not only advertising for tenders, but actually making an expenditure of \$32,400 in hot haste during the progress of a General Election, to move the rails from Esquimault to Yale, concluded that he was just as serious as I concluded he was. I was

not alone, for the organ of his party seems to have been labouring under the same misconception, as a reference to the *Globe* will show. Not only did the *Globe* say that, but it also stated, on the opening day of this Session, if I remember rightly, at the time the hon. leader of the Opposition was actually intimating that he was prepared to go back upon his own record, and abandon the keeping of good faith with British Columbia, to which he had pledged this country, it told the people that if he had not lost power the work would have been under construction at that moment. I need not say more than that to show how thoroughly the hon. gentleman had convinced every person of his intention to go forward with that work. I dare say I will be told by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake): Granted that your figures are correct, assuming that you can build this Railway for even less money than you have estimated, you have only encountered the first difficulty; you have then to operate the line, and the cost of that will be so greatly beyond anything you can hope to obtain from it, that you will place an intolerable burthen upon the people of this country. I must address myself for a few moments to that question. I will first give the information I have just received from the Superintendent of the Pembina Branch :

"The 160 miles we have now opened in the North-West, shows that from the 1st day of March to the 12th day of April we have carried 5,236 passengers, and 1,248 loaded cars, containing 12,460 tons of freight. The gross receipts during that short period were \$36,387, and working expenses \$15,000, leaving a net profit of \$21,387, and this during a more difficult and stormy period than has been known for many years."

By July, 1882, we will have about 700 miles of this road in operation; we will have 85 miles from Selkirk to Emerson or St. Vincent. We will have 200 miles in operation west of the Red River, which, with the branch of 16 miles to Winnipeg, will give us some 700 miles in operation, without reference at all to the section in British Columbia. I have every reason to believe that every mile of that road, from the day it is opened, will make an ample return for all the expenditure incurred in its operation. I think it is safe to say that in every succeeding year, as we extend gradually this road towards the

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

Rocky Mountains, it will furnish such an additional volume of traffic from Red River to Thunder Bay, which will become the great *entrepot* of that country, as will prevent it from burthening the people, and give us some fair return for the interest on the money used in its construction. Hon. gentlemen must not forget, as I said before, that the whole aspect of affairs in this country has entirely changed within a brief period; that that which would have been properly regarded as highly imaginative in relation to the development of the Canadian North-West, must now be looked upon with very different eyes indeed. My hon. predecessor need only recall to his mind the fact that he publicly advertised, in 1876, offering \$10,000 a mile and 20,000 acres of land for the construction of the road, and asking how much more capital tenderers would require, 4 per cent. upon for twenty-five years, to induce them to undertake this work. And what was the response? Not a tender. So completely had the hon. gentleman opposite succeeded in imbuing the minds of capitalists in this country and abroad with the hopelessness of this enterprise, that not one of them would undertake it as a commercial enterprise, on any terms. What is the condition of things to-day. Supposing this Government were to put an advertisement like that in the papers asking on what terms capitalists would come forward and construct the road from Red River, to Kamloops, and repay us all the expenditure we have made beyond Red River, and undertake to maintain and operate not only all that part of that road, but the rest of the road down to Yale or Burrard Inlet? Would there be no response? If such a proposal were made to-morrow, does he not know that the first capitalists of this country would come to the front and offer to construct and operate that road on terms that would for ever settle the question as to whether this undertaking would be a serious burden on the people of this country. I have good reason to state that such an offer as that would secure the construction and operation of the whole line from Red River to Kamloops, with the operation and maintenance of all the road to the Pacific, at a cost not exceeding \$13,000, or \$10,000

per mile, from Red River to Kamloops, and 26,000,000 acres of land. In that case we would be in this position, as the hon. gentleman would see, that the whole expenditure of an unknown quantity, proving a burden that could not be calculated, would be entirely removed, and we would be in a position of having this great national work accomplished within ten years, and on terms that would involve comparatively light expenditure from the people of this country, and that would be a thousand times recouped from the development of the North-West.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not a thousand times.

MR. BLAKE: Nor a hundred.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: While I say recouped, and when I said a thousand fold, I did not mean, as the hon. gentleman knows, that the actual amount would be returned a thousand times. I meant that there would be such a development of the magnificent North-West of this country as would lift Canada rapidly into the position of a nation. And I would ask the hon. gentleman whether, under these circumstances, the Government is not in a position to say that they feel entirely free from any apprehension as to the cost either of the construction or the operation of this road after its construction. Before I sit down, I must refer to the question of cancelling the contract of the Georgian Bay Branch. As the hon. gentlemen know, the Georgian Bay Branch was undertaken without the necessary information. As the hon. gentlemen know, the policy of the Government of that day had to be completely changed after they ascertained the difficulties they would encounter, and the uselessness of the work after it was done. Instead of going from Nipissing to the Georgia Bay, it was decided to stop the road at Cantin's Bay, and canalise the French River from that point. The Government satisfied themselves that, in the interest of Canada, all the money that was expended south of Lake Nipissing would be thrown away. Having satisfied themselves of that, they cancelled that contract. It is now evident that the attention of the whole of this country is turned to the question of obtaining the shortest line of communication to our Great North-West by Sault Ste. Marie. Hon. gentlemen opposite

may remind me that, at one time, I entertained serious objection to going to Sault Ste. Marie, but the case is different to-day.

MR. MACKENZIE: Most other people are going to the States.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: There is nothing that makes one despair so much of the future of this country, as the determined, settled policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to decry and trample down their own country; but I tell hon. gentlemen they mistake the patriotism of our people if they imagine they will ever ride into power over the ruins of their country. What is wanted to give a rapid and decided impetus to the progress and prosperity of Canada is that patriotism in the hearts and minds of its sons, which will enable them to unite in taking up a great national question, free from the lowering and degrading tendency of party politics, which leads men to seek party and personal advantages at the cost of the country. When I opposed the construction of the line to the Sault, it was at a time when we had no line under construction from Thunder Bay to Red River; but the moment the Government was committed to the building of that line, it was our duty to look for means by which we could make it productive. What are those means? I have satisfied myself that the road, with its easy grade and cheap rate at which it will be able to bring down the products of the North-West, cannot possibly have a competitor. What would be the result of the extension of this road from Nipissing to the Sault Ste Marie? The distance from Montreal to Winnipeg *via* Chicago is 1,741 miles. But, suppose a road were built to the Sault, and a line was built to St. Paul along the south shore of Lake Superior, the distance by that route would be 1,563 miles. By Duluth, the shortest line to be obtained by way of the United States, would be 1,514 miles. From Montreal to Nipissing, and thence to Thunder Bay and on to Winnipeg, the distance would be 1,358 miles, while by the Sault Ste. Marie and water communication from Goulais Bay to Thunder Bay, it would be only 1,288 miles. I believe that with the character of our road, the cheapness with which we can bring the traffic of the North-West across it, there is no road, be it by way of Duluth or

St. Paul, that can compete with us. Therefore, I am glad that there is the prospect of seeing either the Canada Central or Pacific Junction carried through to the Sault, bringing our great North-West within sixty hours of Montreal, and Toronto 100 miles nearer, and that within a comparatively brief period. Those who will look at the Union Pacific Railway, and notice the enormous difficulties its builders had to contend with, will see ours is not a stupendous task. They had to go through a comparatively barren country compared with which ours is a garden. For more than a thousand miles they had to surmount heights of 4,500 feet above the level of the sea, while the passes through which we cross the Rocky Mountains are under 4,000. They have to go through a country where the snowfall in the passes reaches thirty feet, and where they have forty miles of snowsheds, to prevent trains from being buried. They have to pass through a country with steeper grades than we will have to encounter, and yet the road was built in the teeth of just such Parliamentary struggles as we are to-day obliged to endure. But, when constructed, the road silenced all opposition; and if, with a country which, according to a high American authority, embraces three-fourths of the remaining wheat zone on the American continent, if, with this advantage, and our other advantages, we hesitate in discharging our duty to the country, we should be unworthy of the position we occupy, either as statesmen or patriotic Canadians. No person can look abroad over the Dominion without feeling that the Great North-West Territory is the district to which we must look for our strength and development. Just as the older of the United States look to their Great North-West, with its rapidly increasing population, adding hundreds of thousands and millions to their strength, not only may we look for strength by reason of an additional Customs Revenue from the increased population of that Territory, but we must look upon that western country as a field for the manufacturing industries of the older and more settled parts of Canada. Every person acquainted with this country knows we have exhausted to some extent its bread-growing power, but under the National

Policy that Canada has adopted, we must look forward not only to building up thriving centres of industries and enterprise all over this portion of the country, but to obtaining a market for those industries after they have been established; and I say where is there a greater market than that magnificent granary of the North-West, which, filled up with a thriving and prosperous population, will make its demands upon Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for these manufacturing products that we, for many years, will be so well able to supply? I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite should have made this a battle ground of party. If there was a single question upon which the Government had a right to demand from hon. gentlemen opposite a hearty, cordial and unanimous support, it was on their endeavour to assume, and to deal with the responsibilities which they had placed upon the shoulders of the people of this country. I believe at the time they proposed their scheme they were doing an unwise and dangerous thing; but the improving times, the change that had come over the country, and the development of the North-West, had altered the position. At this moment the eyes of a large portion of the civilised world are centred upon the Great North-West of Canada, and hundreds of thousands of people in every foreign country, as well as the British Empire, are studying the question as to whether they shall come with their capital and industry and build up Canada into a great, prosperous and progressive country. Under these circumstances, hon. gentlemen opposite are unwise and unpatriotic in making this a battle ground of party. There was no necessity for it. I recognise, to the fullest extent, the advantage of having two great political parties grappling with each other, not on the low grounds of personal or party ambition, but on a great national question on which a broad line of demarcation can be made between them, and regarding which they can do battle for great principles on which they differ. We have such a question in the National Policy without dragging in the Pacific Railway. If we are defeated on that issue, hon. gentlemen opposite will take our places irrespective of the policy of the Pacific Railway. Having that line of

demarcation between us, let us, on the great national question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, unite as a band of brothers, irrespective of old parties, show not that we are Liberals or Conservatives, but that we are Canadians, and that in every word that is uttered, whether we sit on the Treasury Benches or on the Opposition side of the House, we feel we owe it to Canada, to ourselves and to our children, to do all that men can do to strengthen the hands of those who are engaged in a great national enterprise, upon the success of which the rapid progress and prosperity of our common country depends.

MR. BLAKE: I shall endeavour to bring forward the amendment of which I have given notice, in the spirit which my hon. friend opposite indicated as correct in the opening portion of his remarks notwithstanding his failure to show that spirit in the course of his speech. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in the view that this question is to be degraded by its discussion as a party question. We hear a good deal of that sort of thing when one party takes a line of argument inconvenient to the other party. Those who adopt that position, in effect condemn the institution of party altogether. They seem to argue that legitimate party questions are such only as are inferior, or of small magnitude; and that great questions should be handled on some other and higher principles. If so, what is the justification for party at all? But they do not carry out their view to its legitimate result in any aspect; for a moment later the hon. gentleman himself said that there was a most important, a most vital question—the so-called National Policy—which he rejoiced was made the battle ground of party. I do not know any reason why we who claim to be as true Canadians as the hon. gentleman—we who have just as great a stake in Canada as he has, we who have our interests here, we who are just as proud and just as hopeful and trustful of the future of this country, if only prudence shall guide her destinies, as the hon. gentleman can be—why we, the Liberal party, should not be free to express our united opinion as to what the interests of our country demand; and it is because, in our opinion, it is desirable that a postponement of the Western

Section of the Pacific Railway should take place, that I propose to place my amendment in your hands. The line of address adopted by my hon. friend obliges me to go a little more minutely into what I may call the antiquities of this question than I had intended. I must now advert to these antiquities a little more in detail than I would have done, not so much to discuss them in their party aspect, or to ascertain the extent to which each party has become committed, one way or another, not so much to ascertain who was right and who was wrong in the past, not so much with a view to recrimination as to determine what, on the whole, has been the settled policy of Parliament on the subject of increasing the burdens of the people on account of the Pacific Railway. It was on the 1st of April (a fitting day), in the year 1871, that hon. gentlemen opposite, then as now controlling public affairs, carried an address of this House, praying that British Columbia might be united with Canada, on a stipulation to be included in the Terms of Union, that the Pacific Railway should be commenced within two years and finished in ten years. At that stipulation of the Terms of Union the Opposition, and other hon. members not in their ranks, expressed an honest, a genuine alarm. The Terms of Union were believed to be prodigal in all their aspects, and ruinous in particular, with reference to the Railway stipulation. The scheme met with earnest opposition on the part of many not belonging to the Liberal party. There were several divisions upon it, and in one of these it nearly met its fate, the majority which served it being only ten. My hon. friend from Dundas, a supporter of the Administration, moved that amendment which went to postpone the consideration of the question until the sense of the people could be taken upon it. The Government became alarmed lest they should not be able to carry the scheme, and they gave assurances that some resolutions would be brought forward, which might serve as a defence to their followers against the public indignation, which it was apprehended might be aroused by their assenting to the bargain. The Address then passed. This was on the 1st of April; and it was not until the 4th of April that there was a proposal made in the

House for a definition of the liability for the construction of this Railway. The first proposal, made by Sir George Cartier in the absence of the then and now First Minister, and seconded by the present Finance Minister, was that the House would, on the following day, consider a resolution, "That the Railway should be constructed and worked as a private enterprise, and not by Government, and that the public aid to be given to the enterprise should consist of such liberal grants of land, and such subsidy in money or other aid not unduly pressing on the industry and resources of the Dominion, as the Parliament of Canada shall hereafter determine." This resolution was not satisfactory to the friends of the Government. It did not meet the exigencies of the case;—it was too elastic, too vague, it did not mean enough; and the consequence was that on the 11th of April, in substitution for that, a proposal was moved and seconded by the same hon. gentlemen in the same terms—with this exception, for the words "not unduly pressing upon the resources of Canada," the words "not increasing the present rate of taxation" were substituted. This was more precise. The alteration was made in order to satisfy the supporters of the Government, and if possible the people. The hon. the Minister of Railways asserts now, but I deny, that the Terms of Union were in form and fact modified by that resolution. During the debate, an hon. member of this House (Sir Antoine Dorion) moved an Address to Her Majesty praying her to incorporate the resolution into the Terms of Union. That motion was supported by the Liberal party, but was defeated by the votes of hon. gentlemen opposite, who insisted that no such resolution should be carried; that it would prevent the proposed Union, and deprive us of the inestimable blessings to flow from annexing British Columbia to this Dominion; and that the opportunity of so annexing that Province might be lost forever. The opportunity thus fairly offered to make that a condition of the Terms of Union was rejected by hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, I have always urged, and still urge, that the surrounding circumstances cannot be wholly ignored. Having regard to the fact that

delegates were here from British Columbia taking part in the discussion, having regard to the fact that the resolution was in a sense, though not officially, and as it is alleged without authority, recognised by them, I have always urged that British Columbia could not in equity and good conscience wholly ignore the resolution, but should remember that the Union was in fact obtained by means of the resolution; but I have been obliged to concede that she was not strictly and legally bound by the terms of that resolution, even if the work turned out to be such that its accomplishment would materially affect the interests of the Dominion, since the terms agreed to gave her, by the strict letter of the law, the right to insist that the work should be proceeded with, no matter what the consequences. She is entitled to say, "Here is my bond, I ask for my pound of flesh." There was then, subject to and not controlling the legal effect of the Terms of Union it is true, but still contemporaneous with them in 1871, a formal resolution declaratory of the desires and intentions of Parliament, that the work should not involve an increase in the taxation. The first Pacific Railway Act was passed in 1872, under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite. This Act recites the resolution against an increase in taxation and the propriety of carrying it out; and provides a limited quantity of land and money as the means. We were even then told that the remaining land would meet the money grant, which would cost us nothing. This was the second Parliamentary declaration against increased taxation for this object. The Government, in 1872, chartered a Company which deposited a million of money as security for the construction of the road. Subsequently the Company, which was dependent on the raising of foreign capital for its success, found that it could not obtain that capital without modified conditions, and asked for better terms, which the Government refused. It then proposed to surrender the charter, and receive back the million hard cash, which it had deposited in order to secure the fulfilment of its contract, and so sure were the Administration that they could make a better bargain with others, or so kindly disposed were they towards that particular Company, that they accepted

the surrender of the charter, and returned the money that had been deposited. They met the House shortly after, in the fall of 1873, and they had already found that some other and different arrangements would have to be made to accomplish the construction of the Pacific Railway. The Government of that day acknowledged that their scheme, their plan, their act, their charter, under which the Company which they had favoured had been incorporated, were failures and they declared that a new plan, requiring new legislation, would be submitted to the House for providing means to carry out that great enterprise. The Speech from the Throne delivered in 1873, contains these words:

"The Canadian Pacific Company, to whom a Royal Charter was granted, have, I regret to say, been unable to make the financial arrangements necessary for the construction of that great undertaking. They have, therefore, executed a surrender of their charter, which has been accepted by me. You will, I trust, feel yourselves called upon to take steps to secure the early commencement and vigorous prosecution of that railway, and thus to carry out in good faith the arrangement made with the Province of British Columbia. A measure for that purpose will be submitted for your consideration."

What kind of measure? Circumstances to which, after the tone taken by the hon. gentleman, it would be ill-bred to allude, prevented the new proposition from being brought down. The reign of the gentlemen who promised that new scheme suddenly came to a termination. It is very well known, however, that the new idea was not in fact a new idea, that the idea of the First Minister, as he stated publicly in the county of Lennox in 1873, always had been the same, namely, that the work should be constructed as a Government work, and that it would, if he had been in Ottawa during the Session in which the arrangement had been made, have been so undertaken; but the pressure of the Opposition had been so great that his colleagues had yielded, and for their action he admitted he was responsible, though his own views remained the same, that the work should be constructed as a Government work. Then what was the new plan which has never seen the light? It must have been a measure for construction by the Government in accordance with the opinions of its

chief. It was to be something different from the old plan. What other difference could there be? This proves that the cry of change of policy is not sincere. The new measure to be brought down must have been a change from construction by a company to construction by the Government. There is no other alternative. The Government resigned and the hon. member for Lambton assumed the position of First Minister. In his published address to the electors of Lambton, which stated the Ministerial policy on which the elections were held, my hon. friend declared that the bargain which had been made under the auspices of the late Government was one which could not be fulfilled. He stated that it would not do to commence the construction of the road until the country had been thoroughly surveyed, and that it would not do to prosecute the construction faster than the resources of the country would justify. He furthermore declared that application would be made to British Columbia for a relaxation of the terms which hon. gentlemen opposite had imposed upon the country; and for such an arrangement as would give a reasonable time for the commencement and performance of the work without too great a strain on our resources. The present First Minister denounced this as a breach of faith with British Columbia, entitling her to secede. So different were his views from those now advanced by the hon. Minister of Railways. Shortly after the elections, and after I had left the Government, a gentleman, formerly a member of this House (Mr. Edgar), was sent to British Columbia with a view of negotiating with that Province for a relaxation of the terms. The propositions were rejected or not accepted by the Government of British Columbia, and were withdrawn sometime in the month of June. Meantime the Session had been held, and a new Pacific Railway Act had been introduced. This second Act recited expressly all the previous resolutions against the increase of taxation. It recited that the taxation had been, to some extent increased in order to meet the obligations of the Dominion, and declared that it was proper to provide for the construction of the road as rapidly as the work could be accomplished without further raising the rate of taxation; and,

MR. BLAKE.

the former scheme having failed and it being impossible now to assume that the road could be constructed by means of a company, power was given by the Government to build sections as a Government work; but the avowed and stated policy of the Administration was to use that power only for the purpose of doing some parts of the work in advance of the completion of the surveys for the through line; and it has been repeatedly explained, by my hon. friend, the member for Lambton, that his intention was, as soon as the surveys were completed, to submit the whole of the road to tender, on a land and money basis, the contractors taking over, as cash on account, the works meantime executed by the Government. It was a scheme devised to make progress where, and so far as progress could be made consistently with the resolution against increased taxation. The Minister has complained that there was no reiteration of the declaration that the road should be built only by a company, but there was contained in the Act a power to do the work by means of a company. At any rate it was unnecessary to reiterate that. My belief is that it would have been contrary to the policy which the present First Minister believed to be sound when he announced his views in Lennox, in 1873. I maintain that, by that Act, which repeated and re-enacted the old resolutions, and declared it was proper to proceed only consistently with the provision against increased taxation, there was a reiteration of the old Parliamentary policy, then reaffirmed for the third time, that the road was not to be constructed on any plan which would cause increased taxation. I well remember that the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. DeCosmos) objected to the introduction of that provision into that Act, because he conceived it would be in derogation of the bond, the fulfilment of which he so much desired. In 1875, during the recess, British Columbia having appealed to England, Lord Carnarvon offered his good offices, and he suggested certain terms, to which, as far as they could, the Government agreed; the statement of the Government being that they would do their best to carry them out, as they were not contrary to the spirit of any Parliamentary resolution, or the letter of any enactment.

The Government subsequently declared that this expression was designed to indicate that they were not intending to attempt to transcend the taxation resolution. It is contended that they could do so, and that they did in fact so bind the country by their action, although Parliament never confirmed it. I altogether deny that the executive Government has any general or implied authority of a nature so extensive; but were it otherwise, no such authority could be implied in the face of a distinct determination by Parliament in an adverse sense; nor can any case be imagined in which there could be a more decisive declaration by Parliament of its policy that there should be no increase of taxation for the building of this Railway; and consequently a more clear limitation upon any such supposed implied executive powers as are suggested. The Minister says that under the Carnarvon terms there was an agreement to build the Island Railway, by which \$4,000,000 were added to the cost of the whole; but he seems to have forgotten that his own Government in 1873 had come to the determination that the terminus of the Railway should be at Esquimalt, and this determination, if adhered to, necessarily involved the construction of the Island Railway, and indeed of other far more extensive and costly works. I had taken occasion in the fall of 1874 to declare my individual views on the subject of the Pacific Railway. I then stated that I thought the fulfilment of the agreement with British Columbia impossible; that unless she chose to be reasonable and to agree to a relaxation of the terms, I saw no hope of performing them; and that, if she insisted on secession, as the consequence of the non-fulfilment of the terms of Union, I, for one, was prepared to say, "let her go," rather than ruin the country in the attempt to perform the impossible. I have never changed that opinion, and each succeeding year has strengthened my view as to the wisdom and soundness of such a decision. During the Session of 1875, when the Carnarvon correspondence was brought down, I did, as the hon. gentleman says, ask the leader of the then Government whether he proposed to invite the sanction of Parliament to the arrangement. He replied that he did not propose to invite the

action of Parliament directly, but that he would rely on Parliament to enable him to carry it out. Well, that answer of itself indicated that the assent of Parliament was essential. Will anyone seriously contend that the Executive Government of this country could, not merely without the authority of Parliament, but in spite of the anti-taxation resolution, make an agreement which would of itself bind the country to build the Island Railway, to expend not less than \$2,000,000 a year on construction in the mainland, and to finish the road by 1890? It was, however, soon made apparent that the action of Parliament was necessary in order to carry out the Carnarvon terms. A Bill was of necessity brought in to authorise the construction of the Island Railway, one of the most important parts of those terms. I opposed that Bill because I believed that the Island Railway was not a judicious undertaking, and also, and chiefly because it was part of the Carnarvon Terms, which I did not believe were such as could be fully carried out consistently with the taxation resolution, to which I for one was determined to adhere. The Bill succeeded in this House, but it failed in the Senate, and the result was that the sanction of Parliament was refused to that essential part of the Carnarvon terms. At the close of that Session then the whole question was open. The arrangement had failed. Parliament had declined to authorise an essential part of the terms; fulfilment of the terms had thus become impossible, and it became necessary to reconsider the whole matter. I believe that everyone to-day concurs in this result; at any rate I do not observe that the Government now proposes to build the Island Railway. Shortly after the close of the Session I entered the Administration upon a distinct understanding in reference to the Pacific Railway. That understanding was that the Carnarvon terms having failed by reason of the action of Parliament, a moderate money compensation should be offered to the Province for past and future delays in the construction of the Pacific Railway; that it was always the understanding of the Government and that it should be distinctly stated, that any pledge for fixed expenditure, or for a time limit, was subject to the taxation resolu-

tion, in such sort that the work should not be necessarily proceeded with in case it would involve an increase of taxation; and, that any arrangement made with the Province should be expressly, as it must in fact be, subject to the sanction of this Parliament. This understanding was carried out by the Minute of Council of September, 1875. By that minute, referring to the former negotiations, the Government declared as follows:—

“It must be distinctly borne in mind that, every step in the negotiations was necessarily predicated on and subject to the conditions of the resolution of 1871, passed contemporaneously with the adoption of the terms of Union with British Columbia, subsequently enacted in the Act of 1872, and re-enacted (after a large addition had been made to the rate of taxation) in the Act of 1874, that the public aid should consist of such subsidy in money, not increasing the then existing rate of taxation, as Parliament should determine. This determination not to involve the country in a hopeless burden of debt is sustained by public opinion everywhere throughout the Dominion, and must necessarily control the action of the Government, and it cannot be too clearly understood that any agreements as to yearly expenditure, and as to completion by a fixed time, must be subject to the condition, thrice recorded in the Journals of Parliament, that no further increase in the rate of taxation shall be required in order to their fulfilment. The sanction of Parliament to the construction of the proposed railway from Esquimalt to Nanaimo was necessarily a condition precedent to the commencement of the work. The other important features of the arrangement, namely, the limitation of the time for the completion of a certain portion, and the specification of a yearly expenditure, were deemed to be within the meaning of the Act of 1874, subject, of course, to the condition already mentioned, which was referred to in the minute of December, 1874, when the Government expressed ‘a willingness to make these further concessions * * * as the concessions suggested might be made without involving the violation of the spirit of any Parliamentary resolution, or the letter of any enactment.’”

The Government added a proposal of \$750,000 as compensation for delays. British Columbia rejected the proposal, and insisted on the fulfilment of the Carnarvon terms; she urged that the increase of taxation which had taken place in 1874, and the Railway Act of that year involved an abandonment of the resolution of 1871, by which she contended that she was never bound. On the 13th March, 1876, the Government rejoined by a minute in which they showed that the resolution of 1871 was not abandoned,

but was re-enacted; in which they admitted that it was not part of the Terms of Union in form, as they would have desired, but argued that it could not be wholly left out of account. The minute added that “the people of Canada would not consent to enter unconditionally into arrangements which though less onerous than the Terms of Union would yet involve such a burden as might but for the condition plunge the country into ruin.” The Government made no further proposal, but ended the negotiations by stating that, British Columbia having refused their offer of September, 1875, “it remains only to endeavour to construct the Railway as rapidly as the resources of the country would permit.” These minutes were dispatched to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and also to British Columbia. During the Session of 1876, a vote, hostile to the policy of the Government, and seeking to condemn it for delay in the work, was proposed by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos). It was voted down with practical unanimity, the hon. member obtaining but six or seven supporters. I think all the present Ministers voted against it; and the present First Minister both spoke and voted against it, declaring that the conduct of the hon. member for Victoria in insisting as he did on the fulfilment of the terms gave very good colour and reason for the charge contained in the minute of the Government that the action of British Columbia seemed more influenced by the desire to see many millions expended in their midst, than by the wish that the enterprise should be carried on consistently with the interests, and according to the resources of the country. Later during the Session the correspondence to which I have referred was brought down, and the House became possessed through these minutes of the declaration of the policy of the Government, and of the whole statement of the case. The House was made aware of the decision of the executive not to make any further effort to obtain the authority of Parliament for the construction of the Island Railway, and of their solemn declaration that they had not intended in the former negotiations, did not then intend, and would not agree, to make any unconditional agreements, to make any agreements otherwise than subject to the

taxation resolution. With this knowledge we came to the discussion of the vote in supply for the construction of the Pacific Railway, and to that vote it was proposed to add words declaring that the grant was made "with the view that the arrangements for the construction of the Railway shall be such as the resources of the country will permit without increasing the existing rates of taxation." That vote was moved after the occurrence of all the events to which the hon. the Minister of Railways has alluded as imposing such dreadful responsibilities upon him and his friends. He has not indeed spoken consistently upon this point, for after all these events, after the making of these terms by which he alleged we were more tightly bound than by those of the Union, he declared to-night in one part of his speech that, we were obliged by them to do what? to finish by 1890? No! he says he does not hold himself bound to do that. To spend \$2,000,000 a year? No! he says he does not hold himself bound to do that. To build the Island Railway? No! he does not even propose to do that: so that while the hon. gentleman at one breath cries out: "I am bound!" "I am bound!" "I am bound!" like himself, he turns round the next moment and exclaims: "I am free!" "I am free!" "I am free!" But, Sir, after all these entangling negotiations, after all these chains and fetters had been wound round this unhappy country by the late unfortunate Administration, it had prior to the vote of 1876, fully declared its meaning; it had taken its stand, it had declared that it would not recede from or abandon the Parliamentary policy of the now increase of taxation. And the vote to which I have alluded, was, under these circumstances carried, not by a party majority, but by a united House. The vote was 149 to 10; among the majority were a large number of members and supporters of the present Government. I find in the majority four of the present Ministers, Messrs. Langevin, Masson, Bowell and Baby. I find there also, many active members of the party including you, Sir, Messrs. Cameron, of Victoria; Caron, Costigan, Desjardins, Haggart, Kirkpatrick, McCallum, Mousseau, Orton, Ouimet, Plumb, Robinson, Rochester, and White; besides many others; in all

forty-two, out of the small contingent which, at that time represented the Tory party in this House. We were on that occasion nearly unanimous. In that year, 1876, long after the making and failure of the Carnarvon terms, and after the Government had fully declared its meaning and its policy, this House was almost unanimous in favour of the view that the country was entitled to say, and was bound to say, and we did in the name of the country say that the arrangements for the construction of the road should be such as the resources of the country would permit without increasing the existing rates of taxation. This is the fourth vote recorded by Parliament in the same sense. Now, I claim that I have proved that apart from the serious, the dreadful, I hope not the fatal error of 1871, in declining to engraft upon the terms of Union this limitation—an error for which the Liberal party is not responsible, because it did its best to avert it; that apart from that error the continuous and unvarying policy of Parliament was before, and after, and notwithstanding the Carnarvon Terms that this road should not be so constructed as to necessitate any increase of taxation. What happened after the Session of 1876? The surveys had been prosecuted; some contracts were let, some progress was made. The Session of 1877 arrived. Was there any proposal from the Opposition declaring that we should proceed faster with the work, anything to alter the view taken in 1876? Nothing! The Session of 1878 followed with the same result, nor did aught occur to shake the deliberate, solemn and repeatedly affirmed declaration of Parliament on this subject. But, meantime, further progress was made, and to some enquiries the Government answered that it hoped to be able shortly to advertise for tenders for the whole work on the land and money basis, subject to the approval of Parliament. It was the policy of the Government at the earliest moment at which the condition of the surveys would permit, to take that step, and so to give a fair trial to the plan, the only plan by which the road could be constructed in any short time without increasing the rate of taxation; and if that trial failed, it was obvious the whole question must be opened afresh for consideration, and that it would be the duty of

the Government to consider of a new policy. Well, an advertisement was issued in May, 1878, I believe, for tenders for the whole line upon the land and money basis, and subsequently, I believe in August, for the construction of the middle part of the eastern link, I think in three sections, and also for the line from Yale to Kamloops. I had then long ceased to be a member of the Government, was not even in the country, and knew nothing about the matter until a few months ago. Of course, it follows that I am not able to say anything on the subject of my own knowledge. My hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) has already stated the circumstances under which that advertisement was issued, with a view, while yet the tenders were being asked for the construction of the whole line upon the land and money basis, to obtain all the information possible, on all alternative plans, so as to be able to present it to Parliament with such policy as the Government might ultimately determine upon. But it would have been a radical change in the policy of the Government as announced—as the people of this country, certainly as I understood it—had the Government, after the receipt of these tenders, proposed to Parliament the construction of the 125 miles in British Columbia as a Government work; and if they had proposed it, the hon. the Minister of Railways would have found me, as he complains I sometimes was, restive again. I would have declared it was impossible in my view to carry out any such policy consistently with the former resolutions, and I would have opposed it, with what effect I know not, but with what earnestness I could. I find then nothing proving an alteration of policy on the part of the Government or of Parliament on this question until the Session of 1879. Then, indeed, there was a change. The new Government having been formed in the meantime, the grand proposal of last Session was brought forward. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) says, he is going to give us another batch of resolutions, and he read us some of these high-flown resolutions he brought down last Session. They indicate the character of the work in the view of the hon. gentleman, the relations of this country as well as the relations of the Empire to the work, and

the mode in which alone it can be successfully prosecuted. The first declares that an engagement was entered into with British Columbia, but it says nothing of any engagement with the Imperial Government or Lord Carnarvon, now so much talked about, to construct the road Not, however, by any specified time; on the contrary, I find the Government by this resolution declaring the contract to be, that the line should be constructed with all practicable speed. Next, there is a declaration that the Canada Pacific Railway will be a great Imperial highway, and so forth. Then there is a declaration about the unprecedented state of enforced idleness of the British working classes, and the possibility of a scheme of relief on a large scale being found indispensable to alleviate the destitution. The hon. gentleman, not content with taking charge of the suffering thousands of Canadians, and relieving by his legislation all the misfortunes under which our poor 4,000,000 are labouring, in the largeness of his heart, and the magnitude of his resources, took charge of the unemployed poor of England; and by his wit, and that of the Imperial Government together, this great scheme of outdoor relief—so far outdoors as the North-West—was to be carried out for the relief of the destitution of the suffering poor in Great Britain. Then the resolution introduced the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was to afford immediate employment to a vast number of workmen, open up vast tracts of fertile land for occupation, and thus form a ready outlet for the overpopulated districts of Great Britain and other European countries. And the Government is authorised and directed to procure the substantial assistance of the Imperial Government by guaranty or otherwise towards the execution of the project as a national work; and a hundred millions of acres of land are set apart for the purpose of supplying funds. Then there is a resolution to alter the route; an arrangement for building a short extension from Selkirk, and a proposition that it is expedient to make further explorations in the Peace and Pine River districts; then there is a declaration that in the opinion of the House the selection of the Burrard Inlet terminus was premature; upon which I shall say no more, than that if in the year 1878, with

all the information that was then obtained, it was premature to decide that Burrard Inlet should be the terminus, how premature was it for hon. gentlemen opposite to decide that Esquimalt should be the terminus in 1873? That is the problem, the arithmetical calculation, which I shall desire the hon. gentleman to answer. The hon. gentleman laughs at it. We know that whenever the hon. First Minister hears an awkward question he turns it off with a laugh, but it will be admitted that the hon. member for Lambton, and the House and the country knew more in 1878 about what should be the terminus than any one could know in 1873. Therefore, if it was not premature to select Esquimalt in 1873, it could not be premature to select another terminus in 1878. Then there is a resolution that it is necessary to keep good faith with British Columbia; and then there is a provision, the sting of which is in the tail. The 14th resolution declares that the Government be authorised to make further explorations, and to enter into contracts for constructing a portion of the line in Columbia not exceeding 125 miles in length without the further sanction of Parliament. Here for the first time do we find the policy of building a railway in British Columbia as a Government work brought down by the Government for the consideration of Parliament and adopted by Parliament. Well, on what was it that this part of the Government policy was based? On what was it that the House was asked to hurry into an engagement to commence, as a Government work, 125 miles in British Columbia? Was it upon something old or upon something new? Was it upon something fresh? Yes. The hon. gentleman pointed out that there were hundreds of thousands of unemployed poor in England. He referred to their misery and destitution, he said it would be necessary for the English Government to provide some means for their relief. He pointed to what he was going to do in England. Both he and his colleagues declared that the scheme possessed certain elements of success. The first Minister declared it must and would succeed. He said that they would go home; that they would enlist the sympathies of the Imperial Government; that they would obtain the co-operation which they

solicited, and which this House authorised them to obtain, the Imperial aid, by guarantee or otherwise, towards the construction of this line. They went home, and, like other people who have gone home, they came back again. But, Sir, although we heard a great deal of some matters they transacted, although the Finance Minister's loans, and the Minister of Railway's purchases of rails were told to us over and over again, until we got more tired than ever of discussing the rate of interest upon loans and the price of steel-rails—although, I say, these proofs of financial and commercial ability were discussed *ad nauseam*, not a word was heard upon the great mission—upon the principal point. What in the world is the difference whether we get one-half per cent. more or less on a loan of a few million dollars? What in the world is the difference whether we buy steel-rails at \$24.40 or \$25.40 compared with the other question? Very important things both; but what in the world do we care about these questions compared with that of obtaining a sound and solid basis of Imperial aid for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway? We have heard a great deal of the mint and the anise and the cumin, but of the weightier matters of the law very little indeed. Now, why this silence? We have endeavoured to elicit information on the subject. I, myself, ventured to put a question or two, I endeavoured to draw out the hon. gentleman on the Address, and subsequently by a question, but still there was silence. We authorised the Government to proceed to England to accomplish a most important work, but not a word is told of the result. Something, indeed, was told. Oh, yes. We asked whether any arrangement had been made, any promise had been given, and we were told there had not. Some person asked the same question in the Imperial Parliament, and the answer was the same. But, to-night, we are told that these Ministers at home are diplomatic, that there was in effect a secret understanding, that they were deeply interested—O, so deeply interested—in this matter. The Minister is now able to state this fact, perhaps—may I venture to suggest—with greater confidence than he would

have done before the late elections. He says, indeed, that the British Government did not want to be handicapped at those elections by any promise. But, Sir, if this scheme for relieving unemployed Britons by sending them out to our North-West was to be an advantage for the British people, why should it be unpopular? Why not proclaim it on every hustings? Why not make it a battle cry in the elections? But, the hon. gentleman says that would not do; the people were not to know. It was like a certain arrangement which was agreed to in this part of the world, with reference to this same Pacific Railway, which "should be kept quiet until after the elections." It is now, however, alleged that there was a bargain. Well, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman's plans in England, under these circumstances, failed. It was because the hon. gentleman found that it would be useless for him to communicate officially that he has nothing to give us. It was because his informal and confidential communications resulted unfavourably, that as Sir Michael Hicks-Beach says, there was nothing put on paper, and the hon. gentlemen came back here with no more assurances than they had before they left Canada. This we know because the hon. gentleman has made a statement to us on the subject, he has told us what his expectations are. He has told us the resolutions he is going to bring down. There is to be a resolution modifying the plan for the sale of the lands. Instead of selling them at \$2 an acre all round, they have adopted another plan, and want to modify this resolution accordingly. But we hear nothing about further resolutions touching Imperial aid. Still, the hon. gentleman says he had many conferences with politicians and capitalists, and the Finance Minister made complete arrangements for all the funds that may be required for the completion of the Pacific Railway from sea to sea, so that, as fast as he wants it, he can get the money, provided we give him authority to raise the taxes required to pay principal and interest. He says also that the prospect of an Imperial guarantee from Mr. Forster, if he is to be the new Colonial Secretary, are quite as good

as were the prospects of a guarantee by the Beaconsfield Government. That may be so, and I dare say it is so; but the reason given by the hon. gentleman was a speech which Mr. Forster had delivered at the Colonial Institute. My hon. friend's memory is of that character of which memories often are. He remembered what was agreeable, and forgot what was painful. He remembered well Mr. Forster's diplomatic suggestion, that "he was not sure that it might not be advisable for the Government to be very liberal in these matters," and he turns that into a promise. But as to the *quid pro quo*, Free-trade with Britain, which Mr. Forster suggests the hon. gentleman utterly forgot all about that. Mr. Forster says that the liberality must not be all on one side; that it is not fair to ask the Mother Country for assistance, and then to throw obstacles, by means of Protection, in the way of their disposing of their manufactures in the Colonies. Well, I will say, frankly, that if the arrangement for aid from the Imperial Government should turn out to be one for a guarantee only, I am not at all certain it would be a blessing to this country that the guarantee should be obtained. It is true the guarantee would enable us to raise money at a lower rate than that at which we are raising it. It is true, also, that it might enable us to raise money which we could not raise at all without the guarantee. But it will not help us to pay the money we borrow; and I do not think it always a convenient thing to have facilities for borrowing money, unless we see also that there are commensurate facilities for repaying it. The explorations which the Government took authority to make, resulted in a report by the Chief Engineer, in which he suggested that they were so far favourable to the northerly route as to render it improper to commence at that time construction in British Columbia, and expedient to make further explorations. The Government, however, decided adversely to that view, and determined to finally adopt the route to Burrard Inlet. Now, even with all the haste that was used in reaching this decision, it had become impossible at that time to fulfil the arrangements, on the basis of which Parliament had been asked

to authorise the letting of these contracts without its sanction. That basis was, that the work should be commenced in British Columbia, in 1879. But tenders were not called for till near the end of 1879. The first contracts were not let till December of that year, and the last was not let until the 10th February, 1880, two days before the meeting of this Parliament; so that, for several reasons, the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman had asked Parliament to give him special authority, had failed. They had failed in this, that the construction could not be commenced until after Parliament was in Session, and, therefore, there was no ground for the action; they had failed in this that no inconvenience or delay would be caused by waiting for the assent of Parliament. Another ground on which the authority given by Parliament ought not to have been exercised, is this: the House was led into the adoption of the series of resolutions in which this authority is contained on the statement made by the Government as to the certainty of their success in obtaining Imperial aid. They wholly failed in that; the basis for the authority disappeared, and, therefore, the course they pursued in using the authority was in this as well as the other particulars censurable. Again, the report of the Chief Engineer justified, and in fact rendered proper further investigation before fixing on the route. This contract which they have let without the sanction of Parliament will reach, according to the estimate, \$9,100,000, and with the rolling-stock, rails, etc., the line will cost certainly not less than \$10,000,000, according to the tenders. That is the estimate, I observe, from the hon. Minister's statement, which the Chief Engineer now makes with reference to the contract. The hon. Minister observed that he had adopted an entirely different practice from that of his predecessor with reference to the letting of contracts. He said the contracts on the eastern end had been let on imperfect surveys and inadequate information, which had resulted in great loss and in the disappointment of expectations which had been formed. He, however, undertook to pursue a different course, to secure complete investigation and absolute certainty, as far as certainty can be obtained in these matters, as a pre-

liminary to the letting of his contracts, and I think the rule he laid down was an excellent one. I think the fullest information ought to be obtained in the interests of the country, with reference to the character of the work, and so forth, before the work is let. We know the reasons which induced such departure as was made from this custom in the earlier days of letting this work, when the hon. member for Cumberland, then in Opposition, cheered the then First Minister when he announced his intention of at once letting the contracts. If the principle which the hon. Minister so ostentatiously put forward as governing his action was specially applicable anywhere, that point was British Columbia. But how far the hon. gentleman's practice on this matter conformed with his pretensions is to be found in the memorandum to the schedules for the Columbia section, which were submitted for the information of intending tenderers. There will be found there a note in these words:

"Some of the quantities are estimated from preliminary location measurements, and may be considered roughly approximate. Other items are merely conjectural, and are placed herein for the purpose of obtaining rates."

This was the thorough, exhaustive, minute and detailed survey; this was the accurate information which the hon. gentleman got before he let the Yale-Kamloops contract! Some of the estimates are simply roughly approximate! Others are merely conjectural and are placed for the purpose of obtaining rates! As to the eastern contracts, if I am rightly informed, there was no information of any material consequence in the hon. gentleman's hands which was not in the hands of the hon. member for Lambton before he left office.

Mr. PLUMB: Section 15?

Mr. BLAKE: If my hon. friend will allow me to continue, he will soon have an opportunity to enliven the House with one of his short speeches. It may be permitted to a person who has not gone over the ground, who has not even made a preliminary location measurement, who has not even made a conjectural estimate of the items, to make a conjecture in the gross, based upon former experience, based on former reports, based upon what is known of other sections of the Railway, and from what has happened as to other roads, based on the

general experience of the world in reference to estimates of this description; and my conjecture is that this road is as likely as not, instead of costing \$10,000,000 to cost \$12,000,000 or more. The contracts, however, provide, as the hon. gentleman as said, that the Government may suspend operations if the vote is expended at any time, or in case the public interest requires, a suspension of the work, and may in such case cancel the contract; and that in no case will the contractor be entitled to damages by reason of loss of profits, but only to expenses incurred in connection with the collection of material and work already done. The Georgian Bay branch contract was lately cancelled by the Government under similar provisions. The hon. gentleman has stated that he expects the expenditure next year on this work will not exceed \$1,000,000, but, although possibly no more than \$1,000,000 may be expended the first year, yet it is certain, according to the estimate formed of ten millions, and if the work is to be carried out according to the terms of the contract, which provides for its completion in five years, that an average of two millions a year will be required, and if we are going to expend only \$1,000,000 next year, this means that there will be a larger amount expended relatively in the following years. Roughly, we are involved by this contract in an average expenditure of \$2,000,000 a year for the next five years, and if the road costs \$12,000,000, then \$2,400,000 a year for the same time will be required. The hon. gentleman has said that the road, which is in the middle of British Columbia, will be a pretty good thing. It starts, it is true, at a point from which the ocean is accessible by light steamers; it runs a considerable distance into the interior, but, as far as I can observe, considering the condition of the country, its population, its capabilities for early settlement, this may be said of it, that it begins nowhere, ends nowhere, and will serve no earthly purpose. I quite agree that in the construction of the Pacific Railway as a through line, by the Burrard Inlet route, this might have been the best point to commence at, but I am speaking of it as it is. The hon. gentleman has prepared a map, which he laid on the Table in the course of his speech,

as showing what recent explorations convince him is the state of the country, with reference to its capacity for settlement. Without turning at this time to that portion which affects the North-West, I would desire the particular attention of my hon. friend the member for Vancouver, to that portion of the map which represents the Province of British Columbia. The hon. member will observe that the parts which are marked brown are barren and unfit for anything. The parts left white embrace certain small tracts in which people may find a living. The hon. Minister, in the early part of the evening, insulted my hon. friend by calling his country inhospitable, and my hon. friend will see what a double insult is conveyed in his laying on the Table a map showing the bulk of the Province unfit for settlement.

MR. BUNSTER: I would like to ask my hon. friend if he did not have that map coloured on purpose.

MR. BLAKE: My hon. friend no doubt believes that I am the only person who would have ventured to produce such a map. But it is not my map. It is the map of the hon. Minister of Railways, who has done the hon. member for Vancouver "brown." It is not to be supposed, however, that all this white ground is available for white men. There is a large portion of the land even there, which the hon. the Minister of Railways, in the early portion of the evening, rightly called inhospitable. For example, the northern part of the tract left white is useless, in consequence of climatic influences. Although there are some portions of land in it, which are rich enough to be cultivated, yet the climate prevents their being settled, but in the lower portion there is a little land capable of settlement, as the hon. gentleman has said. At the delta of the Fraser River, there are some 400,000 acres of land capable of settlement, though I believe some of it requires dyking in order to make it useful. East of the Fraser River there are 640,000 acres, or 1,000 square miles, at the outside, according to the statement in the official report, of land capable of settlement; and west of the Fraser River there are 192,000 acres, if so small a quantity is worth mentioning. There is of arable land 1,200,000 acres, not altogether, but

MR. BLAKE.

in three divisions, and each of these is broken by hills, valleys and rivers, so that the country can only become a few small detached settlements at best. Let me read you an extract from the report of Mr. Marcus Smith, your Assistant-Chief-Engineer, made in 1879, and brought down the other day; he says:

“From the River Pembina westward across the Rocky Mountains, and by a chain of valleys to Fort Hope the distance is 605 miles, of this only 92 miles traverse a country fit for settlement, being the central plateau, or bunch-grass belt between the Rocky and Cascade Mountains.

“A breadth of seventy miles on each side of the line would include Lac La Hache and the settlements of the Lilloet District on the west, those of Lakes Okanagan and Shuswam on the east, and embrace an area of about 12,000 square miles, on which it is estimated there are about 200 farms taken up, and the white population is about 1,000. About one-tenth of the arable land is under cultivation, but the grazing land is nearly occupied and supports 20,000 to 25,000 head of cattle, a considerable number of horses and sheep.

“If the whole of the arable land of this area were put under cultivation the total produce would probably not exceed that of an average county in Ontario. On the balance of the 605 miles the country would not support a white population of more than a few hundreds. The cost of constructing this division of the line would be heavy, probably not less than \$50,000,000.”

MR. DECOSMOS: What is the exact size of an average county in Ontario?

MR. BLAKE: I do not know the exact size, but as the hon. gentleman interrupts me, I will read the hon. gentleman's own statement made in debate on the subject of this line. It gives some valuable information. The hon. gentleman says this—I read from the *Official Debates* for 1877:

“The First Minister had referred to the valuable land on Fraser River. As a fact, however, there were not perhaps over 400 square miles, or 256,000 acres of valuable arable land along the whole river, from Yale to the mouth of the Fraser. In farms and population there, they did not exceed the farming population in his own district, and were far behind that which existed in the district of his hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Bunster); but what was there from Yale to the mouth of Burrard Inlet to support a railway? There was nothing in the district to support a railway, so far as at present known; and when they reached the Yale canyon there were sixty odd miles of canyon to get through, which was nothing but a vast ditch, cut by the water coursing through for ages; there was nothing there, unless mineral wealth was found in the mountains, which were walled up on each side. Next,

they had to go forty miles beyond before they found anything but some high grazing land, and away down in the bottom, along the Thompson, some patches of land that could only be cultivated by irrigation. After forty miles more, at the end of Kamloops Lake, they found a high, rolling, grazing country and a few farmers. The population of that country has not increased 50 per cent. within the last ten years. When they reached Kamloops they found a delightful point, from which open lands, but narrow, stretched along the north fork of the Thompson for twenty miles beyond; it was comparatively worthless and, unless mineral wealth were found from Tête Jeune Cache to that spot, it could not be considered as sufficient to invite the Government to construct a railway in that direction. If the Government was determined to bring a railway by Tête Jeune Cache and Kamloops to Burrard Inlet, he alleged, not only from a Dominion point of view, financially speaking, with respect to the cost and receipts of the railway, but in the interests of commerce, in the interests of the industry of their Province, that the line of railway could not be made a success by the best administration of the country. The sole and whole reason was that they could not make a way traffic. It was simply following a ditch or ditches through the country, and was not calculated to make a way traffic or aid in the gaining a large share of the trans-Pacific traffic.”

MR. DECOSMOS: What I ask is, what is the size of an average-size county in Ontario?

MR. BLAKE: As I have said before I am not able to state the exact size of an average county in Ontario.

MR. BUNSTER: Who made that statement the hon. gentleman has just read?

MR. BLAKE: It was the hon. member for Victoria. Well, Sir, we are to have this road for 125 miles lying in this ditch that the hon. member speaks of, with no means of placing there a population sufficient to create a traffic. The hon. the Minister of Railways talks of placing there within four or five years, a population of 100,000. Why, it could not be done, and if it was done they would starve.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It was the *Globe* that said such a population could be put there.

MR. BLAKE: And does the hon. gentleman agree with that?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes.

MR. BLAKE: I tell the hon. gentleman that he could not do it. If such a population went there within the time he names they would stay there as bones, not as living men.

MR. McINNES: I would say here—

MR. BLAKE: To judge from the number of gentlemen who are continually interrupting, one would think there must be a great many men in British Columbia; the only one who at all observes the proprieties of debate is the senior member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald). I have said, Sir, and in that I am happy to agree with my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos), that I do not find that the resources of the country in question are likely to make the proposed work profitable. There is indeed some chance that the line will not be required to be kept open after it is built, and we shall thus save the running expenses. The running expenses depend upon the traffic. If the traffic is heavy, then, of course, we shall have adequate returns, but if it be light, we shall have heavy running expenses without returns, for there must be in that isolated region, machine shops; all arrangements for making, or at any rate for repairing locomotives and cars, a staff and so forth, if the road is to be run at all. The engineers, taking the Intercolonial Railway as a guide, have estimated the running expenses of working the 125 miles at \$295,000. If there is hardly any traffic it will not cost so much. But we cannot hope to escape altogether from running expenses, which will, of course, include renewals and repairs, though I fancy the item of renewals to rails will not be a heavy one. Our annual payments therefore, in respect of that railway after construction, will be considerable. The interest on the cost of construction at \$10,000,000 will be an annual burden of \$500,000, or if the line costs \$12,000,000, \$600,000, to which may be added a loss in running expenses of perhaps \$150,000 a year, or more, making a total annual charge of from \$750,000 to \$850,000 a year. But that is not all, nor the chief part of the burden, because this line is proposed to be constructed, not as an isolated transaction—not as a complete thing in itself—not as the end of the expenditure in British Columbia, but only as the commencement. It is but a pledge; it is but a hostage for the many other millions to be expended there. We hear, indeed, nothing now of an Island Railway, except the suggestion of the Minister of Railways to-night, that a line eight miles long might be necessary to get beyond the reach of the guns of St.

Juan. But apart from this we hear nothing, and I think the judgment of the country has so far condemned that project as to render its revival impossible. But for the mainland we are to deal with a proposal to build a long and very costly line. We have a new set of estimates brought down to-night. This is not the first or second set—it is at any rate the third set. Before I deal with them in the gross, I wish to refer to one fact which proves, plainly, that they are the second set brought down this Session. The other side had a sort of preliminary skirmish on this question on the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk, on the land policy of the Government. The hon. First Minister then said it was inconvenient to discuss the Pacific Railway policy of the Government on that occasion; that this should be postponed, till the general debate now going on; but you will have noticed that he immediately proceeded to discuss and expound it. The hon. gentleman declared that the expenditure in connection with the Pacific Railway, up the 30th June next, would be about \$15,000,000. We know that the expenditure up to December last, largely exceeded \$14,000,000, and I think the estimate of \$15,000,000, up to the 30th June, is perfectly fair. It will be in the memory of the House that he stated that from 30th June next, the expenditure would be \$10,000,000 a year for the next two years, and \$5,000,000 a year for the following eight years. This will make a total expenditure of \$60,000,000 to be made after the thirtieth of June next, or of \$75,000,000 adding the \$15,000,000 already spent. This statement was not made recklessly. It was made after due deliberation, of set purpose, as a deliberate declaration of the policy of the Government, on the highest authority; and the hon. Finance Minister on the following day confirmed it, declaring that it was based on Mr. Fleming's figures. To-day, the hon. Minister of Railways states that the whole expenditure, including the past \$15,000,000, will be under \$65,000,000. He has seen the First Minister, or those behind him, and goes ten millions better. There is a change of over \$10,000,000 between the deliberate estimate of last week and the final estimate of this week. I would like to know

MR. BLAKE.

where this ten millions has gone. I would like to see the details of these varying estimates, because they are on the whole surprising to those who have been forming their opinions on the detailed statements made in published reports by responsible officials. There are 550 miles of a very difficult road to build, from Jasper House to Port Moody. For a part only of that road, for the 493 miles between the Divide and Port Moody, Mr. Fleming's estimate was about \$36,000,000. The estimate of Mr. Smith was \$36,500,000, and the estimate of Mr. Cambie was, I think, \$31,000,000. But the average estimate of the Chief and Assistant Engineer may be said to be over \$36,000,000 for this 493 miles, which would run up the 550 miles to \$40,000,000; and now it is said that the 550 miles, composed of this 493 miles and of 57 additional miles of inexpensive road, can be built for \$30,000,000, a difference of \$10,000,000. You add more than one-sixth to the mileage, and you subtract more than one-sixth from the cost. If so, the part is greater than the whole. I may be permitted to doubt a little whether a large part of the \$10,000,000 which has disappeared in a week from the cost of the Pacific Railway, has not been arbitrarily cut off from the British Columbia section. I cannot but believe that a very large part of that amount has been economised by taking an extravagant sum from that section, and I shall remain of the opinion, until I see some detailed statement, giving reasons why this immense saving is practicable, that the last estimate of the Chief Engineer is not so trustworthy, or based on such sound calculation as the former estimate of himself and his assistants. The House must not forget too that Port Moody is not the terminus of the Railway. The Engineers say that the terminus must be at Coal Harbour, or English Bay. You do, indeed, reach the Pacific seaboard at Port Moody, but not a satisfactory terminal harbour. You must go further, and spend another million of dollars to accomplish the other fourteen miles of distance before you see the end of your labours. But even supposing it to be our unhappy fate to get no further than Port Moody, and supposing the hon. gentleman's revised estimates to be realized, I call the attention of the House

to the fact that he calculates, himself, on spending \$30,000,000 for the western section, and \$13,000,000 only, or less than one-half the former sum for the whole of the prairie line. The fatal burden is still in the west. The hon. gentleman was right in dealing with the British Columbia, or western section, of this Railway as really beginning at a point east of the Rocky Mountains. But he did not go far enough east. In order to decide what is the true point of commencement of the western or British Columbia section of the road, you have to decide what is in truth the western end of the prairie road. That point is the commencement of the British Columbia section. I go further than the hon. gentleman. At a point seventy miles west of the longitude of Edmonton, you get to the end of the prairie. It is not necessary, in order to early settlement, that even as far as that point the country should be traversed by the Railway. Beyond that point, the Railway simply becomes necessary in view of British Columbia interests, and as a through line; unless, indeed, the outlet of the western prairie country is to be the Pacific and not the Atlantic ocean. I take, therefore, the longitude of Edmonton, which is also the point of divergence in case a northerly route should hereafter be adopted, as, for present purposes, the point of separation between the prairie and the British Columbia sections, and my hon. friend from Lambton, upon all the information which the official documents and the Engineer's reports give, added to his own knowledge, (assuming the continuance of the same gradients and curves, and the same style of construction and equipment, which were always intended up to the time he resigned,) estimates that the 256 miles from Edmonton to the summit would cost \$9,400,000, which added to Mr. Fleming's and Mr. Smith's estimates of over \$36,500,000, for the road from the Summit to the Pacific would give a total of over \$45,000,000, as the cost according to the old estimates and old style of construction of what may be described as the western section of the Railway. Of course when the hon. gentleman chooses to give us the information which will make it possible for us to judge what style of road he now pro-

poses to build ; when he tells us what the curvature and gradients are to be, and the general character of the works and style of the road, we shall be better able to judge of the correctness of his revised estimates, but he would not even tell us a little while ago, what the estimated cost of equipment was ; he would merely say it was a light equipment, by which we can judge that this estimate is arrived at by cramping the road very much indeed. It would be very easy to tell, if only it were convenient to let us know, what the estimated cost of the equipment is. It is estimated upon the cost in dollars, of so many locomotives, so many freight and passenger cars at such a price. It is included for example in the estimate of \$13,000 a mile for the prairie road. But the hon. Minister of Railways would not tell us how much he could squeeze out for equipment in dollars from the \$13,000 a mile ; and I am not surprised, because, I dare say, he would have to go into decimals to give it to us. When you recollect that an adequate rolling-stock, according to the former estimates, costs \$2,000 a mile ; that the steel rails, plates and fastenings cost many thousands more per mile, you will find how very little remains of the \$13,000 a mile to construct the Railway. Then I say that the British Columbia end, taking the route adopted from the longitude of Edmonton at the old rates, and on the old style, would cost \$45,000,000, on which the permanent interest charged would be \$2,250,000, besides a large sum for running expenses. Now, the question for the House to determine is whether we ought or can afford here and now to take the initial step, pledging us to an absolute expenditure of at least \$10,000,000 at once, and to an ultimate expenditure for the standard through line from Edmonton to the Pacific of \$45,000,000, making an annual interest charge of \$2,250,000, besides over \$1,300,000 a year for the gross running expenses, subject, of course, to deduction of the gross receipts. Considering only what the railway works are which we are called upon to execute in the North-West to the eastward of Edmonton, and not considering at all our other engagements—the general financial engagements of the country ; the demand for various improvements, East, West, North and South,

the Provincial demands for aid ; not taking a comprehensive view of these various calls, but confining ourselves for the moment to the demand upon us in order to develop the North-West, in order thence to get the money on which the hon. Minister depends for the construction of the road in British Columbia, in order thus to render the construction in British Columbia possible. Is it—I will not say the part of prudence, but the part of sane men to commence now an expenditure of \$45,000,000 in that end of the Dominion ? The hon. gentleman has told us what, according to his present estimate, we have to do. According to his view we have to spend \$15,000,000 to build the road from Selkirk to Jasper House, and nearly \$5,000,000 on the Eastern works, making nearly \$20,000,000 to be spent, besides the \$15,000,000 already expended ; so that by the time we reach Jasper House, our total expenditure, exclusive of interest, will have been nearly \$35,000,000. But except by most seriously degrading the road, by altogether lowering the style of construction, by changing it from a good through line to an inferior colonisation road, it will be necessary, according to the estimates of the hon. member for Lambton, if they be correct, to expend a very much larger sum than the hon. Minister calculates to reach this result. The Canada Central Railway subsidy reaches \$1,440,000, the surveys, including those location surveys, which, after all, come out of the pockets of the people, whether called exploratory surveys or location surveys, amount to \$4,000,000. The road from Fort William to Selkirk was estimated at \$18,000,000 ; the Pembina Branch cost \$1,500,000, and adding \$100,000 for the Red River Bridge, we reach a little over \$25,000,000. From Selkirk to Edmonton, according to the old grades and style of construction, the hon. member for Lambton estimates at \$17,650,000, which, added to the \$25,000,000, makes a total of over \$42,500,000 as the amount, including what has been spent for surveys, which it will have cost the country, irrespective of interest and construction, to reach the point which I suggest as the reasonable terminus for the prairie section of the road. Of this amount we have paid \$15,000,000, and must provide nearly

\$28,000,000 more. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman can make a very large reduction in these figures by increasing the curvature, by raising the gradients, by degrading the road in every way from a first-class to cheap colonisation railway. I am not at present declaring that it may not be good policy for him to do so,—possibly it may be so; but I think the House cannot intelligently dispose of the hon. gentleman's suggestions on these points without having before it some more facts and figures than have been communicated. I do not think we can decide that \$13,000,000 will pay for the work according to the present plans of construction, till we know what the curves and gradients and other works are to be, and we may be called upon to consider whether we are not sacrificing to a large extent the future to the present in the matter; whether we are not causing a very much larger ultimate expenditure by the proposed present economy at the expense of the condition and quality of the road. If the hon. Minister of Railways can find a plan by which he can construct the road with inferior curves and grades and in an inferior style to that heretofore contemplated, but reasonably good however, and the conversion of which to superior curves and grades and a first-class style can be ultimately secured, when needed, without much added cost, I think it may be a prudent thing to reduce for the present the expense in this way. On the other hand, we must look to the ultimate conversion of the road into a first-class road, a cheap carrying road for the North-West, without which it will be useless for that long stretch of country towards Battleford and beyond; for the grain will have to come down along the Pacific Railway a great many miles before it reaches Selkirk or the Red River. The House must remember that according to the theory on which the hon. Minister advocates the completion of the road, he is bound to give reasonable grades and curves to the prairies of the West. The Western settlers will at best be in an inferior position to those nearer Selkirk; and if you add to their disadvantages a heavy tax on the transport of their grain by reason of an inferior road to Edmonton, it will not compensate them, to say the grain can be moved cheaply from Selkirk eastward. What they want is to get it cheaply moved

along the whole distance. Again, of course, the through traffic depends on the road being first-class, and we must remember that after we have spent all the hon. Minister proposes, we shall have not a Pacific, but a Colonisation road. According to the old system of construction that central section would cost, including the other items I have mentioned, altogether over \$42,500,000, leaving out entirely both ends. What are the ends to cost? \$45,000,000 is as I have stated the cost from Edmonton to Burrard Inlet on the West; and from Fort William to Nipissing on the East, the hon. member for Lambton, estimates at a length of about 650 miles, and a cost of \$32,500,000. Thus the ends makes up together \$77,000,000, the centre and the past expenditure \$42,500,000, making a total of \$120,000,000, and that wholly exclusive of the legitimate and necessary charge, which must be added in all cases, the charge for interest during construction. In all enterprises of this description every estimate with reference to expenditure includes a provision for interest on capital provided during construction, before the enterprise becomes productive, and this item is to be considered in the reckoning. The House may be surprised to learn that on our expenditure up to this time, and rating the interest at 4 per cent. only, as the money was raised partly on guarantee, that interest up to 30th June next will exceed \$1,250,000. Taking the estimates of ten days ago, if \$60,000,000 are expended in the next ten years, there will be a total of over \$24,500,000 for interest, calculating interest on future loans at 5 per cent., the lowest rate, as I believe, at which the money can be raised. Of course, according to the hon. Minister of Railways, we have saved ten millions during the last week, and therefore the interest of that ten millions is to be taken off; but even deducting it, unless my hon. friend would be kind enough during the progress of this debate to save us another ten millions, we should still find over \$22,500,000 of interest to be provided before the completion of the line, according to the reduced figures, before we are able to reap the benefits of that enormous through and way traffic, the profits of which are then to pour into the coffers of this coun-

try. We must not altogether forget the eastern connection. The hon. gentleman has not been altogether oblivious of that part of the through line. It was politic on his part to throw out some faint hopes of the construction of that link. Quebec has spent some \$11,000,000, which she can ill afford, for the construction of a railway principally designed to tap the Pacific trade. Quebec has stretched her arms out towards the great west, as far as this city, and the question is, how soon is she to get further, how soon that great expenditure is to be productive of the benefits expected? I am glad to know her road is paying something as it is; but what Quebec expected was not simply that it should pay, while it is new and cheaply worked, some fraction of the interest on the cost of construction, but that it would pour a great tide of traffic into her principal cities, and bring prosperity into her midst. But unless and until an eastern connection of some kind is made, those expectations of the Province of Quebec, on the faith of which she proceeded to construct her railway, cannot be realised. My hon. friend felt that. I should not be surprised—I do not know anything about it—but I should not be surprised if my hon. friend had been told something of that sort in private. I should not be surprised if some hon. member from Quebec had forcibly expressed to him, in private, the same observations which I have now made in public. I should not be surprised if it had been indicated to him, in language as strong as was consistent with the politeness due to a powerful Minister, that it was essential that he should throw out, at any rate, some ray of hope, however faint, that at some early day the Quebec Railway should be connected with the through line; that he should say to the members from Quebec: "Gentlemen, at the present time we can only burn the candle in the middle, and at the western end, but the time will come sooner than you expect when we will be burning it in the middle and at both ends, when it will be alight in the east also." That is, in fact, what the hon. gentleman has vaguely suggested to us to-night. But my hon. friends from Quebec will consider how nearer they will be to the attainment of a connection with the Pacific

Railway by engaging immediately to construct the western end, and to spend, according to the revised estimates, \$30,000,000 in British Columbia. They will consider how much it is going to hasten the day in which our surplus cash will enable us to make the connection for which they long, to flog \$30,000,000 into that "Brown Country," which is depicted in the hon. Minister's map. They will judge whether our purse is like the widow's cruise of oil, in which, however much you may draw from it, there will always remain enough. They will consider whether even out of our abundance, even out of our prosperity, even with our large capacity for raising loans and obtaining moneys, we will be all the better able to deal with the eastern end, because we are commencing now to build the western end. They will reflect upon the possibility, nay, I will say the strong probability, that the effort to build the western end, if so precipitately engaged in, may crush this country, destroy the whole scheme, and render impossible for all time, or, at any rate, for a very long time, to attempt an eastern connection. According to his fashion, the hon. gentleman was not quite consistent in this matter. He was at pains to point out, in order to soothe the anxious fears of his friends and supporters, that the Government was in a position to go slowly. This contract, he says, contains clauses which give an absolute power to stop the work at any time; and if we find the resources of this country are going to be too heavily weighed down by building this 125 miles in British Columbia, depend upon it we will stop. We are not going fast; we are going slow. We expect, however, within ten years, having saved that ten millions I have spoken of, to do this much, at any rate; but we will not engage to do it within ten years. We do not consider ourselves bound to British Columbia to do it by 1890, and we will not do it within ten years if it presses too heavily on our resources. So much was necessary in order to soothe the fears of those who dreaded that the taxation would be too great and the expenditure too rapid. But then the hon. gentleman had to draw back, and in order to show that even all that expenditure would not indefinitely postpone the work at the eastern end, had to show "the silver trim-

ming"—I think the hon. Finance Minister calls it—he had to show the "silver trimming" of the cloud and he said in effect: "So confident am I of the success of my scheme that I will not name the day in which the blushing East shall be married to the rosy West, but it will be very much sooner than any of you expect." One moment he said: "I will go slowly in the West, because the work may be too heavy for us—don't be afraid," and the next moment he exclaimed: "I can get on so fast in the West that I shall be able to begin in the East quite soon—don't be afraid." Such were the hon. Minister's consistent statements. Well, I say that these suggestions are intended, no doubt, to be satisfactory and consolatory, and, perhaps, they will prove so; but to my mind, looking at this from a practical point of view, I believe that the suggestions of the hon. gentleman are impracticable of execution, and that it may be found out of the question to commence the eastern end until we have got through the centre and the western end, if the work is to be carried on according to his scheme and his views, which, I believe, as they stand, are beyond the resources of the country. Quebec may expect the eastern end to be commenced when the western road is finished—that is, that it will be begun in 1890, and may be finished in 1897, and I hope they will all be alive to enjoy it. Now, besides this enormous expense to which I have referred, besides this aggregate of I do not know how many millions of dollars, the interest of which, according to the old estimates, will be six millions a year, we have got to consider the running expenses. These expenses Mr. Fleming estimated, in former days, at \$8,000,000 a year; but my hon. friend from Lambton estimates them at a gross sum of \$6,750,000 a year for the whole line, or \$4,500,000 a year from Fort William to the Pacific. Of course, against this sum are to be set the receipts, which will be considerable, and will, in some sections of the road, perhaps, meet the expenses; but in the early days, and for a long time, the road as a whole will, I believe, be run at a loss. Thus you have a charge for interest and expenses for this Pacific Railway, which, if you add the cost of interest during construction, places it, according to any estimate you may form, wholly

beyond the resources of this country to do the work in the way, and at the rate that the hon. gentleman has suggested. Now, what must we do? What are we bound to do? What are those things which it is essential for us to do? I agree that we must finish the road to Selkirk; and I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman is going to save a million on it. I would prefer, if he would make it a million and a-half, which would be perhaps as easy. We ought to finish the road to Selkirk as rapidly as possible, consistently with due economy. The contracts are let, and I suppose that road will proceed. I agree, also, that we ought to proceed with the road through the western prairies as rapidly as we find the settlement and the development of that country requires us to advance. I believe that just as fast as we see that the flow of settlement presses for it and will be promoted by it, we ought to get on with the prairie road; and, therefore, to the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, that he has contracted for one hundred miles, and that he is about to contract for another hundred, I offer no dissent, but my hearty approbation. I believe that the true course is that which the hon. gentleman has adopted. That is, to proceed with the construction of these sections. He has told us in what time he expects to have them finished; but long before they are finished we may know at what time and at what rate it is necessary for us to proceed further in order to develop that country. We can be guided by circumstances, and construct the road, if necessary, even slightly in advance of the actual tide of settlement, but not so far in advance as to be expending our money before it can be of any use. To do that which I have suggested, to finish the road to Selkirk, to pay off the subsidy of the Canada Central, and to proceed with the construction through the prairie, will, in my opinion, drain the resources of this country, taxed and burdened as it is, to the utmost farthing. But to that we are committed. The die is cast. We must, whether our hopes be brighter or fainter, all agree to give a fair trial to the great experiment, on which we have risked so much, of endeavouring to settle, as rapidly as possible, that great North-West country, in the way and

manner I have suggested. Burdened as this country is, that work will demand the most prudent management and the most careful economy, and will involve an elimination of every other expenditure which can be in the meanwhile avoided. According to the former figures of the hon. gentleman's Engineer, and to the view of the hon. member for Lambton, our interest charges will be about two millions a year when that road is completed as far as Edmonton. All that we can get from the lands in that country, for the next few years, during which we shall be engaged in the construction of the road, will not, I believe, do more than help to eke out that interest. I now proceed to state my views about the land question, but whatever we may decide about the land, I maintain that to attempt at this time more than is necessary, more than is essential, more than the cardinal thing upon which the success of the whole enterprise is to turn, is an act of folly and madness. I intend before I sit down to discuss what is the true financial condition of this country, and what is its rate of taxation as compared with the rates of taxation existing in 1871; and to consider how far, apart from the sale of the lands, it is possible for us to undergo the strain which the proposed work will inflict upon us. But before I touch that subject, it becomes necessary to deal with the question of the lands, because the allegations made the other day with reference to the sales of lands, were that these sales would relieve us almost immediately from the interest liability, and practically from the liability for principal. I quite agree that if the calculations of the hon. First Minister and of the hon. Minister of Railways, as to receipts from lands, and expenditure on construction are founded upon a reasonable basis, they remove all serious difficulty and we may fairly and reasonably launch out into the construction of the Central and Western, and also into the construction of the Eastern end of the Pacific Railway. I perfectly agree that if these matured conjectures, in which every doubt was given to the side of prudence—which represent minima instead of maxima; if these close and accurate calculations are fairly to be counted upon as the results of

the immigration and the Railway construction; if business men, acting in their own concerns, or acting for others for whom they are trustees, ought to accept these figures as a basis for encountering for themselves or for others for whom they act enormous liabilities, then the results of these calculations do justify as in assuming the liabilities proposed to us. Now, let us see what these calculations are. They assume that the emigration will commence at 25,000 and increase yearly by 5,000, making, in the course of eleven years, 550,000 emigrants. Of these 68,500 are to become homesteaders and preemptors, at an average rate of \$3 an acre for the preempted land; 34,200 are to become purchasers of and settlers upon railway lands, at an average rate of \$3 an acre for the railway lands, making 102,700 owners of 32,640,000 acres to be settled in that country in the course of eleven years. The Government calculates not merely on this number of emigrants, not merely on this number of purchasers, not merely on these prices, not merely on this acreage, but with a sublime indifference to all the dictates of prudence, and to all the experience of all time, they calculate on the settlers on these lands paying their large instalments up to the day. They calculate on the receipt of \$38,593,000 from land sales in eleven years, and, in addition, on a good debt of \$32,750,000 more, bearing interest, making over \$71,300,000 for lands, with a claim for interest on the debt at 6 per cent. They estimate the cost of survey and management for this vast undertaking at \$2,400,000. I allege that the result of these several calculations is absurdly extravagant. I hope for a very large emigration to the North-West this year, and perhaps next year. I do not intend to be bound to an estimate for ten years by the results of one or two years. I call the attention of the House and the country to the consideration of the fact that we are dealing with an estimate, not for one or two years, but an estimate for ten years; not an estimate of \$10,000,000, but an estimate of \$60,000,000; therefore, I do not intend to be bound by the figures for the early years, attended as these are with many exceptional circumstances. Of course the whole

thing is conjectural; but we have a right to refer to the experience of the United States, to which, indeed, the hon. gentleman referred as the nearest analogous experience to ours, and as furnishing with all due allowances the only available guide. I will take the settlement of the Western States and Territories, which have formed the scene of the most rapid development which the world has hitherto known. I deeply regret that we are engaged in this discussion without the advantage of the United States Census very shortly to be taken, because I agree that circumstances in reference to the Railway development of later years have sensibly affected the tide of settlement, therefore these figures are to be taken with a measure of allowance; still we must consider, whatever may be now the relative advantages of our own North-West, that these states and territories were at the time the choicest in the world open, and that they gave very great facilities for settlement. I take the group of Western and North-Western States and Territories, comprising Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, Dakota, Montana, Wyoming and Colorado. The area of the group is 634,000,000 acres. They had a population, in 1850, of 2,740,000. The yearly increase between that year and 1860 was at the rate of 282,000 a year, and the population, in 1860, reached 5,600,000, so that at first sight hardly any calculation of increase would seem extravagant; but let us ascertain of what this population was composed. In the year 1860 there were of persons born in the group 2,530,000, or 44 per cent. of the whole population; of persons born in other parts of the United States, 2,015,000 or 37 per cent. of the whole, making an aggregate native population of 4,545,000, or 81 per cent. of the whole. Of foreign born emigrants 1,050,000, or only 19 per cent. of the total population; so that the extremely rapid increase which took place in those years is due mainly to the natural increase in the territory itself, and to migration from the Eastern to the Western States, and not to foreign immigration into the country. The annual increase to 1870 was still greater than in the prior decade. It averaged 300,000 a year. In 1870 the population was 8,640,000, thus com-

posed; born in the group, 4,390,000, or over 50 per cent.; born in other parts of the states, 2,500,000, or over 29 per cent., making 79½ per cent. in all of natives; foreign born, 1,750,000, or 20½ per cent. of the whole population. These figures show that there were three great sources of increase, to which I wish to allude for a moment, in order that we may see how far we can expect similar results. First, there was a very rapid natural increase in the western country, **as always happens when there is abundance of fertile land, producing plenty of food—consequently once there is a substantial nucleus of population, the natural increase is a most important factor.** Second, that there was a very great migration from the Eastern to the Western States—a home migration, not an immigration from abroad. Lastly, that there was a large foreign immigration; now these figures, though demonstrative of the considerations to which I have alluded, are yet subject to observation, because, during a part of the last decade, native born Americans, from both East and West, were swelling the armies of the Union by hundreds of thousands; therefore, there was not in that rapidly growing country that relative increase of the population by natural causes and home migration, that would otherwise have occurred. The war had taken the men away from the soil; and at the same time there was a foreign immigration equal to, if not exceeding, what had previously occurred in the United States, so that while there was a very great foreign immigration during a portion of that decade, the domestic sources of supply were seriously diminished by the deadly struggle in which the life blood of the nation was being poured out like water. No doubt, however, the foreign immigration is in fact a larger factor than it appears to be in the settlement of the Western States. It was through the foreign immigration to the east that the east was able to send so many of its own sons to the west; therefore, the foreign immigration did play a very important indirect part, as well as its direct part in the settlement of that country. Now, in 1850, the population of the remainder of the States, exclusive of the group of states and territories to which I have referred, was no

less than 20,000,000. In 1860, it was no less than 24,830,000. This shows that, notwithstanding the extent to which the population of the east migrated to the west, the population of the former was maintained and advanced, by virtue of the foreign immigration and natural increase. The total number of immigrants to the United States, in the decade from 1851 to 1860, was 2,600,000; from 1861 to 1870, 2,500,000, and from 1871 to 1880, making an estimate for the last eighteen months, 2,700,000. I repeat then, for we cannot dwell on it too much the three factors which produced this enormous increase of population in these splendid Western States. The first, a very rapid increase of their native population; the second, a large home migration from other States; and third and last, the foreign immigration, operating directly by the immediate advance into the west of immigrants, and indirectly by displacing a certain number of the native population who were so enabled to go west. It is said that the domestic transference of population has been even more rapid, and has, therefore, played a still more important part in the present decade than in former decades. Let us compare our circumstances with theirs in these particulars: First of all, we have at present no nucleus of population in the North-West worth mentioning. It is towards the end of the decade for which we are calculating that this factor will begin to exert an appreciable influence. Next, look at that native recruiting ground, that constantly increasing population, first 20,000,000, running up to I know not how many millions from which I have shown the Western States draw their main supply. How do we stand as to that? We stand 4,000,000 against their 30,000,000 or 40,000,000. We stand with only a tenth of their population, with a relatively insignificant number, of whom we know it to be a fact, a deeply to be regretted fact, but a fact which exists, and which there is no use trying to conceal, that many go to the United States—that out of our 4,000,000, in the best times, hundreds of thousands leave us—I think the hon. member for Cardwell, (Mr. White), gave us at over half a million, the number of those who went over during the last decade, in which prosperity was the rule, in

which there was no depression, in which every Canadian had a home and good work, but still in which something occurred to allure them to the settlements in the Western States, largely by direct removal there of those who preferred a more southern climate, but also to a very great extent by removal to the manufacturing towns in the Eastern States, thus freeing the citizens of those states and enabling them to go West. Now, from our 4,000,000 there cannot without most serious consequences to the older Provinces be a very large number of emigrants altogether; and of that number a considerable proportion will continue to go to the manufacturing communities of the States—there are persons who prefer the latter to the rural and remote settlements—and others will go still to the Western States in spite of the advantages we offer them in our own North-West. We may hope—I do, I am sure, as earnestly as any man can hope—that those residents of the older Provinces who decide to remove will simply transfer their residences to some other part of this Dominion. I hope that the emigration from Canada to the United States may be seriously checked and replaced by migration to the North-West. I hope that many of those who are actuated by an adventurous spirit, or a desire for change, will seek the North-West. But my hopes will not change the facts, and, whatever we may hope and wish, it is only prudent, it is only wise, that before incurring vast obligations which, whatever the result of your speculations, you have got to meet, you should count the cost and carefully consider the risks, and weigh the probabilities. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that a considerable number of our surplus population will still go to the manufacturing centres of the Eastern States; that some of our agricultural population will do what some have done before, and are doing now, prefer Dakota and some of the Western Territories. But suppose I am wrong—suppose that, moved by some sudden flush of patriotism changing the desires and inclinations on which they have acted hitherto, our whole migratory population should, without exception, resolve to remain within the borders of the Dominion, and to that end move to our North-West in preference to

the manufacturing or the Western States ; or, suppose the establishment of an actual wall, as high and asefectual as your Tariff wall, to keep all these within your bounds as you wish to keep out all foreign manufactures ; suppose you build a wall like that of China, not indeed to keep out invaders, but to bar your own citizens from transgressing your limits, and to drive them into the North-West, what would it do ? Certainly it would be better than their going to the United States, for to go there involves a positive loss to the whole Dominion of their resources. But it is no better for us, with reference to the early ability of the country, as a whole, to meet these burdens—it is no better for us that they should reside in the North-West than that they should remain in the older Provinces. In the most highly coloured view they will only be in one part instead of another part of the Dominion ; they will only be paying taxes in the East instead of the West. But talking of it only during the next few years, I do not agree that it is merely a transference of tax-paying power. I am convinced that the North-West settler, for several years, will not be a very heavy contributor to the net revenue of Canada. He is a new settler. He pays, the Minister says, an average of \$3 an acre for his land. At the end of the third year he pays four-tenths of the money and interest. He has to build his house ; he has to build his barn, and to fence his land ; he has to get his implements and his animals, and to maintain his family—in the homely parlance of our country, he has “hard scratching” before him for some years. It is true that the prairie has very great advantages in some respects. It enables you if you have capital and can lay out money, to fence in and sow very much earlier and to raise your crop very much sooner. But, on the other hand, the scarcity of timber, and so forth, renders the material required for the house and the barn and the fences dear, and that is what, I have no doubt, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) meant, when he spoke of the initial difficulties of the settler, in the prairies of our North-West as compared with those of the wooded country. I expect to be called unpatriotic, because I tell a few plain truths, but those who are so loud in this kind of denunciation may

go on. I believe that it is not patriotic to be dishonourable. I believe it is not honourable to present false views of one's country to emigrants or others. We should not overstate, but fairly state the true position and situation of the case. But whatever refined diplomacy, whatever reticence we might, under other circumstances, choose to exercise, it is impossible, in reference to the proposals of the Government, on which we are asked to commit the country so deeply, to do otherwise than give the reasons why those proposals are not based on sound grounds ; and we must state circumstances which their high-toned patriotism might lead them to conceal, nay, perhaps even to deny. The free grant settler will not be, in early days, a very large consumer of dutiable goods. He will live as hard as he can, smuggle as much as he can, and smuggle a good deal, too, under the present Tariff ; he will, in due time, under the influence of that Tariff develop home manufactures. For I suppose that the North-West is not to be deprived of the beneficent influences of the National Policy—to find that they are to be our hewers of wood and drawers of water ; I suppose they are not to be doomed to that wretched monotony of life, and to be deprived of that charming diversity of occupation which is a chief argument for the National Policy, Under the hot-bed influence of the Tariff of high prices ; under the influences, whether beneficent or maleficent, of the National Policy, he will have his home manufactures. Since the hon. gentleman announces to us that the North-West is to supply us with a market for all time for our eastern manufactures, let us know how this fleece of Gideon is to be kept wet while all the rest is dry. It is quite true that in early years he will not have home manufactures, but these years will be the hard years for the settlers. They are the years in which it would be vastly important for his welfare to have, I will not say home-made goods, but cheap goods, to be allowed to purchase the necessaries of life at the cheapest rate, and in the market that gives the greatest satisfaction. But you encourage him in this way. You tell him we have established a Tariff wall, by which you must buy in old Canada, at our prices, what you require in

the North-West. The large expenditure due to the increased price of goods will diminish the settler's narrow and limited purchasing power; and will in effect render him subject to a rate of taxation so high as to interfere with his comfort and advancement. The hon. gentleman talks of a large return to the coffers of the Dominion after paying the expenses of Local Government. To talk to the men who are to settle—to whom you are going to sell lands—to talk to them of the large taxes you expect them to pay is a new way to encourage them to go there. What cold water have we thrown, as it is alleged, upon the settlement of the North-West, that can be equal to that? I maintain that for the early years the taxpaying power of the persons who migrate from the east to the west will not be anything like what the hon. gentleman states, and that, in fact we can expect no net returns of any material amount from that country during the early years of its settlement. For the first year or so but little local or municipal Government may be needed, and with the country in that disorganised state, you may, of course, take a small net revenue out of it; but after Local Governments are established the cost will more than equal the return. Nor must you forget that the country is now costing you far more than a million a year.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: British Columbia and Manitoba pay largely into the Dominion Treasury.

MR. BLAKE: I propose to show, before I sit down, the net result in those very Provinces. The conclusion is that the resident of old Canada moving to the North-West does not at first increase, but, rather diminishes the aggregate taxpaying power of the Dominion. But, besides that practical reduction in the taxpaying power, there is another reduction involved in the transfer of population. Nobody can deny that there has been a serious depreciation in the value of real estate in the Dominion.

MR. BUNSTER: Except in British Columbia.

MR. BLAKE: Well, if the hon. gentleman's exception be true, I can give no better proof of the monstrous character of the operations which are now proposed—operations for which the whole of the vast Dominion, with its overburdened

exchequer, is to be taxed to benefit a Province with 12,000 white people, which is the only Province in which real estate is on the rise; and I venture to hope that the Province which is prospering so greatly will not insist on the less prosperous Provinces further depressing their resources by raising \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 for the benefit of their fortunate little sister, but that she will wait a little longer for her railway. I have said there is a serious depreciation in the value of real estate. That is true in regard to Ontario, whatever it may be in regard to British Columbia; it is true as to New Brunswick; and I believe, as to the other Provinces. A chief reason is that the demand is not so great as it was formerly. Formerly our farmers, young and old, the natural increase of our population, created a demand which led to enhanced prices—now large numbers of them are going West. The supply is greater relatively than the demand, and that is one and a very potent reason why there is a depreciation in the value of our lands. Thus I attribute to the emigration this result that our property in the East is not so valuable, and not so likely to appreciate, and we ourselves will not be so well off if the people continue to migrate to the North-West; and that also shows that in the early years the migration to that country will not help us, but, in fact, will lower our tax-paying power for a time. When the settlers begin to thrive—when they pay off the \$71,000,000 which, it is alleged, they are to pay into the Exchequer, when the North-West becomes largely productive, affairs will probably change and the strength of the Dominion, as a whole, will be increased by the larger measure of prosperity enjoyed in the new settlement; but that result cannot be looked for in the immediate future, and it does not in the least alter the argument that in the near future our tax-paying power will be rather diminished than increased by the domestic migration.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said he understood his hon. friend intended to speak for some time yet. He had been on his feet for a long time, and it was now late. He (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) therefore suggested that there should be an adjournment, and allow his hon. friend to continue to-morrow.

MR. BLAKE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said if his hon. friend (Mr. Blake) desired an adjournment he would certainly consent.

Mr. BLAKE moved the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to, and Debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Ten minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 16th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RECEPTION OF PRIVATE BILLS REPORTS.

EXTENSION OF TIME.

Resolved, That the time for receiving Reports on Private Bills be extended for two weeks from the 16th instant, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.—(Mr. Langevin.)

SUPPLY—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion (Sir S. L. Tilley): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

MR. BLAKE: When the House was good enough to permit me last night to postpone my further remarks, I had pointed out, with reference to the domestic migration of the United States, that it was impossible to hope from our home resources anything approaching an equal supply for the North-West; that in fact their increase furnished no indication whatever of the rate of increase on which we could count from that source, save that it would be infinitely smaller, and could not be mentioned in the same breath; and I was about to advert to the relative condition of the two countries with reference to foreign emigration. I quite agree that recent events furnish us with a very happy prospect of a considerable immigration of British farmers here. I hail that as one of the most encouraging circumstances to be looked at in glancing at our future. I think that what has happened, and what is happening, cannot be without important benefit to us. There can be no doubt whatever that the conditions of British agriculture have greatly changed, owing to the increasing food supplies both in

meat and grain from foreign parts. The cheapening of the supply has rendered it impossible for English farmers to continue paying the large rents they have been accustomed to pay. There is consequently a struggle between the landlord and tenant at this time, and it is not to be expected that the landlords will submit without reluctance, or except upon the pressure of necessity, to a very large reduction, or to any reduction they may think unreasonable in their rents, and in the course of that severe, if not hostile struggle, it is to be expected that a great many British farmers will emigrate to this country. But, notwithstanding that circumstance, I hold that it is impossible to contrast the situation of the two countries—Canada and the United States—on the general question of foreign emigration, without concluding that our future is not to be measured by the estimate of theirs. What has happened in the west with reference to them cannot be expected reasonably to happen in our West with reference to us, so far as the result is to be obtained by foreign emigration. I have already stated that the foreign emigration to the United States for the decade ending 1860, was 2,600,000; for that ending 1870, 2,500,000; and for the present decade it is supposed it will amount to 2,700,000. These figures are enough to convince us that the rapidity with which western lands have been settled, so far as that rapidity is due to the direct or indirect effects of foreign emigration, it is not a rapidity which we can hope to reach in our North-West. Nor can I agree that the area of land in the United States available for settlement, although it is, no doubt, being rapidly diminished, is as yet at all reduced to such proportions as to force the current of emigration to our North-West. There are still large areas of land in that country which are available for settlement, and which, to those who happen to prefer the United States, will give them an opportunity of settling there for some years to come. The United States, in a sense, commands the market in this respect. The emigration to the states, as far as I can understand, has been composed in later years, to very large extent of the Teutonic races. The Germans have played a very large part in the settlement of the United States

They exist there in very great numbers and they exercise there a powerful influence. The same opinions which led the inhabitants of that and all the countries of Europe, enjoying but partially developed constitutional Government, when deciding to leave their native lands and seek foreign shores, to choose the United States as their goal, have derived further strength from the knowledge that there are settled in the great Republic millions of their brother Germans and the descendants of their brother Germans. It is therefore natural that we should expect, for several years to come at any rate, that the bulk of the Teutonic emigration will go, as it has gone hitherto, in the direction of the United States. The next important factor in the emigration to the United States has been from the people of the country from which I am descended; and we know that the circumstances of that country are such that, unfortunately for us, and for the British Empire, there has been a strong impulse on the part of a very large and important part of the population of Ireland to prefer the Republic. In this case the sins of the fathers have been visited on the children. The wrongs and injustice inflicted on the majority of the Irish population in former days—at least the memory of those wrongs and that injustice, the recollection of transactions, which no man would at this day vindicate or defend, has remained with those now on the soil, and obliterates, or at any rate obscures to their vision the more liberal conduct and the more just course which has animated British policy in this respect of later years. That circumstance has led to a large emigration from Ireland to the United States; and we know what the condition of Irish sentiment still is. But I hope for great things for Ireland and the Empire from the events of the last few days. I hope and trust that the advent to power of the Liberal party, supported by a great majority of decided Liberals and Radicals, will result in fresh measures for relief and justice to Ireland, which will tend still further to weaken her old feelings of hostility and disaffection, and to make the Empire in this regard a United Empire. I hope we shall see among other things a moderate measure of Home Rule for Ireland, and witness by the applica-

tion of that measure the creation and maintenance of true and real bonds of union between Ireland and the rest of the so-called United Kingdom. But things being as they are, and having regard also to the financial condition of the bulk of the Irish peasantry, no wise man can expect that within a short time, that within the next few years, there will be any serious change in the current of Irish immigration. So far as the Roman Catholic Irish are concerned we must expect that the tide of emigration will continue for some time to set towards the United States. I hope the proportion may be diminished. I should rejoice greatly to see the Irish people recognise the advantages we offer them, and establish themselves within our borders, but still, I believe that for sometime we cannot count on a decided change. The set of emigration has been sufficiently shown by the figures I have given, and naturally, with the imperfect information available to those coming from other parts of Europe, and apart from all consideration of soil and climate, the notion of the important position and situation they would occupy under a Republican form of Government—the idea that as citizens of the great Republic they would have a greater part and more active share in the Government of their country—has actuated a great number of emigrants from the European continent to choose the United States as the field where their energies and their talents could be most fully displayed and the advantages of citizenship most freely exercised. Among the obvious material advantages presented to the minds of such persons is this: that the National Debt of the United States has been reduced in fourteen years by \$603,000,000. It has been reduced by 30 per cent. of the amount at which it now stands, and that great reduction has been affected in the face of great difficulties and obstacles, and, notwithstanding a period of depression which they have experienced, and which seems likely now to be followed by a period of revived prosperity, perhaps of inflation. I say that the contrast in this respect, upon which I shall take occasion later further to enlarge, between the condition of the United States and that of the countries from which emigrants come, is a contrast calculated to allure

them to the Republic. Though the statistics for the current decade of the United States are not yet available, I am able to refer to some figures showing the later progress of two states, especially alluded to by the hon. member for Cardwell a few days ago, Kansas and Nebraska. We were correctly told that Kansas had increased from 360,000 in 1870, to 850,000 in 1879, thus showing an increase in nine years of 490,000. I have already pointed out the elements of which the increase of population in the Western States is composed, and the domestic and foreign recruiting grounds from which that country draws her increase. These considerations alone show that the results in Kansas do not prove that our North-West is going to have a population of 550,000 in ten years, as stated, for none of the conditions are parallel. But apart from the fact that Kansas had in 1870, 360,000 of a population to start with, from which came a large natural increase forming an important part of the 490,000, it is to be remembered that Kansas had moreover in 1870 over 1,500 miles of railway in operation and during the decade her railway facilities were increased to 2,300 miles. There is no doubt, I believe, that this state has shown the most remarkable development in the history of the world. In 1866 the State of Kansas was the twenty-fourth in rank in the United States as a corn-producer, and in 1878 she had run up to the fourth. In 1866 she was twenty-fourth in rank as a wheat-producer, and she had run up in 1878 to be almost the first in rank, producing in that year 32,000,000 bushels of wheat. With all these advantages, with all these proofs of an unexampled progress, with that large domestic and foreign recruiting ground, to which I have before alluded, we find her increase of population in nine years was but 490,000, and we are told that the North-West without the advantages which were possessed by Kansas, is to have an increase through emigration of 550,000 in eleven years. Now, Sir, I will refer to Nebraska. In that state also there has been, as the hon. member said, very rapid progress. In 1870 the population was 122,000. In 1879 it was 386,000. The increase in the nine years was 244,000: There was thus, of course a substantial nucleus, the natural increase from which would form no immaterial part of the total increase.

There was also a great domestic and foreign immigration. There were also great railway facilities throughout the period. In 1870, there were 705 miles of railway in operation, and in 1878 1,320 miles; yet with all those advantages there was only an increase of 244,000 in the nine years; and even that increase was due to the circumstances to which I have referred, which give the States a greater power of settlement than we can hope for. These are the figures for the two States which hon. gentlemen have chosen, and I believe rightly chosen, as presenting the strongest grounds for their expectations. I do not think they furnish good grounds for these expectations. I do not think that the only experience to which we can refer, having regard to the differences between the two countries, justifies us, however sanguine or fervent our hopes may be, justifies us as business men, dealing with a business transaction, and calculating the cash returns we may count on from the North-West lands in the next few years, in concluding that there will be an emigrant population of 550,000 in that country at the end of eleven years, and in incurring on the faith of that result enormous liabilities, which, if not met out of the lands, must be met otherwise. Such a thing may happen—I wish it would, but I do not think it is probable, because the experience of no other country, making allowances, proves that it can happen in our case. The statement, I think, is purely conjectural, is highly improbable, and cannot be sustained by any analogous occurrence. So much for the first postulate of the hon. gentlemen. I do not grant his postulate. I do not think that it is demonstrable in any way. I believe that all past experience points to its inaccuracy. But it is enough for me to say that it is not so far proved as to render it prudent to count on its accuracy. Next, as to the probable number of acres to be sold and preempted, the hon. gentleman said the Government expect to sell to the purchasers of railway lands 10,820,000 acres, and an equal amount to preemptors, making a total of 21,640,000 acres to be sold. They expect to make free grants of 10,830,000 acres more, making altogether 32,640,000 to be disposed of. Now, the sales by the United States from 1860 to 1869 were 11,770,000

acres; but we are to double that quantity in our sales. The lands disposed of in the United States by tree grant and under tree-planting conditions during eleven years from 1868 to 1879 amounted to 47,140,000 acres; but we are to sell in eleven years 21,760,000 acres, and dispose of 10,830,000 acres more free. Although I quite admit that there are other considerations to be regarded in this comparison; that a large quantity of lands was in the same time disposed of by railway companies in the United States, and that therefore in applying their figures we must make considerable allowances, still I think these figures furnish us with some ground on which to base our calculations. I have no accurate information as to the sales of railway companies' lands. I do not pretend to be able to inform the House on the subject, but it is well-known that the railway belts in the United States are as a rule infinitely narrower than ours, that the United States itself owns the alternate sections of these lands, and that the greater portion of the land called railway lands by us could not be so denominated according to the system of the United States. But we expect to sell twice as many acres as the United States sold in ten years. Well, may our hopes be realised! But can we afford to venture the future of our country upon the realisation of those hopes? That is the present question. There is, however, a still more important point to refer to in connection with this subject. I will give the number of acres taken up for farming purposes in the twelve great States and Territories to which I have referred, at three different periods, as compared with the population. In 1850 the population was 2,740,000. The number of acres taken up was but 35,000,000, or twelve and a half acres per head. The number of acres of improved land, was 12,900,000, under five acres per head of the population. In 1860 the population was 5,610,000. The land taken up was 67,450,000 acres or twelve acres per head, and the improved land six and one-third acres per head. In 1870 the population was 8,665,000. The land taken up was 95,190,000 or under ten and a-half acres per head. The improved land was under six and

a-half acres per head. You thus find that in those States which are pointed to as the example on which our progress is to be based, there were only during the most progressive period twelve and a-half acres of land per head taken up for farms, and five or six acres per head of improved lands. Compare this with the figures the hon. gentleman has given. Grant him the 550,000 emigrants he estimates, he still assumes that these will take up 32,640,000, or more than fifty-nine acres per head of the population. The hon. gentleman may say "that is my liberality, I am offering ever so much more land than United States has given, and it is natural that more land will be taken up per head." No doubt that accounts for part of it, though for how much, I will not pretend to state; but I hold and believe that it is impossible seriously to act on the assumption that nearly five times the acreage per head will be taken up in the North-West that was taken up in the most prosperous period of the development of the States I have mentioned. I think that the calculation of the hon. gentleman has been demonstrated to be utterly fallacious. It proves that either the hon. gentleman has over calculated the number of settlers on farm lands to the population, or that he has over calculated the quantity of land each settler will take. One or other of these propositions must account for the difference. You cannot seriously assume that fifty-nine and a-quarter acres per head will be taken up with us where the United States dispose of only twelve and a-half acres to each head. Can it be said that experience proves the probability of this calculation so satisfactorily that we should commit ourselves irretrievably on the chance of its realisation? These figures are suggestive also in another respect, that of revenue, to which I have referred. You find the proportion improved is very small in proportion to the amount taken up, in the earlier period not much more than one-third, or four and three-quarter acres per head. I quite agree that our lands being largely prairie, we may expect to improve or render productive more rapidly a larger acreage than the average improved acreage in the Western States, and due allowance is to be made for that circum-

stance ; but, making the most liberal allowance, is it possible that from the extent of the improvements indicated by these figures, a large amount in payments on land, taxes and revenue, can be realised from the settler in the very early days ? These figures, as to the acreage of improved lands, adding what amount in reason you please for differences of condition, show that the returns cannot, in the early years, be very large, inasmuch as what the settlers pay must consist of surplus profits after building houses, barns, and fences, getting their lands into cultivation, and maintaining their families. I affirm that the figures I have mentioned do not justify the calculations of the Government. But whatever you may think as to the calculations considered up to this point, I hold it to be clear that the estimates of the cash to be realised from land sales are still more extravagant. The Government expect to receive in cash \$38,600,000 in eleven years, which would, exclusive of interest, be less than half the cost, a balance of over \$32,000,000 being payable later. The United States realised in the eighty-three years up to 1879, from its public lands, \$204,500,000, the average being \$2,460,000 a year. In the twenty years preceding 1879 they realised \$30,350,000, or an average of \$1,500,000 a year, which for eleven years would make \$10,500,000. But this Government expects to realise \$38,500,000 in eleven years ! Of course the lands sold by the Railway Companies in the United States are not included in this calculation. Making every reasonable allowance for this circumstance, and having regard to the conditions of the Canadian so-called railway belt, and assuming the average prices of the Government to be correct, the figures justify no such expectation. But the Government's calculations, made "by the highest authority," are wholly fallacious. The railway lands are divided into five belts, and the prices are, in each belt, \$5, \$4, \$3, \$2 and \$1 respectively, which, taken together, makes \$15, and divided by five, the number of the belts, does, indeed, produce an average of \$3 an acre, which is the estimate of the Government. But this, though a very simple, is not a scientific or accurate method of arriving at the true average price, because the various belts differ in width. In the first and

highest-priced belt the width is but five miles ; in the second, fifteen ; in the third and fourth, twenty, while the width of the \$1 belt is fifty miles. The true average—assuming as the Government does, the lands to be taken up according to their relative value and attractiveness, and that the lands will bear the enhanced prices put on them, according to their proximity to the railway, instead of being \$3 for these railway lands is, when you allow for the varying widths of the belts, but \$2.12½. This single error, of course, reduces the receipts from these lands nearly one-third, or by several millions. But the calculations as to the preemptions is still more amusing. The Government calculate according to the first Minister's statement that for the land preempted they will receive the same average of \$3 per acre, whilst the highest price payable for any preempted land is but \$2.50 an acre. This is the price for the first three belts. The fourth belt is \$2, and the big belt, which nearly equals in width all the others, \$1 only, and consequently, the average price for these lands is \$1.75, or not much over one-half the estimate made "on the highest authority," which, by the figures given, would seem to be calculated at \$2.50 an acre. I have thus pointed out how little this House can depend on the Government estimates. The general result of those two errors is, that instead of \$38,500,000 being receivable from these lands in eleven years, only \$23,350,000 will, on the basis assumed by the Government itself, be received, or a difference of \$15,240,000. And correcting the same errors as to the sums remaining due at the close of the term, the estimate of \$32,750,000, for these sums remaining due must be reduced to \$21,620,000, a difference of \$11,590,000, making a total error of calculation of \$26,830,000 in the estimate presented to the House by the hon. the First Minister, and endorsed by the hon. the Ministers of Finance and of Railways, as the groundwork for our action. Under these circumstances I am not surprised that the hon gentleman should have felt it necessary to save the \$10,000,000 he economised last week. The extravagance of the estimate is shown in other ways. It seems that a purchaser will pay on railway lands \$1,219.70 for a lot, while the preemptors,

at the same rate for their half, 160 acres, will pay at the highest \$522,40, principal and interest. But apart from these errors of calculation, reducing so largely the fund upon which we were to depend for building the Columbia section of the Canada Pacific Railway, there are other considerations which wholly vitiate the estimates of the hon. gentleman. The average price to be realised largely depends upon the sale of lands in the nearer belts, and if anything occurs to disturb the sales in them, it is quite clear that even the smaller average I have stated cannot be realised. Then, not merely the average price, but the whole sales depend upon the character of the country. My hon. friend from Lambton will kindly relieve me from discussing in detail this important point, as having looked at all the reports on that subject, he will undertake the task of pointing out what, according to our official information, is the character of the country in the railway belt. It will be found that the map which the hon. gentleman brought down last night, and in which he depicted the barren spots as brown, is not at all "brown" enough with reference to the North-West. It does not by any means accurately represent the extent of the bad and inferior land in that country. The hon. gentleman stated that he estimated there were 150,000,000 acres of good land in the North-West; but he did not state that all that was arable or wheat land; and I understand from him in conversation that he does not mean any such thing. It will be found that the number of acres of wheat land are not to be measured by anything like those figures. In fact, Mr. Fleming, in a late paper, places the wheat land at 80,000,000 acres, and the pasture land at a like quantity. All estimates on this subject are at present conjectural; but, doubtless, there is a vast expanse of fertile land, though broken by intervening spaces of barren and inferior soils. There is there good land enough to support a very large population. It will be found, however, that circumstances will prevent much of the high-priced lands close to the railway belt being taken up. There is bad land close to the Railway, in many places, barren, swamp and inferior land. These and other considerations show that, both with reference to the smaller average,

which is obtainable only by assuming that the lands near the Railway are all good lands, and with reference to the general rate of prices, which is reached on an exaggerated view as to the quantity of first-class land, the expectation of the hon. gentleman is not likely to be realised. It is obvious that if there be bad lands close to the Railway the settlers will not pay \$5 an acre for them. There is no object in being near the Railway, if you can raise nothing which you can send away by it. You would rather be fifty miles away, on land capable of producing a crop, than close to the line on a desert or a swamp. Another circumstance which vitiates this estimate is, that settlers will not buy railway lands as long as free grants are obtainable. I speak in the large. Of course there will be instances in which a settler will buy railway lands; and the capitalist who wants more than 320 acres, will, doubtless, buy railway lands adjoining his free grant. But, speaking generally, you will find that settlers will not purchase railway lands so long as free grants are obtainable. There is a good reason why they should not. They get 160 acres free, and the remainder on more favourable terms than the purchaser of railway lands, and, therefore, there will be, in these earlier years, fewer settlers on railway lands than the hon. gentleman calculates. Another reason why there will be fewer purchases, by settlers, of railway lands, is that the hon. gentleman has placed a barrier in the way of such purchases by opening the railway lands to speculators. Speculators are following day by day, and hour by hour in the track of the surveyors, finding out the best sections of railway lands, particularly in the cheap outside belts, and their entries are in the land office before the report comes in; not with the view of settlement, but with the view or taking what people on the English stock market call "a long shot"—with the view of investing ten cents an acre in dollar lands, or twenty cents an acre in two dollar lands, in the expectation that after an interval of years the development of the country will enable them to exact enormously higher terms from the settlers coming in. The hon. gentleman may delude this House by a return, this year or the next, into the notion that he

MR. BLAKE.

is going to make a great deal of money by selling the railway lands, because he is selling to speculators a large quantity of cheap lands on which the purchasers are paying only ten or twenty cents an acre; but the real and solid returns to Government from railway lands will be what settlers will ultimately pay. Those from buyers on speculation will be but insignificant. What the settlers will pay is the measure of the true value of those lands to us; and you are deliberately marring the chances of developing that country, when you place in the hands of speculators, upon the payment of 10c. or 20c. an acre, the choicest part of the railway lands; leaving it to them to determine, at their good pleasure, how soon and what prices the intending emigrant may take them, and begin to make them valuable and productive to himself and the country. For the sake of making a false show of selling fast, you are throwing away the best chances of an effective and useful disposition of these lands. Then it is pretended that the pre-emptors will, at the end of three years, pay in bulk four-tenths of their pre-emption price with the interest. The hon. gentleman seriously suggests that 3,000 homesteaders, who go in 1880, will, in 1883, pay in \$696,000, or \$232 a piece, on account of their preemptions; that the next lot will pay \$928,000; the third, \$1,000,000, and so on, until 1890, when the sums to be paid in by the pre-emptors will be \$1,576,000. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the free-grant settlers will, as a rule, take up their preemptions. No doubt they will enter for them, and proceed to improve them, but there is equally little doubt that when the end of the third year comes round, the hon. gentleman's coffers will not be much fuller, by reason of the payments for preemptions then falling due. I do not mean to say he will not ultimately realise a considerable sum; but, I am talking of his calculation, that he will build this Railway in ten years practically out of receipts from these lands. I say that all the experience of all Governments with reference to sales of public lands is that the settler is slow to pay. Is the hon. gentleman going to tell these men, who have been straining every nerve to culti-

vate and improve these lands during their first three years, that unless they then pay up their preemption money, they shall forfeit their preemption? Is he going to use the landlord policy with reference to these settlers? Is he going to evict them? No; he has no intention of doing that. He will not even threaten them with eviction or forfeiture. I do not hear much talk of threatening even the speculators in case of default. Depend on it, there will be no such talk to the settlers. Judging from all past experience, the result will be, that settlers will feel secure—will feel that it is not necessary for them to pay promptly; and, indeed, to create a feeling of insecurity, by threats or harsh methods, would be most detrimental to the settlement of the country. Consequently, the calculations based upon the punctual receipts of revenue from these lands will be wholly falsified, even if all the other calculations should turn out true. The hon. gentleman expects to receive, in the fourth year, \$1,870,000; in the following year, \$2,622,000; in the next year, \$3,230,000; in the next year, \$4,112,090; in the next year, \$5,058,000; in the next year \$5,833,000; in the next year, \$6,877,000; while the last year of this series of rapid progression is to yield \$7,562,000, to be received in cash from the sales of North-West lands—an aggregate of \$38,593,000, apart from the sums not yet due of \$32,712,000. Now, I venture to say, if every one of the other calculations be realised, if the hon. gentleman gets into that country the amount of emigration he expects, and at the time he expects, if he makes sales to the numbers and at the prices he expects, these calculations as to the dates and amounts of his receipts will, under no circumstances, be realised. Under no circumstances will he receive these sums, or anything like them, at these times or anything like them. Let the fourth and subsequent years be the test. The receipts from settlers in all the earlier period will be relatively small; and not before these settlers, who can pay only out of their surplus profits after improving their lands and maintaining their families, achieve prosperity and become able to pay, will you find the lands becoming, as they ought to be, a source of revenue to the country. Even according to the cor-

rected calculations, the Government would be receiving in the fourth year \$1,231,000, running up to nearly \$5,000,000 in the last year, so that these corrected calculations are, in this respect, almost as preposterous as the original. Depend on it your returns will be long deferred. Then the hon. gentleman takes up the question of the expenses of management and surveys, which he estimates at \$2,400,000. Now, judging by the results in the United States, that also is quite too low. You will remember that there is an enormous acreage to be surveyed. If all the lands were fairly good lands, and the surveys could be kept only abreast of the settlement, you would require to survey 49,000,000 acres to effect the settlement the hon. gentleman expects, not that so much land is to be taken up by that number of persons; but to give room for the expected homesteaders to take up their free grants, so many townships as will comprise nearly 50,000,000 acres must be surveyed. But that is on the assumption that all the land to be surveyed is good land, and that all the land surveyed will be taken up. I say that is an assumption we cannot reasonably act upon, since there is bad and broken land, and since you must keep surveys ahead of settlement; and it is more correct, perhaps, to conjecture, as we are now in the region of conjecture, that 80,000,000 will be the amount of acres required to be surveyed, in order to effect the disposal of the smaller quantity, than to conjecture that 50,000,000 will be the number. Then, there is the cost of collecting all these millions of money from all these thousands of men. I think the charge too low. I do not know what the immigration policy of the Government is to be, whether they intend largely to increase the expense for that purpose or not, or to devote the available amount to the North-West; but it is obvious that, if these lands are to be rendered productive by immigration, the cost of inducing immigration should be considered a first charge upon the lands; and that this, in addition to the cost of surveys and management, should reasonably be deducted from the proceeds of the lands, before you can apply anything to railway purposes. Indeed, I may go further and say, that the cost of payments for Indians of over

\$550,000 a year, and for the Mounted Police Force about \$300,000 a year, in all \$850,000 a year, and other local charges, are prior charges on the proceeds of the lands. I maintain that the whole thing is visionary. Indeed, I may remind the House that when the hon. gentleman opened his remarks, he demanded a certain postulate to be granted to him; that he declared later that he would prove his figures to a demonstration; and then at the end he offered us to abate one-half. "If you will not," says he, "take the whole of my estimate, take one-half." A calculation commencing so pretentiously, and terminating in so humiliating a manner, was hardly, perhaps, worthy the serious attention I have been compelled to ask the House to give it. Now, with reference to the application of all this money. In the announcement of the First Minister, he took \$38,600,000 to be received in the eleven years, and deducted at the close of the period \$2,400,000 for management, the net cash coming in being thus, \$36,200,000. Set this against the \$60,000,000 he estimated to be spent on the Pacific Railway, and there is a small balance of \$24,000,000! Yet the hon. gentleman tells us the cost of the road is to be met out of the land sales, without encroaching on our taxes. But that is not the true state of the account. The hon. member for Gloucester at once pointed out that the hon. Minister had not allowed for the interest on the cost of construction, and that this would absorb a large part of the receipts. To that, no reply was then made; but the next day the hon. the Finance Minister acknowledged the justice of the criticism, and, in that free and off-hand manner in which he is accustomed to deal with millions of money, agreed that \$18,000,000 for interest on the \$60,000,000 should be deducted from the receipt. First, he would reduce the hon. First Minister's estimate by half, then take off \$18,000,000 from the remainder, and still, said he, enough remains to build the road. Even the \$18,000,000 the hon. the Finance Minister was willing to deduct, does not represent the true state of the case. As I said the other evening, we shall have spent, up to the 30th of June, \$15,000,000, in round numbers, on the Pacific Railway, the interest paid on which, at only 4 per cent., would amount

to \$1,272,000 up to that period. But, taking the figures of the hon. Minister given the other night, namely, a further expenditure of \$10,000,000 a year for the two first years, and \$5,000,000 a year for each of the eight following years, allowing interest on these at 5 per cent., and on the old balance at 4 per cent.; and taking the receipts from lands as the hon. Minister himself erroneously estimated them, then the result would be a yearly deficiency for interest so large as to run up in the third year to \$3,332,000, and in the sixth year to stand at \$698,000. The account gets to the credit side in the year 1887, and from that time the interest is paid, and something is available towards the principal; but the practical result would be a credit, according to that calculation, not compounding the interest in the earlier period or crediting the later yearly surpluses to capital until the close of the term, of \$12,631,000 only to the capital account of the Pacific Railway. But according to the corrected calculations, there would be a deficit of interest, swelling each year until in 1885 it reaches a sum of over five millions, thence gradually diminishing, until at the close of the term it stands at \$1,478,000, so that the practical result would be that, at the close of the term there would be nothing accomplished out of the proceeds of the lands, except to pay the bulk of the interest on the cost of construction, and the whole capital account, with a portion of interest, would remain due. Let me summarise these results—the statement of the hon. First Minister gave him a net return from lands of \$68,900,000, against an expenditure of \$60,000,000, leaving a credit balance of \$8,900,000. The corrected statement gives him a net return of \$44,470,000 only, and an expenditure for principal of \$60,000,000, and for interest, excluding arrears of interest, of \$23,560,000, in all \$83,560,000, leaving a debit balance of \$39,090,000—a trifling error in the grand result of about \$48,000,000. And, when you remember that even this calculation is, as I have proved, based upon wholly visionary estimates, I think it is established that, as business men, we cannot build largely on the taxes of this country being lightened in respect of the construction of this Railway within the next few years.

My conclusion is this, that although we may receive, and I hope we will receive, in the time to come, a considerable revenue from our lands in the North-West, yet we cannot, as prudent men, expect that we will early receive such a large amount, or anything approaching it, or anything approaching one-half the amount which the hon. Minister suggested; that we cannot expect that the immediate charge and strain upon the resources of the country, involved in the Ministerial programme, will be early relieved by the receipts from lands. We must look, therefore, to our other resources for the present bearing of that strain, and when these large receipts do come in they will come in only to recoup us for the long years of arrears of interest which will meantime have accrued, and will not do much towards the liquidation of the original cost. These fantastic calculations do not bear investigation. They are based on extravagant speculations in everything tending to increase the receipts, and on erroneous figures besides; they are based on untrustworthy estimates in everything tending to diminish the charge, and on erroneous figures besides; and, on the whole, I declare that no sane business man would incur large liabilities on the chance of meeting them out of such resources. Now, Sir, I for one, have no wish to prevent any expenditure which is essential for the settlement of the country. I wish the House to understand that that is, at any rate, no part of my policy. On that subject, as I have said, the die is cast. Most of us believe that we have a prospect there; and I want all to unite in the effort to realise that prospect. I think even those who do not believe it to be so bright as others do will agree in making the effort. I wish that we should direct our exertions to every step calculated to make the best of that country; to settle it at the earliest day; to give it as soon as possible a productive population, and to make it a prosperous and influential portion of the Dominion. It is because I want the great experiment to have a fair chance of success, because I believe that, committed as we are, it is our duty and our interest to give it that chance of success, that I implore the House to direct its undivided attention at present to this point; to apply the avail-

able resources, scanty as they are, of this country, exclusively to that backbone of the whole enterprise, without the success of which there can never be a Pacific Railway from sea to sea, without the success of which our whole plan and future may be scattered to the winds. Prudence in our expenditure is essential to the success of settlement. Do you suppose that those intelligent persons who are about to emigrate to this country will be attracted or repelled by the proposal to expend \$30,000,000 in the gorges of British Columbia? Do you suppose that the suggestion that we can afford to expend this large sum at present, because these settlers will repay it in taxes and land purchases, is calculated to encourage them to go into that country? Do you suppose that these people, scanning the policy and programme of the Administration upon this subject, and understanding that this vast expenditure is to be at once incurred because they will pay it all, may not say, "perhaps we had better not join, perhaps we had better not be partners in this gigantic undertaking if we alone are to meet the expense." Prudence in the limitation of our burdens, prudence as to the increase of the National Debt, prudence as to every enterprise the Government are undertaking at the same time that they are undertaking the settlement of this country, is an essential condition to the success of their effort at colonisation. Do not frighten away those who might join us, by your lavish and reckless engagements, based on their anticipated payments and their expected taxes. Our position is critical, and we should husband our resources for what that position may demand. The hon. Minister himself stated yesterday that Canada stood in a critical position. I agree with him, and standing in that position—more critical in my view, perhaps, than in the hon. gentleman's—it is doubly necessary that we should take care not to undertake just now more than is generally agreed to be essential to the success and the future of our country. Tide us over for the present, and if your expectations are realised, if you receive these large sums within the short period you have predicted, if within four or five years these sums are paid into the Treasury, then it will be soon enough to decide that there is a practical basis upon

which business men can act; soon enough to agree that there is a foundation upon which we can proceed to build in British Columbia. Then we can honestly tell our constituents that there is money, obtained from the lands, out of which the Railway can be built, without further adding to their burdens. But, in the meantime, we cannot honestly say this; we cannot show them that the resources of this country, without using means raised by the heavy burdens of taxation levied for the purpose, will suffice to build the Railway in British Columbia; and I, for one, stand opposed to the expenditure of these heavy taxes in any such way. And now, having shown that we cannot depend on the sales, and must look to the taxes, at present, to meet the proposed expenditure, it is necessary to ascertain our present condition, as compared with our condition in 1871, and to examine into the state and resources of this country. Circumstances render it extremely difficult to form an accurate estimate of our position. Fortunately, we are called upon to form an estimate now, not for one or two years, but for a series of years. We have a policy, a plan for ten years, before us, and we are, therefore, called upon to measure the future of this country for a long term. The best course is to look back a little and see whether from the lessons of the past we can derive any light to be shed upon our future condition. It is difficult, as I have said, to deal, even in a series of years, with the question of the progress of this country. The vicissitudes of the seasons, upon which depend our main industry and source of wealth, the changes in the markets of the world, in the price of grain, and in the price of lumber, our principal articles of export, the changes in the world's trade, the succeeding depressions and inflations which result in alterations in the profits of our shipping business, and in the cost of the goods we import, all these circumstances render it an extremely difficult task for a Finance Minister from time to time to forecast the future of Canada, even for a short eighteen months; and it is with unfeigned diffidence that I venture to offer some general observations with reference to the past as throwing light on the present and future of our country. For three years after Confederation the amount of our

imports was almost stationary. The times were hard. That period was followed by several years of tremendous inflation. The hon. member for Cardwell referred to one circumstance, which, no doubt reduced to some extent the apparent amount of our imports, namely, our illicit trade with the United States. There was also the excessive value of commodities. These circumstances, no doubt, are to be considered as modifying the apparent inflation. But, apart from the question of illicit trade, these inflated values only show after all that we got less for our money. They do not prove that we paid less money. After this period of inflation, there have followed four years of ever widening and deepening depression; and the first question I put is, how far our tax-paying powers have really increased since 1871, when it was resolved that we should not increase the existing rate of taxation in order to complete the Pacific Railway. Two factors have to be considered in order to solve this question—first, the increase of population—secondly the increase of resources. Increase of population does not necessarily mean increase of tax-paying power. We may have more heads, but each head may be poorer, and consequently there may be a smaller aggregate of surplus wealth, though divided among a larger number of heads. In this case there would be no increase of tax-paying power. I do not believe that the people of Canada are, on the whole, able to pay more taxes per head to-day than in 1871. There has been an enormous shrinkage in our lumber trade, from \$28,000,000 in one year to \$13,000,000 in another. There have been many bad crops. There has been a great shrinkage in bank stocks, and a number of these institutions has been swept away altogether. There has been a great depreciation in real estate, not so much as compared with 1871, but sufficient to be destructive of any increase between 1871 and 1879. There has been a general and long prevailing and deep state of depression in trade and commerce, resulting in the loss of an enormous amount of capital. Besides this, there has been a large increase in federal, provincial, municipal, corporate, and private indebtedness. Anyone who listened to the debate, the other day, could not

but be appalled by the statements as to the amount loaned on mortgages in the Province of Ontario. Added to all this, there has been an upward turn in the price of gold, which is unfavourable to all borrowing and indebted communities. Against these unfavourable circumstances are to be set expenditures, which have taken the form of assets. We have made large federal, provincial, corporate and private improvements. But these are represented in part by premature or mis-directed applications of capital. No one will pretend that the Intercolonial Railway, located as it is, is a good commercial speculation; and several Railways in Ontario and elsewhere have been constructed at a time and on routes which prevent their value from equalling their cost. Many of these public works will in future be very valuable, but at present they do not form an addition to our resources commensurate with the burdens they involve. The tax-paying powers of the people of Canada, man for man, are, I repeat, no greater than in 1871. One proof of that is, we are actually buying less. For four years the imports have been diminishing. Last year they reached the lowest point for nine years. It may be truly said that we bought less in nominal value, because goods were cheaper, and we got more for our money; but that observation does not hold good to the full extent to which it is sometimes advanced, for values in 1871 had not reached their maximum, and were not so far above those for 1879 as to account, to any adequate extent, for this difference in the amount of our importations. The truth is that we are not buying largely, because we are too poor to buy largely—we cannot afford it. And this, as I said, is a corroborative proof that we are not better able, man for man, to pay taxes than in 1871. Nor will an inflation next year, or the year after, if there should be one, alter the facts. We do not proceed by regular steps, we go up and down; and on this occasion it is our rate of progress for a series of years, not for a year or two, that we are called on to consider. Speaking generally, in view of the history of the last decade, and in view of our resources and our true elements of prosperity, old Canada cannot expect a genuine rapid increase of her resources. I hope

for progress; though it will be hindered by our Tariff laws. The hon. gentlemen opposite hope for progress on account of our Tariff laws. Both are agreed in hoping for progress. That there will be progress I have no doubt, but I think it will not be such as to interfere with the correctness of the calculations I am making. I call on those who indulge in more sanguine hopes to give a reason for the faith that is in them. I believe hard work, rigid economy, prudent management, and gradual progress and accumulation is the fate of this country, as a whole, and of its population individually. I regard it as no unhappy fate, I regard it as possessing great and compensating advantages. From the character of our climate, and the nature of our resources, and other circumstances, from the necessities of our situation, we are taught to practice virtues whose possession is a full compensation for the absence of those somewhat easier conditions of life, those more lightly earned gains, those brighter material prospects which may, perhaps, be observed in some other lands. Sturdy independence, manly labour, vigorous exertion, prudent self-restraint, wise economy and temperance, these are great and satisfying compensations; but, Sir, we must show our appreciation of these virtues by an earnest effort to practice them, not merely in private life, but as the distinguishing characteristics of our national existence. If we do not, we fail; and when you find in this country apparent progress by leaps and bounds, you may conclude that that progress is more fictitious than real, and will be followed by disaster which will sweep away our fictitious gains, and leave us poorer than before. Now, Sir, assuming that our tax-paying power is no greater, man for man, than in 1871, we have only to ascertain the increase of population since that time. The hon. Minister of Finance roughly estimated our population the other day at 4,000,000, that is, including the new Provinces. For obvious reasons I take, for the old Provinces, the rate of increase demonstrated by the last Census, although I think that too large an estimate; and I make out our population at 4,050,000, including the new Provinces, which, for this purpose, may be reckoned at something under 200,000. Now, of the new Provinces, it

may be repeated that whatever their tax-paying powers, their tax-consuming powers are still more remarkable. I have an interesting table of the results as to the collection and distribution of our Revenue for the first ten years after Confederation, which will answer the prudent query of the hon. Finance Minister yesterday, in reference to the tax-paying power of Manitoba and British Columbia, when he asked why we should not count on a large net revenue from the North-West, having regard to the example furnished by those Provinces. Now, Sir, assigning to each Province the revenue derived from it, as shown by the Public Accounts, and charging each Province with its local services, and with such parts of the Federal services as are by the Public Accounts distinguished and assigned to the separate Provinces, the results are as follows: We collected in all \$198,000,000; we spent in all \$189,350,000; leaving a surplus of \$8,650,000. The receipts from Manitoba were \$876,000, the distinguished expenditure, \$1,599,000; the deficit on this head, \$722,000. For Prince Edward Island the receipts were \$1,596,000; the expenditure, \$2,624,000; the deficit, \$1,027,000. For British Columbia the receipts were \$2,558,000; the expenditure, \$3,441,000; the deficit, \$883,000. For Nova Scotia the receipts were \$19,112,000; the expenditure \$21,175,000; the deficit \$2,060,000. Then there come the receipts and expenditure on joint account for services not divided among the Provinces, for example, Legislation, Civil Government, a large part of the interest on the Public Debt, and other undivided items, and all the expenditures in connection with the North-West and the Pacific Railway. For these the receipts were \$7,599,000; the expenditure, \$50,581,000; the deficit, \$42,982,000; adding to this the aggregate of the provincial deficits before stated, you find a total deficit of \$47,677,000. Now, how was this met? We come to the surpluses. The receipts from New Brunswick were \$17,106,000; the expenditure, \$16,957,000, leaving a surplus of \$508,000. The receipts from Ontario and Quebec, jointly, were \$149,160,000; the expenditure, \$93,340,000; leaving a surplus of \$55,820,000, thus making with the New Brunswick surplus, a total

surplus for these three Provinces of Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick, of \$56,328,000, to be applied to the payment of the deficits before enumerated, amounting in the aggregate to \$47,677,000, leaving, after their payment, a nett balance of \$8,650,000 applicable to the reduction of debt. We find, therefore, that Ontario and Quebec have to provide and have provided for the bulk of this vast undivided expenditure resulting from the Confederation of the various Provinces comprising the Dominion; New Brunswick having supplied towards her share the sum of \$508,000, and Ontario and Quebec, after providing their own share, having provided the share also of all the other Provinces of the otherwise unprovided balances. I have not divided the various items for Ontario and Quebec, which are given jointly in the Public Accounts; but taking a few great heads of Revenue, a general conclusion may be reached. Thus the Excise duties of Ontario amounted to \$26,732,000; those of Quebec to \$13,647,600. The Customs duties for Ontario (allowing those on dutiable goods going into Ontario, though entered at Montreal, according to the results ascertained after exhaustive examination by the Commission which dealt with that subject some years ago), amounted to \$60,725,000. The Customs duties for Quebec amounted, according to the same results, to \$31,357,000. I estimate the division of Bill Stamps to be two-thirds for Ontario, and one-third for Quebec, making \$1,106,000 for the former, and \$552,000 for the latter. The general result on these heads is to give a revenue from Ontario of \$87,954,000, and from Quebec of \$45,556,000. I know that these figures may be disputed in some respects by the people of the Maritime Provinces as to particular items; for example, those which have reference to expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. I know it is contended, whether rightly or wrongly, that this expenditure should be entered as a general charge against the whole Dominion, and not charged separately against those Provinces. There may be, of course, other disputable details. I state this in order that the House may understand that these figures may be somewhat affected, but I am convinced that the re-

sult will not be very materially altered on that account. It will be seen from these statistics that some of the smaller Provinces, heavy as their contributions are—and I freely admit that several of them are heavier contributors *per capita* than some of the larger Provinces—are yet not adequate contributors to, on the contrary that they are heavy drains on the revenues of Canada; and it will be further seen that the bulk of the expenditure—I may say every shilling of the expenditure on the North-West and on the Pacific Railway—is contributed by the Province from which I have the honor to come. But apart from the question of the distribution of taxation, I have shown that our gross taxpaying power, as a whole, may be said to have been increased since 1871 by the addition of 560,000 souls, or sixteen per cent. to our population; that is, that if we can, or if we choose, to buy, man for man, goods to the same amount in money, as we bought man for man in 1871, our consumption of imported or excisable goods, and consequently our revenue would, under the same rates of taxation, be larger by 16 per cent. This then is the estimated measure of elasticity—not indeed the actual measure, for, as I have said, we are not buying, we cannot afford to buy, on the same scale—and, therefore, it is altogether too favourable a view for us to take. But let us adopt it for a moment; and proceed to enquire at what rate our expenditures have increased during the same time. Sir, the increase in expenditures has been altogether disproportionate to the increase, even on the most favourable view, of our tax-paying power. Our gross expenditures have risen from \$15,600,000, in 1871, to \$24,800,000, in 1879; an increase of \$8,800,000, or nearly 56 per cent. ! This, indeed, includes the charges on Revenue, which, in some cases, are represented by cross entries; but, on the whole, the charges on Revenue have increased seriously, relatively to the increased receipts. There are, in this branch of the expenditure, large added burdens. For example, in the Post Office, the deficiency, in 1871, was \$203,000; in 1879, it was \$612,000; an increased net charge of nearly 200 per cent. In Public Works, there was, in 1871, a surplus of \$315,000; in 1879, a deficit of \$817,000;

an adverse change of over \$1,000,000. But, leaving out of account all the charges on Revenue, how does the remaining expenditure compare? In 1871, it was \$13,250,000; in 1879, \$18,890,000; an increase of \$5,640,000, or over 42 per cent. Look at some of the items which produce this appalling result. The capital of our net debt stood in 1871, at \$77,700,000; in 1879, it had risen to \$147,480,000. It had almost doubled. It has since increased, so that it is now more than doubled; and still it goes rolling on. Our net annual charge for interest was in 1871, \$4,300,000; in 1879, \$6,660,000; an increase of \$2,360,000, or nearly 55 per cent.; and it still goes rolling on. The increase in the charge for interest has not indeed kept pace with that of capital, for several reasons. We have raised a large sum from our people without interest, in the shape of legal tenders in circulation, and compulsorily held as bank reserves. We have issued several guaranteed loans at very low rates of interest. We have reborrowed to pay off old loans at a much lower rate of interest than the rate they bore; we have borrowed fresh money at better rates; and we have been borrowing at a discount, which, of course, means that we have been capitalising a material part of our charge for interest. But with all those advantages, real and apparent, I believe, our nett annual charge for interest will, by 30th June next, be increased by \$2,700,000, a year or nearly 63 per cent. The truth is, Sir, that our annual foreign loans are now not much more than enough to pay our interest. Some part of them, indeed, have been of late years devoted in terms to that purpose; we have had yearly deficits, and have been obliged to borrow to pay our interest. But apart from this, the average annual loans to be raised for the next few years for Public Works will be not much greater in amount than our yearly interest payments. Can we go on so borrowing for ever? No, Sir, and the Minister who tells us he can, has yet prudently arranged to avoid an application to the London money market this year; and is about to try his hand at a cheap domestic loan. He is to ask us at home, out of our abundance, to supply him free of interest with the sum

MR. BLAKE

he wants. Passing from the charge for debt, some of the items which comprise the ordinary annual expenditure show startling increases. The Provincial Subsidies have increased 31 per cent.; Civil Government, 34 per cent., with an enormous further increase in the present Estimates; Administration of Justice, 83 per cent.; Penitentiaries, 46 per cent.; Indian grants, by \$480,000; North-West Police, by \$290,000; in Legislation there has been an enormous increase; with a general result that the ordinary expenditure has increased between 1871 and 1879, by \$2,330,000, or over 50 per cent. In the face of this startling and wholly disproportionate increase of our expenditures over our tax-paying power, is it not plain that we have been going too fast? We have been running ahead of our resources. We have increasing our expenses more than three times as fast as our tax-paying power. Our situation is truly critical. We have been imitating, and even surpassing, the extravagance and recklessness of the nations composing the European system. The European nations in the fourteen years from 1864 to 1879, increased their National Debts 65 per cent. in the aggregate; but we have doubled ours in nine years. The budgets of those nations were increased in the last fourteen years 40 per cent.; but we have increased ours 56 per cent. in nine years. It is quite true that our expenditure has been more productive than theirs. We have not been engaged in numerous or frightfully expensive wars. We have expended large sums in improvements more or less productive. But for all that, we have been immoderate in our expenditure, we have acted extravagantly, we have gone beyond our tax-paying power, and we have surpassed the European system in the increase of our annual charge. I say we should not present to intending immigrants such a similarity in financial management to the countries which they are leaving, mainly because of their heavy burdens. We should rather endeavour to present to them a cheering contrast to the European system; and this the more because there is one country, our rival and competitor in the immigration market, which does present a marked contrast to the European system. While Canada is so lavishly ir-

creasing her yearly expenditure and National Debt, the United States has presented to the people of Europe the unique example of an enormous reduction in its National Debt, and it is that fact which constitutes one of our greatest difficulties in competing with that country for immigrants. I dare say the hon. gentleman will accuse me of being "unpatriotic," but it is no use blinking the facts. It is not unpatriotic to say what is true.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : The hon. gentleman mistakes if he thinks I object to his stating the fact that a protectionist nation has succeeded in reducing its debt. I should certainly not make any such objections.

MR. BLAKE : I am not now discussing the general question of Free-trade and Protection. However achieved, these are the results. Nor must it be forgotten that a part of the increase in Europe has been applied to public improvements. Much public money has been expended in the construction of railways there. May not the emigrant, flying from burdens in his own country—flying from an enormous National Debt and annual Budget, say that it is prudent for him to fly to a country which presents a contrast to the one he is leaving, which shows a continually decreasing debt, and which, therefore, promises to lighten the burdens of taxation? We do not present that contrast—the United States do present that contrast. They tell the emigrant that they have reduced their debt by \$630,000,000, their interest by a still larger relative amount, their military expenses enormously, and that they are presenting a prospect of progress in the same direction. Why should we not emulate their plan, by placing, so far as our circumstances permit, this contrast before emigrants, instead of following the example set by the old countries from which we expect them to come? The United States has reduced its National Debt by 30 per cent. of its present amount; and its Budget, though large and extravagant compared to its scale before the war, and embracing many millions for war pensions and interest on war debt, now compares not unfavourably with our own. Before the war the expenditure of the United States, with a population of twenty-seven and one-half millions, showed a charge of \$2 a head.

Of course we pay large sums for provincial services, which do not in the United States form part of the federal charge. It is perfectly true that a comparison would be unfair without a very large reduction on that account, but, making that large reduction, it is equally true that the comparison is not unfavourable after all; that our system has become extravagant and onerous, and has gone beyond the increase of the tax-paying powers of the country; and it is time to call a halt. In this expenditure there is included \$1,272,000 for interest already paid on the Pacific Railway. There will be included \$600,000 a year for future interest on the past expenditure on that Railway, and untold sums for interest on the further expenditure. How have we met all this, while our tax-paying powers have been increasing so slowly? How have we made both ends meet? Partly by fresh loans, and partly by adding to the taxation of the people. The hon. Finance Minister said, the other day, that the difference between the taxes of 1868 and 1879 was a dollar per head, and that the increased taxation thus calculated was four millions of dollars. He gave us the figures by a rough calculation. According to my view, the figures for that period, so calculated, would be \$4,400,000, but I hold that this mode of computation is not a fair way of determining the real addition to the burdens of the people, and that they have been in truth increased to a much larger extent. That mode might be fair on the assumption that the people were consuming relatively the same amount of goods as formerly; but if in fact we are consuming a smaller value per head of goods, while we are paying a larger sum per head of taxes, it is obvious that the added taxation upon that limited consumption, which alone our poverty permits, has risen to a greater amount than \$4,400,000, and and to a larger amount than \$1 a head. Suppose, for example, that our imports for consumption were diminished by one half, while the taxes we paid remained the same as before, it is obvious that the burden of taxation on imports would be doubled. It becomes necessary then to ascertain and compare the rates of taxation of 1871 and 1880. There are three principal heads of taxation—first, Bill

Stamps, to which it is not necessary to refer as the amount is not very large, and there has been no material change in the tax. Taking up the second head, the duties of Excise, I will not trouble the House with any calculations as to malt and malt liquors, because the increased tax has now been taken off. The duty on spirits, estimated on the quantity entered for consumption in 1879, at the rate collected in 1880, would be \$3,650,000; and on the same quantity, at the rate for 1871, \$2,750,000. The increased tax is, therefore, \$900,000, or 33 per cent. of an addition. It may be alleged that the quantity entered for consumption in 1879 was abnormally large, and consequently, that the gross sum of \$900,000 is in excess of the increase on actual consumption. Were this so, it would not, of course, affect the rate of increase which would remain at 33 per cent. But I dispute the allegation, for it will be found that the quantity warehoused in 1879, is far below the corrected average for the nine years from 1871 to 1879, and is almost equal to the uncorrected average for that period. It is, therefore, obviously not an excessive consumption. I admit that the hon. gentleman can hardly expect so great a consumption this year, but, in my opinion, that is largely due to the fact that the tax has been raised beyond the true point of greatest productiveness. The magnitude of the tax has given rise to a great deal of smuggling or illicit distillation, thus interfering with the revenue, though not with the consumption, or with the cost to the people. I hope that the hon. gentleman may be right in attributing some part of the diminution to the prevalence of sounder views, as to the wisdom of abstaining from the use of liquor. But, after all, the test which I have applied, is the only fair one, and this proves that the quantity is not excessive. As to tobacco, the duty on the quantity entered for consumption, in 1879, at the rates for 1880, would be \$1,580,000. At the rates for 1871, \$1,140,000. The increased tax is, therefore, \$440,000, or 39 per cent. of an addition. The consumption is below the corrected average for the nine years, and, of course, far below the uncorrected average. It is, therefore, clear that this represents the minimum addition on this head. The result then is that the

increased excise on spirits and tobacco is \$1,340,000, or over 34 per cent. of an addition. Now I come to the last and greatest head of taxation, the Customs' duties; and I wish to show the House what is the increase in taxation on this head on the whole mass of the imported goods, dutiable and free, which we consume. To ascertain our consumption it is obvious that you must not take the total importations; nor can you, with propriety, take the goods entered for consumption. But by deducting from these the value of foreign grains and the products of foreign grains imported, since these articles are practically only in transitu, and are either exported in specie or set free for exportation an equivalent amount of home grain, you arrive, as nearly as the information given by our returns will allow, at the quantity of imported goods, free and dutiable, which we actually consume. This forms the basis of my calculation. Allowing for the temporary duties imposed in 1870, and taken off in 1871, by a proceeding which came into operation prior to the date of the taxation resolution, the rate of taxation on the imported goods, free and dutiable, which were consumed in the four years from 1867 to 1871 was, upon the average, 13.90 per cent. This, then, I take to be a fair ascertainment of the burden of our Customs taxation in 1871. But I may say that, even if you make no allowance for the temporary duties to which I have referred, the average rate will be raised only to 14.21 per cent., an increase which you will see is not sufficient materially to affect the results. During the subsequent three years (1872, 1873 and 1874), in the course of which there were considerable remissions of taxation, and in which also the very large consumption may have somewhat disturbed the relation between the quantities of free and of dutiable goods, the average rate fell to 12.33 per cent. In 1875, the first completed year after the increase made under the late Government, the rate was 14.32 per cent., a large increase indeed, an increase of nearly one-sixth, on the average of the preceding three years, but after all a very trifling increase, an increase of only one-thirty-third, on the average rate between 1868 and 1871. But what is the rate now, as ascertained by the return for the first six

months of the year? It is no less than 19.62 per cent. Nor does this represent the whole extent of the increase. The hon. Minister has told us that his revenue is suffering by reason of the excessive importation of goods in anticipation of the tariff. But the goods so imported were, of course, those of the class on which the largest increases were to be made. Of these, therefore, there has been an excessive supply, and by consequence an abnormal proportion of the importations for the last six months have been of goods paying the lower rates of duty. The over-importations being absorbed, and the imports reverting to their normal condition, these proportions will be changed, and consequently the average rate will be higher for the current six months; and, in the future, the Tariff will be found to inflict a charge considerably exceeding 20 per cent. on everything free or dutiable entered for consumption. But apart from this consideration, and assuming 19.62 per cent. to be the true rate, consider what this means compared with 13.90 per cent., the earlier rate. It means a new tax, a fresh tax, of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the value of everything free and dutiable which we import for consumption. It means an increased rate of taxation of over 43 per cent., for 5.72 is more than 43 per cent. on 13.90. Our Customs duties are nearly half as heavy again as they were in the early period. Now, if you apply the new Tariff to our very small consumption for 1879, a consumption many millions smaller than that of 1871, and smaller than any year thereafter, the increased taxation will, on that small consumption, be \$4,075,000, and this, on the incredible assumption that we are not to increase the value of our imports, is the very smallest measure of our added Customs taxation. If to that you add \$1,340,000, the increase in Excise, you find that the additional taxation of this country on the small consumption of 1879 was more than \$5,400,000. This is far greater than the hon. Minister's estimate of \$4,000,000, but it is far less than the burden will be in case the consumption should become normal. It is true that the smallness of the value imported in 1879, is partly due to the comparative cheapness of goods, but we must not for-

get that I have been comparing it with 1871, when values, though higher than in 1879, had not gone nearly to their highest point; and after making every allowance for cheapness there remains a large deficiency to be accounted for only by the consideration that our poverty and our economy have led us to stint ourselves. But prices are rising, and hon. gentlemen say, good times are coming. What would this Tariff produce on a consumption of the average from 1872 to 1875, \$109,000,000? You can easily tell. It is about one-fifth. It would take out of your pockets in Customs nearly \$22,000,000! But let us try to arrive at a normal consumption. You can reach it in two ways. Take the consumption of 1871 and add 16 per cent. to represent the increase of population. This would give you, for 1879, a consumption of \$91,300,000. Or take together the nine years of inflation and depression, ending with 1879, and the uncorrected average would be \$91,000,000, less than the proper estimate, of course, but coming very close to the figure reached by the other mode. Assume, then, that for us, in 1879, \$91,000,000 would be a normal consumption of imported goods, you would pay in Customs \$17,850,000; in Excise of spirits and tobacco, \$5,230,000; in all \$23,080,000. While, at the old rates, you would have paid in Customs \$12,650,000; in Excise, \$3,890,000; in all \$16,540,000, an increased burden on your normal consumption of over \$6,500,000. And this is a fair estimate of the result of the Tariff at the Custom-house and Inland Revenue Office. It is, indeed, quite clear that, with higher prices and good times, the hon. Minister should get a Revenue. When, on an average, one-fifth part of everything we require to import, great or small, cheap or dear, necessary or luxury, raw material or manufactured article, free or dutiable, and two-fifths parts of what we drink and smoke are abstracted by Government for public uses, how in the world can Government fail to realise a Revenue? And yet, if things should so turn out, no doubt we shall find the hon. the Minister coming down next Session boasting of his feat, and endeavouring to persuade the country that he has conferred on it great blessings, when he has in fact

only abstracted from it enormous sums by a raking and grinding Tariff, which is oppressive in its character and vexatious in its operation. But this is not all, Sir, or nearly all. We have been considering hitherto only the amounts that come into the hon. Minister's hands. But the uncounted millions which go into the pockets of the thousands of private tax-gatherers created by this Tariff, partly to unduly swell the legitimate profits of some industries, and the rest to compensate for the misdirected and unprofitable application of capital and labour to other trades; these millions though they are paid by the mass of the consumers, as surely as if they went into the Minister's hands, we are unable to ascertain or take into account. But this we know, that their receipt does not swell the Public Treasure. The people pay them, but the private, not the public tax-gatherer receives them; and so, though the people pay, they receive nothing in return. Sir, we have reached and passed, designedly passed, in many cases, the effective limits of a Revenue Tariff. We have been aiming at different and inconsistent ends. Pursuing revenue through imports, we have been attempting at the same time to check imports, on which our revenue depends, and to substitute for them home manufactures. And certain it is, that unless the hon. gentleman has wholly miscalculated his action, unless he has wholly bungled in the use of the great weapon he has been wielding, he will have stimulated home manufactures in respect of some of the articles of importation most productive of revenue. It is certain that he will have deprived the coffers of the country of the duties to be derived from those articles.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: As in the United States for instance.

MR. BLAKE: I do not propose, as I have already said, just now to enter into a general discussion of Free-trade and Protection, or to analyse the condition of the United States, or to examine how far they may be able to endure losses and to play tricks with the principles of political economy, which we can by no means afford. I think the distinctions are obvious. Nor do I intend to hazard a conjecture as to which of the two inconsistent objects which the hon. gentleman

has been pursuing he will earliest or most signally succeed in. I say that an effect will be sooner or later produced; and while in case of good crops and high prices there is no doubt the last Customs revenue will next year be increased; there is no doubt, also, that a very large sum will be sooner or later—and I think tolerably soon—diverted from the Custom-house to the pockets of individuals. It is plain, by the admission of the hon. gentleman to the extent of \$4,000,000, and, by the figures I have stated to a much larger amount, that we have greatly increased the burden of our taxation, and that every dollar that we are paying and are to pay for interest on the construction of the Pacific Railway, has come and must come out of this increased taxation, or from further additions to our burdens. It is obvious that you cannot meet in any other way the additional interest for the construction of the Railway; and, therefore, your plan is a deliberate violation of the settled and established policy of Parliament. To our present load we are to add many millions more for that work, and where, save from these odious and oppressive added taxes under which we labour, can you find the interest? Even apart from the Pacific Railway, and further expenditure on it, we are in a critical condition. We are trying one great experiment in trade. We are engaged in a supreme effort to make both ends meet in finance. We have not yet accomplished that feat. The hon. gentleman said a month or six weeks ago that the Revenue for this year would be within half a million of the expenditure. I wonder whether he will say so when he moves the second reading of the Supply Bill? We on this side believe the deficiency will be a great deal more. We are not yet in a state of equilibrium as to receipts and expenditure. We are engaged, I say, in one great experiment. Is one great experiment not enough at a time? Would it not be better not to plunge too deeply into experiments, speculations and conjectures? Would it not be better, as we are engaged in this large financial, commercial and fiscal venture, not to enter into fresh pecuniary engagements of an enormous character, based upon expectations of the vaguest and most fantastic kind? Are we now

MR. BLAKE.

finally to subvert the policy of Parliament re-enacted, as I have pointed out four several times, agreed to almost unanimously in 1876, that the arrangements for the construction of this road should be such as not to increase the burdens of taxation? Because, if you agree to the scheme of the Government, and go on now with the construction of the road in British Columbia, you commit yourselves to the construction of that road irrespective of the increased rate of taxation, and of the burdens imposed and to be imposed upon the country. I ask the House not to adopt that ruinous and reckless course; but in preference, to say they will limit themselves at present to the completion of the road between Fort William and Selkirk, and the prosecution of the prairie section, until we see the actual result in point of settlement, development, land sales and, above all, receipts of purchase money; and then, when that result has been ascertained, and a substantial fund has been provided from the sales, a fund available for the purpose of building in British Columbia without continuing to levy the present increased rates of taxation, that they will then, and not till then begin construction in British Columbia. Sir, we must consider the circumstances of this whole Confederation. We must not forget the mode in which it was formed. Hon. gentlemen opposite affirmed, with great warmth, in 1867, and for years afterwards, that it was but a union on paper, and that the reality and permanence of the connection were yet to be established and secured by a careful policy, and by a practical experience on the part of the people of its benefits. A cynic, indeed, has said that, as between Ontario and Quebec, it was rather a divorce than a union; that Nova Scotia was coerced into it, and compensated by damages for the loss of her honour; that New Brunswick was frightened into it, and compensated as well; that Manitoba was forced, and purchased into it, too; and that Prince Edward Island and British Columbia were—shall I say seduced into it? by pledges and promises—some impossible, all extravagant; at any rate by settlements of the most lavish character. But whether this description be true or not, at any rate hon. gentlemen admit that

it was at first a union only on paper. I want to know what has been done to cement it, to make it real and permanent, to make it a union of hearts and interests, to give it vitality and strength? Look at the various Provinces. Almost every one, after all your better terms, is in deep financial difficulties, and is knocking at your doors for further aid. Imitating your extravagance they have outrun their resources, and they have come to look on you as the great tax-gatherers for the Provinces, believing that they may go as far as they please and that Canada must fill the void out of the federal revenues. You have seen the distribution of your revenues and your expenditure. You remember all the promises at the time of union, of low taxes and cheap government. All, all are broken. The vast sums you collect from the smaller Provinces, heavier *per capita* than you collect from old Canada, and a grievous burthen on their people, are yet, as I have shown you, quite inadequate to meet their share of the cost of confederation. Ontario settles the balance. That Province asks no special advantages. She claims no special favours. She is ready to do her part, and more than her part, in the furtherance of the common interest. But she may fairly demand of you a prudent, a just, an economical expenditure of those resources which she contributes, and an abstinence from rash engagements for speculative and unprofitable objects. This indeed is the common interest. It is the interest of the whole. What is the present application of our revenue? Public works and improvements throughout the old Provinces have been, as far as possible, wholly stopped; there is no money for them! Our inland shipping trade, labouring under the greatest depression and the keenest competition, is asking for relief from some of its burdens; there is no money for it! The vast expenditure by which Quebec has strained her resources to accomplish a connection with the great west is largely abortive. Let Quebec learn the prudence of not building railways before they are wanted, and act on the lesson now; there is no money for the eastern link! No, Sir, all that we can raise by taxes or by loans, all that we can beg or borrow, is to be

sunk in the gorges of the Fraser. Should this be so? Are we to tax ourselves to the last point of endurance, and to mortgage heavily our future and our country for such an object as this? If it be true, as your trusted representative, your High Commissioner, said on the 27th March last, that "The duty of opening up the North-West is one we are to perform, not so much for ourselves as for the Empire at large; that the inhabitants of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and even Ontario, have not much greater direct interest in opening up those wheat fields than the farmers of Yorkshire and Tipperary;" if this be true, how much less interest have we in opening up the canons and gorges of British Columbia? If it be true, as your High Commissioner said, on the same occasion, that, "it is impossible for us with our limited means to undertake alone the settlement of the North-West; that we have neither the people nor the money to do it;" if this be true, how much less are we able to add to that intolerable task the Columbia section of the Railway? Is this indeed the way to develop even such a poor and attenuated national spirit as is attainable by a people who are not permitted, who, perhaps, do not even aspire to their legitimate participation in the management of the concerns of the great family of nations? Is this indeed the way to infuse among us the spirit of unity and brotherly love, to make us one, and a contented people? You may perhaps partly satisfy the 12,000 souls in British Columbia; but only because your action is the pledge and hostage to them for the completion of this gigantic work, to the ruin of the whole. For us, for all, this is not the way. It is not by the forced connection of a restrictive Tariff, compelling each of us to trade with some other of us, to our loss, and against our will; it is not by the fatal load of an enormous debt, crushing out our energies and mortgaging our hopes; it is not by an added weight of taxes, lowering the value of our labours, and lessening the comfort of our lives; it is not by flinging, with a lavish hand, into the mountains and rivers of Columbia all you can collect or borrow, while you starve all public works at home; that you will accomplish a real success, that you will consolidate and harmonise the union. You

are making our load heavier than that of the United States. You are making it heavier than we can bear. You are paving the way to that very annexation which you profess to dread; because you are bringing us to a plight in which we may be forced to do, as a people, what we heard described the other day as the sad end of many an imprudent individual borrower, to sell our poor equity of redemption to the only available purchaser. You profess unbounded faith in the permanence of your restrictive Tariff; you blame us for even discussing its operation, for throwing doubts on its durability; and at the same instant you send a High Commissioner to England, who asks her to close her ports against the grain of the world, in order that your farmers and hers may obtain from her millions of poor a higher price for the staff of life; and, who proposes in return, that you should open your ports to her manufactures, thus destroying your revenue, and at the same time, under the fierce and unchecked competition of the cheapest producers in the world, blasting at once every one of your home industries, which is said to be dependent on a duty for its existence. Such is your reckless, your inconsistent, your vacillating, your unpractical policy! Do you ask for mine? I will tell it. Set free the springs of legitimate revenue, by removing the obstacles designed to choke them. Open the avenues of legitimate trade, by lowering the legislative bars designed to close them. Free the people, as soon as may be, from the extortionate taxation by which you oppress them. Return to a moderate revenue tariff, the only practicable plan in our circumstances, and a necessary incident in whose operation is to give some of the so called advantages of protection to some of your native industries. By an earnest and searching plan of economy and retrenchment, directed to every branch of the public service, help to redress the balance between revenue and expenditure, while you lighten the people's burdens. But if you will do none of these things, if you will in all else persist in your mad career, at any rate in this be wise. If, in all else, you be rash, in this at any rate be discreet. Learn that our position is grave and serious, and that our future is dependent

on present prudence. Complete the Railway to Red River; go on with the prairie section as fast as settlement demands. For that, risk something; since, as I have said, the die is cast. But in order to succeed in that, in order that you may have a chance later to do more, deal with that alone now. Bend to that great effort your undivided energies, your whole available resources. Postpone, meanwhile, the western work, and do not, by your present action, based on airy dreams and vain imaginations, risk the ruin of your country. Sir, I move, "to leave out all the words after 'that' and insert the following: 'the public interests require that the work of constructing the Pacific Railway in British Columbia should be postponed.'"

MR. BUNSTER: As a humble representative from British Columbia, I rise to offer a few remarks in answer to the hon. member for West Durham. Sir, the amendment proposed by that hon. member, judging from his past action with reference to the Pacific Province, does not surprise me. We all know, and the country knows, how determined has been the hostility of that hon. gentleman to British Columbia interests ever since the Province has entered the Canadian Union. Why he should pursue such a hostile course towards us is hard to fathom. British Columbia asks but little—simply fair play and a fulfilment of Treaty obligations. That is all the British Government expects under the Carnarvon Terms; and let me tell hon. gentlemen that the Imperial authorities are by no means disinterested in this matter, as the building of the Railway is to England something of supreme importance, from an Imperial point of view. It was only last summer that Col. Lovell, C.B., the Commanding Royal Engineer at Halifax, and that able and indefatigable soldier, Col. Strange, Royal Canadian Artillery of Quebec, were sent out to British Columbia to inspect our system of defence for the Province. There had also been visits from other officers in Her Majesty's army, for similar purposes, showing the anxiety on the part of the English Government to preserve British Columbia to the Empire. We all know Capt. Colomb's opinion of British

Columbia. That gentleman, at the Royal Colonial Institute, spoke of British Columbia as being "the hub of the Empire!" Now if British Columbia is so valuable to the Empire, in her present isolated condition, how much more valuable would she be, if rendered more easily accessible by the Pacific Railway. Look at the wonderful progress of California, since she became connected with the outer world by rail—and look again, at what has been done at home, here in Canada, since the construction of the Grand Trunk, the Great Western and the Canada Southern. It may truly be said that Railways have "made" Canada and the United States. It must be remembered in this connection that British Columbia has never come to this Parliament, like Nova Scotia, when on the eve of rebellion, and other Provinces for "better terms." We do not want "better terms," but simply what has been promised to us. The hon. member for West Durham has often gone so far as to heap abuse on our Province. Now I think are all agreed that it is desirable to build the Pacific Railway, to settle and develop the Great North-West. Without that work Canada can never be a great nation. With many of the elements of national greatness, she would still lack unity and cohesiveness; the iron band only can furnish those. The hon. member for West Durham complained of spending nine millions in building the 127 miles in British Columbia, but what about that paltry sum compared with the development of the immense mineral wealth of that Province and the Dominion generally? Probably the builders would strike on a mine in what he calls a "sea of mountains"—that would more than pay for the building of the whole road. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but we have the mineral wealth—gold and coal—in our Province, and all history shows that they go a long way towards national progress and stability. Two millions of Scotch people have done much for the greatness of England, by their iron, coal and other minerals, and their magnificent beds of limestone. British Columbia has been more to Canada than Ireland has been to England. Ireland is an agricultural country, and furnishes England with beef, butter, eggs and potatoes, which is what the North-

West will do for us. British Columbia will do for Canada what Scotland has done for England. We will furnish the minerals that will afford employment to millions of people, and be to Canada what Scotland is to England, and Pennsylvania and California are to the United States. Now, these Rocky Mountains that have been so much belittled, have a reputation all over the world for their teeming mineral wealth, and every British Columbian feels proud of them, as every Englishman ought to, as long as Canada holds together. For the paltry sum of \$9,000,000 the hon. Member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), would sever the connection between British Columbia and the Dominion of Canada. He forgets that we are now partners with Canada, and we are going to hold Canada to the bargain made with us. The hon. gentleman stated in his speech that, like Shylock, we demanded a pound of flesh. Does it look as if we demanded a pound of flesh when we gave Canada ten years to construct the Pacific Railway? We have been subjected to insults unworthy of a free and enlightend country like the Dominion. Now, I may just say, that we intend to hold Canada to the strict fulfilment of the pledge made by her Government with British Columbia. We have to-day at our end of the road some 5,000 tons of rails. The Government have let the contract for 127 miles, and I am happy to say it will be built at the end of three years. Had this Government remained in power in 1873 I do not hesitate to hazard the opinion that the road would have been built to-day, and we should not have to deplore the loss of 316 of our best British Columbian citizens by being drowned in a worthless American vessel like the *Pacific*.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read *th*: third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Act respecting the Montreal Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 45) To incorporate the Great North-Western Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Ryan, Marquette.)

Bill (No. 46) To incorporate the Winnipeg

MR. BUNSTER.

and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.—(Mr. Bannerman.)

Bill (No. 68) To incorporate the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Macdougall.)

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Credit Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Haggart.)

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

FIRST READING.

The following Bill (*from the Senate*), was read the first time:—

Bill (No. 103) To amend the Act intituled: An Act respecting offences against the person, and to repeal the Act intituled: An Act to provide that persons charged with common assault shall be competent as witnesses.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

SUPPLY—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House resumed the Debate on Mr. Blake's proposed amendment to the motion for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

MR. BUNSTER: The amendment of the hon. member for West Durham I have before me. This is a matter which we have to look at as Canadians. I was very much astonished to hear the hon. member for West Durham try to make a point out of the fact that British Columbia was admitted into the Union on April 1st. This was a sorry jest, considering how we were "fooled" by the Government of which he (Mr. Blake) was a member. Probably the hon. gentleman would like to "fool" British Columbia a little more. Now, I should like to read the agreement made by the late Government with Lord Carnarvon, in order that hon. gentlemen may fully understand the nature of the compact and how solemnly Canada is bound in this matter. Here are the conditions contained in the despatch from Lord Carnarvon to the Earl of Dufferin:

"1. That the railway from Esquimaux to Nanaimo shall be commenced as soon as possible, and completed with all practicable despatch.

"2. That the surveys on the mainland shall be pushed on with the utmost vigour. On this point, after considering the representations of your Ministers, I feel that I have no alternative but to reply, as I do most fully and readily, upon their assurances that no legitimate effort or expense will be spared, first to determine the best route for the line, and secondly to proceed with the details of the engineering work. It would be distasteful to me, if indeed it were not

impossible, to prescribe strictly any minimum of time or expenditure with regard to work of so uncertain a nature; but, happily, it is equally impossible for me to doubt that your Government will loyally do its best in every way to accelerate the completion of a duty left freely to its sense of honour and justice.

"3. That the waggon-road and the telegraph line shall be immediately constructed. There seems here to be some difference of opinion as to the special value to the Province of the undertaking to complete these two works; but, after considering what has been said, I am of opinion that they should both be proceeded with at once, as indeed is suggested by your Ministers.

"4. That \$2,000,000 a year, \$1,500,000 shall be the minimum expenditure on railway works within the Province from the date at which the surveys are sufficiently completed to enable that amount to be expended on construction. In naming the amount I understand that, it being alike the interest and the wish of the Dominion Government to urge on with all speed the completion of the works now to be undertaken, the annual expenditure will be as much in excess of the minimum of \$2,000,000 as in any year may be found practicable.

"5. Lastly, that on or before the 31st of December, 1890, the railway shall be complete and open for traffic from the Pacific seaboard to a point at the western end of Lake Superior, at which it will fall into connection with existing lines of railway through a portion of the United States, and also with the navigation on Canadian waters. To proceed at present with the remainder of the railway extending by the country northward of Lake Superior to the existing Canadian lines, ought not, in my opinion, to be required, and the time for undertaking that work must be determined by the development of settlement and the changing circumstances of the country. The day is, however, I hope not very distant, when a continuous line of railway through Canadian territory will be practicable, and I look upon this portion of the scheme as postponed rather than abandoned."

I wish to point out that there is no harbour north of San Francisco, as good as that of Nanaimo. This road will have to be extended to the seaboard, and I maintain that Nanaimo is the most desirable point to connect. The people of this Dominion, by restoring the right hon. leader of the Government to power, tacitly told him to go on with the road. Now, we are met by the hon. member for West Durham, who says, the work on the road should be postponed. The road will not be postponed. The march of progress demands its early construction and completion. The hon. the Minister of Finance has made arrangements for the money. The hon. the Minister of Railways has sufficient rails on the banks of the Fraser river, and on Vancouver Island for carrying out the undertaking, sent out in good

faith for the building of that Railway, and the sooner the hon. the Minister of Railways, and the people of Canada, make up their minds to complete the road, the better. At present, so long as the Government exhibit a fair disposition, in place of abuse, of doing justice, we are willing to accept the situation, but I consider the Government of the day made a mistake in not commencing at Esquimaux and going eastward. If they had built that road they would have done an injustice to the largest population of British Columbia, to that part where the wealth and influence exist. Our Provinces would be sufficient to give it the means to build the road. We have scarcely less than eight or ten ships always waiting for cargoes, and the vessels are compelled to employ tow-boats, at a great expense, having to pay 50c. per ton. Then reckoning the extra insurance, and the extra pilotage, altogether the cost amounts to about 75c. per ton, which makes the expense equal to a penny a ton per mile. Now, that is considered a good fair price on railroads in Europe. A penny per mile will pay the price of having coal carried on railways in England; and while on this subject, allow me to state, that this road can be built very much cheaper than a road can be built in England, or in the United States.

An Hon. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. BUNSTER: O, yes; carried of course, as the Governmental policy will be, I hope. Having said so much about the Island road, we will now turn to the national continental highway, from Ocean to Ocean. A great deal has been said about the American roads. Let us see what they have accomplished. Now, I have here *Croft's Tourist*, a reliable and trustworthy work, written by an Englishman. This gives a little history of the Union Pacific Railway. Now, did the hon. member for West Durham, when he was trying to postpone the arrangements for the building of our Railway, ever allude to the great advantage this Railway would be, not only to Canada, but Great Britain in case of war. This is a national work. The whole of Great Britain is willing to furnish \$20,000,000 to Sir John A. Macdonald, the right hon. member for Victoria, the moment he wishes to ask for them. We all know that Great Britain has been the mistress of the seas from time im-

memorial, and she intends to remain mistress of the seas, and no one knows it better than Sir John, our Chieftain. He knows he can go over to England at any moment and we can furnish him with the raw material for their factories. We want to build this Railway and he knows very well how to do it. He did it last summer; he got all the money he wanted. It is simply absurd; it is a fraud on the face of it, to go back on a bargain with this young Province, even though it was made on the 1st of April, as the hon. member for West Durham has said. Let me tell him that if it was made on the 1st of April, British Columbians are not such fools as not to know whether they are making a good bargain or not; but instead of receiving a railroad they have received nothing but abuse up to the present time; and but for the confidence that we have in the present Government, British Columbia would fling Canada over, and go back to the old flag that has braved the battle and the breeze for a thousand years. When the Americans started the road to which I have just alluded, it was said that it was of great importance to get money, and any one reading the history of that road, and that company will know two young Englishmen got up bonds; one went to England and carried out the enterprise, obtained the money, and have carried out the enterprise successfully, and what is the consequence to-day? The consequence is that that road was built, and that is the way that that country was populated; and I may tell the hon. member for West Durham, that land their is now selling for, from \$12 to \$25 per acre. Now, however, allow me to draw a comparison from the very map which he produced last evening. The coloured part there represented, is forested land, all we now how valuable that is especially when cleared. By the scale of this map, (and I have measured by that scale) we have one valley there measuring 100 miles by 500 miles—and what is that? That is the best part of our country, for it is prairie land, and it is acknowledged that prairie land is the best land in Canada; because it can be tilled and made available for settlement at once. I will not say anything about our mines, our gold mines, and our coal mines, because I have already referred to them. Now we

come to Vancouver Island. Take our coal fields, which are not to be surpassed in Pennsylvania or England. Anybody taking the trouble to inform himself, will be convinced that my statement is correct. Then we will take our rivers, which it is well-known, are teeming with fish with which we load ships from Fraser River and from Victoria Harbours, and send to all quarters of the globe. It is said, by authorities in England, that our fish—especially the salmon—excel all others in the world. Notwithstanding all this we have suffered lately from being excluded from the American market, in their taking advantage of us by putting a tax on our fish-cans which our fishermen put up. This reminds me, Sir, of what we have suffered in order to remain in this Confederation and be true to Canada, if we were not part and parcel of the Dominion, if we were not loyal to the old flag, we might be able to make our own Treaties with our neighbours, and we might get rid of a great many difficulties under which we now labour. We might be able to make Treaties with the United States, which the hon. member for West Durham has so much lauded to-day. He lauded the United States up to the skies. He told the people from England, Ireland, and Scotland not to settle in Canada—they could get better advantages in the United States, and all this in the face of the fact that we have a better country here than the United States, and it will be far superior when we have this railway. We will then possess of one the greatest country under the sun; but, Sir, I am satisfied that the hon. member for West Durham, and the hon. leader of the Government, will have to take a new departure, because I have here a copy of *Grip* containing a very true picture; Mr. Speaker, there it is; the whole House can look at it; and I see on this picture the hon. member for West Durham waving in his hand a “danger” signal, and standing in an obstructive attitude on the rails over which the locomotive of the Government comes dashing along at full speed. But, Mr. Speaker, I also see, on this picture, a boss leading the hon. member for West Durham off the track by the ear; and this boss has got the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) in a very bad

fix; he has the poor lamb *doon* on his back, and pressing in his windbag with his enormous hoof; the two of them are evidently a "done Brown." It is a fair indication of what their opposition to this great enterprise amounts to. In spite of all that these gentlemen can do I am satisfied that the hon. the Premier will see the road built, and that he is now hurrying it on so that he can come over and see us. He will exercise a watchful eye. He, himself, has told me that he did not like travelling by sea, he said he preferred going by rail. Well, Sir, we shall, therefore have to dispense with the pleasure of seeing him until he gets the railroad built.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let me see that picture.

MR. BUNSTER: I am going to have the picture put in as a matter of history. As I have just hinted, the hon. the Premier has promised that as soon as the road was built he would come and see us. I know he intends to have it built before the next elections.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ha! ha!

MR. BUNSTER: You may laugh. It will take three or four years for the elections to come round, and he knows the building of this road in the meantime will make him doubly sure of carrying the country again. Let me tell the House how long it took the Americans to build the great Union Pacific Railway. Although Geo. Francis Train on the occasion of breaking ground predicted the road would be constructed in five years, history records that the Railway was completed and in working order in three years, six months and ten days. That, Sir, brings my words correct. The hon. the Premier will have this road completed in about three years and six months, and if he does not he ought to. He has the money and the brains—if I may be allowed to use the word—and there is sufficient muscle in Canada to build the road in that time. If he does not get it finished I will not vote for him at the next election. That will make up for the bullying and abuse we have received. Who are not so hide bound that they will keep the naturally resources of this country tied up for the want of getting through them. While, to-day, Canada is sending relief to the starving Irish, she could render them a

greater help by getting them to come over to till our own soil, develop our resources and raise their own food here, and, at the same time assisting our Treasury. We were told in that very long speech of the hon. member for West Durham, which took five or six hours, to which I have before referred, or rather nearly two days to deliver, a great deal about taxation. Do people expect build railways without taxation? British Columbia has submitted to taxation. When we joined Confederation our dutiable goods were 10 or 12 per cent., now they are something like 20 per cent. But we have this advantage, we export more than we import. We are producers of wheat and all cereals we have any quantity of lumber; we have inexhaustible gold and coal mines, as I have said before; we have an abundance of the finest fish in the world; and, all we require is a little more population and the establishment of our own woollen and other manufacturing mills, which will be the natural outcome of this grand policy of the Government, called the National Policy. The hon. member referred to one thing which I was proud to hear, the visit of Mr. Edgar to our Province. He came and offered \$750,000 to buy up British Columbia.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, he did not.

MR. BUNSTER: Yes, he did; but we were not in the market. If I had time I could refer the hon. gentleman to the page in the Blue-book. Mr. Edgar was sent to Mr. Walkem, without sufficient authority, and Mr. Walkem refused to deal with him. We had also another visit from a nobleman, sent by the late Government. I refer to our late Governor-General, the Earl of Dufferin. There was a great deal of talk, but I would like to know how much of his promises have been carried out. Even the Mother Country felt aggrieved and insulted, that a Treaty should be entered into and not carried out. British Columbia has carried out her part of the contract to the letter, and to her disadvantage. She has, at the request of the Canadian Government, reserved a twenty-mile belt on the line of the Pacific Railway, on Vancouver Island, and this has driven settlement on to the mainland. People came to the Is-

land, and under the condition of things, were either forced to the mainland or to the American side. I think, if everything were investigated properly, we have a good case for a suit for damages. But, what were we told in the course of the Debate? The hon. member for West Durham, said, British Columbia was seduced into the Union.

MR. BLAKE: Oh, no.

MR. BUNSTER: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I will leave it to the *Official Debates*. I was sorry to hear such a remark, in the presence of ladies. Our Province has received so much abuse that we are getting tired of it. The only way that hon. gentlemen can become informed regarding its resources is to go to British Columbia, and to see things for themselves, and I will guarantee, that the country is as hospitable as any other part of Canada. British Columbia has been neglected shamefully. We have more natural resources than the whole of the rest of Canada put together. Our harbours are open and hospitable all the year round; they are never closed up as they are here. We have got mountains of gold, our rivers are teeming with fish, and any hunter can always go out and shoot down a deer or buffalo to maintain his family. But I have detained the House at some length, and I think the hon. member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald), will be able to do greater justice to the cause of British Columbia than myself, I will, therefore, leave it now in his hands.

MR. LANGEVIN: When, eight or nine years ago, this question of the Pacific Railway came before the House, we all considered that it was one of the most important and weightiest questions that could require the attention of Parliament. That question has lost none of its importance, none of its weight or interest since that time. On the contrary, the people have attached more importance year after year, to this great work. This evening the question has acquired still greater importance, from the fact that the hon. member for West Durham proposes to postpone one of the most important portions of the Railway. I should say that the Pacific Railway question disappeared before another great question, which is, "Shall we continue to maintain this great Confederation of ours in its in-

tegrity?" The fact is, the proposal of the hon. member for West Durham, I suppose on behalf of the Opposition, is nothing else than repudiation. When British Columbia sent her delegates to settle the terms of Confederation with this Government, one of the conditions was that we should build the Pacific Railway. That condition was assented to by the Government of Canada. It was submitted to this Parliament and assented to. There may have been, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, some difference of opinion about the expediency of undertaking such a great work at that time, but the Act of Parliament was passed and became the law of the country, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House had only to bow to and obey the law. When the Government of 1873 left office, and the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, they did not repudiate that condition of the Confederation or Union of British Columbia with Canada. They went to work to execute that great undertaking, and the only point of difference that we saw amongst the members of that Government and their supporters was that, when the question of the Esquimault and Nanaimo Railway was proposed to the House, the hon. member for West Durham separating himself from his party, voted with a few friends against that measure, and the Government of that day were not powerful or willing enough to pass it in the Upper House. If the Government had only expressed a desire that that Bill should, pass against which the hon. member for West Durham had voted, it would have become law. But there was a power behind the Throne—a power that may still exist to-day behind the leader of the Opposition. That power was stronger than that Government, and the measure for the construction of the railway from Esquimault to Nanaimo was lost. Nevertheless, the Government of 1874 down to 1878, went on with the construction of that railway. They undertook a portion of the road from Thunder Bay towards the west, and another section further on, leaving a gap of 185 miles. If I am not mistaken, the hon. member for Lambton, who was then at the head of Government, called for tenders for those four sections in British Columbia, that the hon. member for West Durham has attacked so

MR. BUNSTER.

fiercely. At that period, I believe, the hon. member for West Durham was one of the strongest supporters of the Mackenzie Government. And, moreover, I think the hon. member for Lambton has stated, sometime ago, that he never intended to build those four sections.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said no such thing.

MR. LANGEVIN: I understood the hon. gentleman said he had not decided to go on with those four sections. But my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has shown that, although the hon. gentleman had not decided to go with them, he had ordered and given a contract to convey 6,000 tons of rails from Victoria to the Fraser River. The hon. gentleman had given a contract for that, nevertheless he says, he had not decided to build the railway! The hon. gentleman says, yes; perhaps he will remember what he said on another occasion. It is for him to reconcile what he has just said with what he said then. At the elections for Ottawa, in September, 1878, the hon. gentleman spoke as follows, according to his organ the *Free Press*:—

“On the west, we have at this moment, very nearly completed 302 miles of road, and during this year will lay at least 270 miles. In British Columbia we have only 6,000 tons, moved up now to Yale, where we will commence, next spring, if Parliament sanctions the contract, to build the road to Kamloops.”

And yet the hon. gentleman has not decided to proceed with this work!

MR. MACKENZIE: Certainly not.

MR. LANGEVIN: But the hon. gentleman said before the electors that he had so decided. Either he deceived the electors of Ottawa or has deceived this House. At that time, the member for West Durham supported the late Government, and had been the colleague of the hon. Premier; he had assented to his policy, and never separated from the hon. Premier on account of the railway work going on. But what a change. As soon as the late hon. Ministers left office, their party ceased to regard the Pacific Railway in the same light. The hon. member for West Durham, especially, became frightened at the prospect of the construction of more than four sections in British Columbia. Everything became dark to him and his party; the greatest ruin was threatening us in connection with that work, which the late Government

had not attempted to construct. But what is the cause of this change? It is this: that instead of having large deficits we have taken the means of preventing them, at the same time carrying the Public Works of the country. The member for West Durham should remember that he accepted the Carnarvon terms exacted from the late Government. Of course the late Government inserted the condition about not raising further the rate of taxation, but that was after they had raised the taxation by \$3,000,000. But did they meet the ordinary expenses even with the \$3,000,000 additional taxation? No. All the time they were in office they ran into debt which we have now to meet. The hon. gentleman says that those terms were not accepted by the Government without the consent of Parliament. No doubt, but they were accepted by the country. It was understood that \$2,000,000 would be expended per annum in British Columbia, but the hon. gentlemen opposite, following their ordinary course towards that Province, repudiated those terms, and sent a Commission to British Columbia; she would not accept \$750,000 in exchange for the original bargain. Up to that time he would not repudiate the Railway altogether; but that Government offered that amount to content that Province for the postponement of the work, as says the hon. member for West Durham. But she was not poor or reduced enough to accept such a bribe, saying: “We have a Treaty with Canada, which we know is just and proud enough to do justice to a small weak Province like British Columbia;” and she was right. She is not unreasonable; she has taken the word of this Government, that it will go on with the Railway; and though the work was not begun before the 1st of January last, the Province knew it was not our fault, and that the contracts would be given out early. Now, if the people of British Columbia, see the road does not progress at full speed, they will not complain, because they know we are acting in good faith, and that if we are not spending more millions and going on faster, it is because we cannot afford it. They know we are proceeding gradually and surely with the work. We do not want to plunge the country into debt and ruin as the hon. member for West Durham

asserts; but we want to keep faith with British Columbia, though not at the immense expense he thinks we shall incur. We wish to build a good road, a colonization road, as intended from the beginning. We shall save a great deal in grades and curvatures, and by that means, be able to build the road from the Pacific to the older Provinces in such a way as not to overburden this country with expenditure. The hon. member for West Durham desires to catch Irish sympathy and Irish votes by expressing great regard for Irish rights and claims, almost going as far as Home Rule, and anticipating benefits to Ireland from the recent change of Government. I have no doubt that Ireland will get justice whatever Government is in power, as Canada got justice when our fathers struggled for a responsible Government. We are as much as the hon. gentleman in favour of Irishmen, and we showed our sympathy by proposing to Parliament a vote of \$100,000 for the distressed populations of Ireland. Our sole regret was our inability to do more. But we do not on this or any other occasion wish to parade that sympathy. It was proper to show it at the proper time; but what reason is there for the hon. gentleman to appeal to Irishmen in connection with the Pacific Railway? Another of the hon. gentleman's objects was to catch all the hon. members from Quebec, and enrol them under his banner. What a bad Government, said he, is this Government which will not give Quebec a Railway to connect it with the Pacific Railway, after it has spent \$11,000,000 for the beautiful railway from Quebec to Ottawa. He says to the hon. members from Quebec: "The Government will not extend the Pacific Railway far enough east to connect with your road; therefore, look, be careful, do not miss this opportunity to vote against your friends; my motion proposes to suspend the Railway in British Columbia." Did he speak about the eastern end of the Railway in his motion? Not a word. He might, therefore, have spared himself the trouble of this appeal. The Government have not changed its policy, which is to have a continuous railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The water-stretches will not be a part of the the Railway, as was the case under the late Government. But we must take the

necessary time for the work. We can trust our supporters, on telling them we are completing the gap of 185 miles between Fort William and Selkirk, and have put under contract, 200 miles on the prairies to the west, and four sections in British Columbia, which the late Government put themselves under contract and decided to build. The road will not cost the large amount the hon. member for West Durham supposes. He speaks of an expenditure of \$120,000,000. If we were to build a railway with a grade of 24 or 26 feet to the mile, it might cost that sum. But, as declared, the Government has no intention of building a railway with those small grades. They are all very well, even essential, for that portion which will carry the trade of the prairies from Red River to Thunder Bay. It was required it should be a first-class road, with small grades and proper curvatures, the lightest grades we can, under the circumstances obtain. But we do not say, for all that, we are to undertake at once all these sections of the road. We will proceed with them gradually. The connection with the railways in Quebec and Ontario will also come, when the railway is built from Lake Nipissing to the main line. Whilst I am on the subject, let me quote from the organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the *Globe*, a paragraph about this eastern end of the railway:

"We now come to the Lake Superior section, which is certainly a political necessity, but not required till the prairie line has been completed and connected with Thunder Bay. It is, as we have shown, reasonable to suppose that at least half a million people will be on the plains when the Pacific Railway reaches the Rocky Mountains. Every family going in afterwards will increase the quantity of produce available for export. The population of the United States doubled itself in twenty-five years; in several western territories the population has been doubled in ten years. The Canadian North-West will gain by immigration continually, and—as always happens where fertile land can be easily procured—births will be very numerous. By the time the line to the Rocky Mountains has been completed, it will be wise to push on the road around Lake Superior, because, before it can be built at a fair rate of speed, a large traffic will await its opening. The Lake Superior section, from the eastern terminus of the main Pacific to Fort William, will be 620 miles long, and, when completed, it will offer to the traffic of the Canadian and to a large part of the American North-West, the shortest all-rail route to the seaboard. It is not needed till the prairies have been opened up by the line to the Rocky

Mountains. After that has been built, it may be safely completed as a commercial road, one that will pay better year by year, and will ultimately be a very valuable property."

That is the opinion of the *Globe* newspaper, and I have no doubt that at all events, a large majority of the hon. gentlemen opposite will not repudiate this article. The hon. member for West Durham has attacked the figures quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, giving the cost of the railway from Thunder Bay to Burrard Inlet. The hon. gentleman has made his calculations; it was a new role for him to play, being a lawyer, and we have very seldom seen him plunged so deeply into figures as he was this evening. He thought that as he had not handled figures for some time he would make free use of them on this occasion. So when he was making his calculations as to the cost of the Railway, he thought he might as well as not double the cost estimated by Mr. Fleming. The Minister of Railways stated yesterday, that the first portion of the road from Fort William to Selkirk, would cost \$17,000,000; from Selkirk to Jasper Valley, \$13,000,000; from Jasper Valley to Fort Moody, including equipments and engineering, \$30,000,000, say \$60,000,000, altogether. Add to this the cost of preliminary surveys, explorations, etc., \$4,869,000, it would make a total of \$64,869,000. Add to this a section of the Pacific Railway from Nipissing to Fort William, \$24,000,000, if the cost is \$40,000 a mile; but if the cost is \$30,000 per mile—as it is more probable to be—it would amount to only \$18,000,000, which, added to the \$64,000,000, would make a grand total of \$82,869,000. The hon. gentleman has tried to convince the House that these figures have been put together for the purposes of the moment, and that they had no basis, that we could not show that they were the results of careful examination and calculation, such as an engineer should place before the head of his department. Under these circumstances, I may be allowed to give this House the data upon which the Chief Engineer has based those figures. It is proper that the House should know that these figures have not simply been put together to show that the Railway will cost \$64,000,000 plus the Nipissing and Fort William

portion of the road, making altogether \$88,000,000. The Chief Engineer has furnished the data of his calculations, which I will read to the House?

"OTTAWA, April 15, 1880.

"To the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, K.C.M.G.,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

"ESTIMATE OF COST, CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

"SIR,—I have the honour to submit the following estimate of the probable expenditure necessary to place the Canadian Pacific Railway in operation from Lake Superior to Port Moody. I understand the policy of the Government with respect to the Railway to be:

"1. To construct the section between Lake Superior and Red River, with the limited gradients and curves set forth in my report, laid before Parliament, so as to secure cheap transportation, and to provide, by the time the railway shall be ready for opening, an equipment of rolling-stock and general accommodation sufficient for the traffic to be then looked for.

"2. To proceed with the work west of Red River by constructing 200 miles on the route recently established. The roadway to be of the character defined by the 48th contract and the tenders for the 66th contract recently received.

"To proceed with the construction of 125 miles in British Columbia, under the 60th, 61st, 62nd and 63rd contracts. The expenditure on the 125 miles to be limited, in accordance with the provisions of the contract and the views set forth in my report of 22nd November last.

"To proceed gradually with the intervening distance. To delay placing additional sections under contract in British Columbia until the 125 miles are completed or well advanced, thus preventing any undue increase in the price of labour.

"To carry construction westward from Manitoba across the prairie region only as settlement advances.

"In my report of last year, I placed the cost of the section between Lake Superior and Red River at \$18,000,000. Since that date, the steps taken to keep down the expenditure on the 185 miles between English River and Keewatin, have been so far successful, as to reduce the length about 3½ miles, and the estimated cost about \$500,000. The rails for these two contracts have likewise been secured at a considerable lower price than the estimate. Whatever an increasing traffic in future years may demand, in the way of territorial accommodation and rolling stock, I am confident the line can be opened for traffic between Fort William and Selkirk, well equipped for the business which may for some time be expected, at a cost not exceeding \$17,000,000.

"West of Red River, 100 miles have been placed under contract and tenders have been received for a second 100 miles section. These two sections are designed to be constructed and equipped in the most economical manner, dispensing with all outlay, except that absolutely necessary to render the railway immediately useful in the settlement of the country. It is intended that the line be partly

ballasted to render it available for colonisation purposes, full ballasting being deferred until the traffic demand high speed. It is intended to provide sufficient rolling-stock for all immediate wants, postponing full equipment until the country becomes populated and the business calls for its increase.

"On this basis, and on the data furnished by the contracts which have been let and the tenders recently received, I am of opinion that the railway can be opened from Lake Superior to the Pacific coast within the following estimate :

46 miles, Fort William to Selkirk, with light gradients, including a fair allowance of rolling-stock and engineering during construction...	\$17,000,000
100 miles, Selkirk to Jasper Valley, with light equipment, etc..	13,000,000
550 miles, Jasper Valley to Port Moody, with light equipment, etc., Jasper to Lake Kamloops, 355 at \$43,660..	\$15,500,000
Lake Kamloops to Yale, 125 at \$80,000..	10,000,000
Yale to Port Moody, 90 at \$38,888.....	3,500,000
	\$29,000,000
Add.....	1,000,000
	<u>30,000,000</u>
Total miles 1,956.....	\$60,000,000

"The above does not include cost of explorations and preliminary surveys throughout all parts of the country north of Lake Nipissing to James Bay in the east, and from Esquimault to Port Simpson in the west, between latitudes 49° and 56° not properly chargeable to construction.....\$3,119,618 or the Pembina Branch..... 1,750,000 or with other amount with which the Pacific Railway account is charged.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"SANDFORD FLEMING."

Another point the hon. member for West Durham endeavoured to make against my hon. friend was when he stated that, from Lake Kamloops to Yale, we had no data to go upon when we stated the Railway between those two points would cost \$10,000,000. On that point, as on the other, I will ask the permission of the House to read a short extract from a report of Mr. Fleming, on which this estimate was based :

"I have examined, says Mr. Fleming, the rates given in the lowest tenders; they generally bear a fair relation to each other, and are about the prices for which other work has been recently placed under contract on other sections of the railway. I do not think experi-

enced and responsible contractors would be safe in undertaking to do the same work at less rate.

"The total sum of the lowest tenders for the four sections, as above stated, is \$9,167,040. It will be borne in mind that the character of the contract to be entered into is materially different from ordinary contracts. This sum represents the maximum. The contract is not to exceed the amount, but it may be very much less.—(See clauses 5, 6, and 7.)

"Those who made the surveys and calculations inform me that the quantities are very full, and that, in actual execution, they can be largely reduced. I am convinced, moreover, that, by making an extremely careful study of the final location, by sharpening the curvatures in some places, by using great judgment in adjusting the alignment to the sinuosities and sudden and great inequalities of the ground, by substituting the cheaper classes of work for the more costly whenever it can safely be done, and by doing no work whatever that is not absolutely necessary, a very marked reduction can be made."

The House will see by this statement with what precaution the Government acted in this matter. We took care to keep in our hands full power to stop that work at any time, if it should become necessary to do so, or to curtail the amount of work, or diminish the expenses. The contracts are entirely in the hands of the Government. If a financial crisis should occur, we would only have to stop the contracts, and the only liability on the part of the Government would be that of giving to the contractors a time equal to that of the suspension of his contracts. Therefore, though the hon. gentleman from West Durham tried to frighten the House, he must admit that the whole thing is in the hands of the Government. If we have the money we may go on; if we have not the money we need not proceed. The Government is pledged to British Columbia, and we must keep faith with her. When I speak of the Government of course I speak of Parliament, because we, as a Government, are in the hands of Parliament, and Parliament, may, at any time, it thinks proper, stop the work.

MR. MACKENZIE: Parliament is in your hands.

MR. LANGEVIN: The country will thank our party and this Government for such a boon. The hon. member for West Durham, in warning the Province of Quebec against this Government in its policy on the Pacific Railway, should have given some evidence

of the good will and great services, and great concessions that the Province of Quebec had ever received at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. He should have told the members from that Province, how they had been treated when, two or three years ago, their Province came to this House and asked for redress. He should have told them how the petition of that Province was treated by those hon. gentlemen when it was presented to the House. What redress did they give to Quebec? In 1878, where was the hon. member for West Durham when that question was put to a vote? Did he show his friendship towards Quebec and her representatives? Did his name appear in the division that then took place? You will set that amongst the names of 70 members out of 112, the name of the hon. member for West Durham is not to be found in the vote on the Letellier question. The hon. gentleman had been in the House, but when the vote came on he was not to be found. He would not give his vote for the Province of Quebec. After that, it is rather doubtful whether the members for Quebec will put themselves in the hands of the hon. member for West Durham. And now, it is well that we should study a little, the course of the hon. gentleman on the Pacific Railway question. He was opposed to the branch from Esquimaux to Nanaimo, and the hon. member for Lambton had not the courage to resist him, and he threw out the Bill. The hon. gentleman further says, that we are not bound by the Carnarvon terms. I suppose the hon. member for Lambton had again to bow to his hon. friend, and say the Carnarvon terms must go also. The next point is, the hon. member for West Durham said, or wished the country to believe, that there was some pledge on the part of the Government of Canada, to build a railway there. Therefore, he assented to the proposal of the hon. member for Lambton, to offer that Province \$150,000 as compensation. That was refused. For what was it offered? As compensation for the delays that occurred in the building of the road in British Columbia.

MR. BLAKE: And would occur.

MR. LANGEVIN: Then came the tenders called for by the hon. the First Minister, for the four sections in British

Columbia. The hon. member for West Durham assented to them.

MR. BLAKE: How did I assent to them.

MR. LANGEVIN: The hon. gentleman assented to them by continuing to give his support to the hon. member for Lambton, and by supporting him at the elections.

MR. BLAKE: I was in England before these tenders were called for, and I did not return until last December.

MR. LANGEVIN: Then why did not the hon. gentleman state on the hustings that he did not agree with his hon. friend?

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Because he was not here at the time the elections came off.

MR. BLAKE: I said I had left this country for the Old Country before these tenders were called for, and I did not return until last December. A matter of fact, I was not aware that any such tenders had been called for until a few months within the present speaking.

MR. LANGEVIN: I accept what the hon. gentleman says, but it is strange he never took an opportunity of declaring that he had not assented to the calling for these tenders, and that he knew nothing about them. It is one of the strangest things possible that the hon. gentleman, while from the country, never saw a Canadian paper, and was ignorant of what was going on in this country. The hon. gentleman now says that if his hon. friend, the hon. member for Lambton, had wished to build these four sections he would have opposed him. It is late in the day to make this statement. We can see how the mind of the hon. gentleman is drifting. There is, first, the giving up of the Esquimaux and Nanaimo Branch; then the offer of \$75,000 compensation, and, subsequently, his attitude in relation to these four contracts. Now, what has he done during the past year? The hon. gentleman being convinced that this Government was to build the Railway by Bute Inlet, denounced the policy of the Government, and it was asserted on the other side of the House that we were expending \$20,000,000 more than would be required to build the same road on the Fraser River. Had we adopted that route they would have asked, "Why did you not take

the route we selected by the Fraser River? We called for tenders, and by accepting them, you would effect a saving of \$20,000,000 to the country." So they found their little game was over, and now their policy was to denounce what they wished for themselves. Now, what is the next move of the hon. member for West Durham? He asks us to postpone these contracts, and his next move will be to ask that their shall be no railroad at all. The country, however, is not of that opinion. The country wants this railway as it wanted the Intercolonial. We do not want to be at the mercy of our neighbours on the other side of the line. We want to build up a great nation in British North America. We want this Confederation of ours to be a success and to make it a success we must have a Pacific Railroad of our own. It is a necessity of our position, a necessity of Confederation, and therefore, the people have determined that that road shall be built. But we are alive to the position of the country. We do not want to build 1,956 miles of road in two, three or four years. We will take the necessary time to construct it, and we will construct it as the wants of the country require it. Another thing that must have struck hon. gentlemen, is the determination of hon. gentlemen on the other side, (and I am sorry to say, the hon. member for West Durham), to depreciate this country. From beginning to end, the speech of the hon. gentleman was a depreciation of our resources and our country, and a eulogium of the United States. He has done his best to prove that our lands are not equal to those of the United States, and that our institutions are not as good as those of the United States, that we cannot have as large an emigration as the United States, that we have not the means of peopling our North-West as the United States have of peopling their Western States. And why? Because I suppose this is British territory, because we have British institutions. I maintain that the emigration from the British Isles will not hesitate to come to our North-West if they can find there good lands and the protection and institutions they have left at home. In that country we have the best lands in the world. We have free lands there to begin with, and settlers may also purchase

lands there at a very small rate. They have also the free institutions of the Old Country and the greatest protection possible. They will have communication with the old settled Provinces as soon as the railway is built. To the manufacturing industries is attributed this attraction of foreign emigration, and the emigration from the old Provinces of the Dominion. But there is no reason why that emigration should not go to our North-West in a very short time. The National Policy is building up manufacturing industries in this country that will require all the hands we can furnish in this country and furnish employment for the emigrants from abroad. Already there is an emigration from the United States into British territory; in the North-West, I saw from a paper the other day, that three heads of families with their wives and children, had just arrived at Winnipeg for the purpose of settling in the North-West. Last year, I am informed, that no less than 3,000 people from the United States settled in the North-West. The hon. gentleman said that we would have but a small emigration to the North-West, and he characterised the figures of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals as "absurdly extravagant." Now, supposing the emigration and purchase of lands were only half that calculated by the hon. gentleman, The hon. gentleman is still not satisfied; he is afraid that too many emigrants will come; and he puts in their mouths good arguments to induce them not to remain but to go into what he calls that beautiful land, the United States. I do not wish to say that the hon. gentleman is not patriotic, but I am afraid that he has forgotten that patriotism for which he had such a high notion. However, I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that, for this year and next year, we could expect a large increase. He says the circumstances are peculiar, and we may expect an emigration this year; probably a larger influx than any previous year, but he will not allow us to have any more after; they must all go to the United States.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting what I said.

MR. LANGEVIN: The inference to be drawn from what the hon. gentleman said was certainly that which I have

stated: Why, if we are to have emigrants coming this year, should we not have them next year and the year after, and so forth? The same reason that will cause them to come this year and next year, will cause them to come the following years also. Surely there is no reason to prevent them coming. The peculiar circumstances are such that these people must emigrate from the old countries if they want to live, which in Canada offers exceptional attractions for all classes. We know that we had to vote a large sum of money the other day—and we did it willingly, cheerfully, and with the greatest pleasure, and we only regret that our means would not allow us to double or treble the amount—to feed a portion of that people who form the population of the British Isles. A portion of that people will emigrate and come out here, as they did before; their lands are too small in extent, and they know if they come over the Atlantic there are homes for them in the prairies of the west, on British soil. They know they will find free land and that they can purchase more, and that they will not find foreign institutions; they will find free institutions, and here they will find home rule, of which we have heard so much. Here they will find the institutions they have dreamt of; here in Canada they will find their compatriots; they will find them in every station of life; they will find them on the Bench, in Parliament, in the Local Legislatures; they will find them at the Bar, in all the liberal avocations; they find them among the merchants, and they will find them amongst the most wealthy and influential people in the country; amongst all these, Irishmen are found taking a prominent position, and well treated, on an equal footing with all of us. We are always willing to receive them, and, if I speak for my own Province, I would say that when, at a certain period, a large number of these poor emigrants were obliged to come to this country—and many of them lost their lives by the plague or other disasters—their children were not left there unassisted, unclothed, unfed, uncared for; they were received by my own countrymen in the Province of Quebec; they were taken care of, and we now find numbers of them in the best

positions in this country. They were not of our own blood; they were not of our own nationality, but they were human beings, and we received them in our houses, we received them as our children. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Irishmen will find here a home, they will find peace here, and contentment, and hon. gentlemen need not be afraid, as the hon. member for West Durham insinuated, that they will not come because they will be under the same British flag, because they will be under the same rule as in Ireland. They know better than that; they know that they are as free in Canada, under the British flag, as they would be in the United States, under the stars and stripes. Ask Irishmen in the United States, ask Englishmen who have gone there, whether we do not have institutions in Canada as good, as free, as independent, as the United States. We have freedom here, Mr. Speaker, perfect freedom, but no license. The hon. gentleman has also stated that the hon. the First Minister had no right to expect from these emigrants settling in the North-West any large contribution to the revenue for many years. And what reasons does he give us? He says they will have to build a house and a barn; they will have to buy cattle and horses and agricultural implements; they will have to maintain themselves and their families; they will have to provide clothing and food; and the whole of these, he says, with hard ash. The hon. gentleman tries to prevent emigrants—I do not know why—from coming here; he says to them: "Do not come here in this country, you will have to pay for everything you require with hard cash." Well, Sir, I do not know with what they pay for the same articles, horses, cattle, implements, clothing, food and so on, in the United States, if it is not with hard cash. They surely, do not give them these horses, cattle, implements, food and clothing for nothing in the United States. Have they not to pay for all these things there, as well as here, with hard cash? This is a very argument to use; it is not worthy of the hon. member for West Durham. I am surprised that he should attack so much importance to it. But he gives the emigrant another reason against coming here. He says: "You will have to

smuggle, and you will smuggle; you will smuggle a great deal." That is the accusation he brings against the people coming from England; that is the accusation he brings against these Irishmen, and against Scotchmen and Englishmen, and French Canadians. These are his words: "He will smuggle as much as he can and I expect he will smuggle a good deal;" and he gives that as a reason why we will have no revenue from that source. I think for my part the hon. the Minister of Finance will call upon the hon. the Minister of Customs to take care that the smuggling does not go on in that direction. The hon. gentleman continues and speaks of the value of real estate. He says it has sunk everywhere, except that the hon. member for Vancouver claimed differently for British Columbia. But the value of real estate has not gone down by the policy of this Government. If real estate did go down very low; if it sank and sank, while the hon. gentlemen were in power; it is well known that since the National Policy has been inaugurated, real estate has been improving; it has gone up from one end of the country to the other; and the hon. gentleman, speaking of banks and bank stocks, said that a number of banks had disappeared. Let him look at and compare the list of stocks two and years ago with the list to-day, and he will see an immense difference this year, and last year, in the value of stock. He is determined to have nothing good in this country; he is determined to see, and show, nothing but ruin and decay. It is the old cry; his friends, when he was quite young, spoke of the same ruin and decay; and so it is going on, and will go on from generation to generation; and I have no doubt this same cry will be repeated at appropriate intervals, by the children of these gentlemen in ten, and fifteen, and twenty, and thirty years hence. As long as they cannot sit on these Benches, so long as they are not in power, everything ceases to be bright, everything is dark; no emigration can come.

MR. BLAKE: That is just what you said at the last election.

MR. LANGEVIN: The hon. gentleman says, that is what we said at the last election. We had good cause at that time. The hon. gentlemen opposite had

brought the country to the last point possible; we had been brought to the eve of a national bankruptcy, by the financial policy of gentlemen on the other side; the country was in a most deplorable condition; people were leaving it at every point; the revenue had fallen off; deficit after deficit had rolled up, and we had to call upon the people and point out the cause of this state of things. That brought about a change, and having been put in power by the people, we inaugurated a wise policy for improving the condition of the country, and the hon. gentleman must see that we have been successful enough. The country understood us and they have brought us here to promote the prosperity of the country, and we have to a great extent succeeded already, though we expect to do more during the next year. In conclusion, I wish only to say that the present occasion is, in my opinion, the first opportunity that this Parliament has had of deciding on this great question decisively. This is the first time that we have been met, face to face, with the important question, whether or not we are to continue to have Confederation, for which we have laboured year after year to bring about, whether that great work is to last or not? It is for hon. gentlemen to decide, and I appeal to the hon. member for Lambton—he must be in favour of Confederation—as his hon. friend, who, I am sorry to know, is in a very precarious state of health. Let us vote this amendment down. Do not let us destroy Confederation; it is a great, a good work. a work by which the institutions of England are to be made permanent on this continent; it is a work to secure freedom for our children for all time to come, to build a great Empire on this continent. We shall not, perhaps, see it fully peopled; but the time will come, if we look to the country, instead of to ourselves; if we look to the country instead of to these Benches. Hon. gentlemen should not forget that at the period of this Confederation being brought about, these Provinces were small dependencies of England; they were scattered, and far asunder; the leading men of each Province did not know the leading men of the other Provinces; they had no common intercourse; they did not know their

separate institutions ; they were separated and isolated from each other, as much as we are separated from Ireland or China ; but to-day we are a united Dominion ; we are a great country, a powerful country, if we be only true to ourselves. We are not very numerous—a little over 4,000,000. But when the United States separated from England they were only 4,000,000 ; to-day they are 40,000,000 of people, perhaps 45,000,000 ; and, Mr. Speaker, they have not a better country than ours ; they had no better prospects and advantages than we have ; they have had bloody wars ; we have had no bloody wars ; they had a bloody war to bring about their independence, and they had another bloody war afterwards ; they had a fratricidal war, which was a most bloody war. We have had no such bloody wars ; England has recognised our rights, has recognised the true policy of making this country a free country, and we are so free that we have not a single British soldier, we have not a soldier of the British army amongst us, with the exception of a small number at Halifax, left to assist in the guardianship of that coast. We are left in the free exercise of our rights, and every man is loyal to the Empire and to our Queen, because we know that we are protected in case of war, protected on the seas, and protected, not only in this country, but abroad ; for every citizen that goes abroad is protected by the flag of England. Mr. Speaker, once more ; do not let us destroy Confederation ; do not let us destroy the charter of our liberties ; let us be true to ourselves, and continue to progress as we have been since the first day of Confederation ; let us continue to be contented and happy. If we begin by passing this amendment, we are, in the words of the hon. member for West Durham, saying to British Columbia, " You may go ; you are not reasonable." It would be unreasonable for us to tell British Columbia to go. She has been patient and reasonable. She will wait until the good times come, when the means of the country will allow us to build the road with vigour. We will build that railway, year by year, and shortly we will have a road from the Atlantic to the Pacific ; and most likely, on that day, we will, I hope, find the hon. members for Lambton and West Durham

in a first-class car going to see their friends in British Columbia ; and at that period they will regret having attempted to destroy the future of Canada, by running down their country, and eulogizing the United States of America.

MR. CASGRAIN : I did not intend to talk on this subject to-night, because I thought that some hon. members on the other side of the House would avail themselves of the opportunity to give us some explanation of this matter. But, as they have not done so, I have some views of my own which I will explain in the best manner I can. I listened to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I must congratulate him on its tone and the earnestness with which he gave his ideas and explained his system to the House. But I do not agree with his views. I understand that some of them are, perhaps, too high or, perhaps, too widespread even for his hon. colleagues. If I understand his plan, it is to connect both sides of the ocean with this Railway. I understand that there is one part that cannot be built for some time to come. I allude to that part connecting Thunder Bay with Georgian Bay, that is the most important part to be built first in the interest of the other Provinces. The construction of that work appears to be too hard a task for the resources of the country, or for the ability of the best engineer we can secure to grapple with it. There is no doubt that a little geographical knowledge of that part of the country would be a great assistance to those who have to deal with the work. That country is so covered with marshes and the soil is so bad and so rugged that it is next to impossible to build a railway. I do not think that the hon. the Minister of Railways or myself will live long enough to see a road constructed over it. In the month of August, in the very part through which the Railway is to pass, the ground remains frozen for all the year, except about eight inches from the surface. With regard to the land question, as I understand it, one-twentieth part of the good arable lands does not belong to the Government. The Hudson's Bay Company have the choice of this one-twentieth of the best lands, and I think as private individuals they will attend carefully to their own interests. If I understand the

matter aright the Hudson's Bay Company has made a certain offer of their lands to this and preceding Government, and judging from the value they set upon them, and comparing it with the value the Government set upon theirs, they will be far from realising what the Government expects. Then there is another point: if those lands are so very valuable they must also be valuable to the Hudson's Bay Company. The Government appears to be going on the principle of speculating in those lands. The Hudson's Bay Company has the same chance of making money out of theirs as anybody else. That Company has received \$1,500,000 to relinquish their rights, and they are relieved from all the charges and encumbrance of protecting themselves there. But what has been the effect on the stock of the Company. It has remained at par ever since. There is another point which has, perhaps, escaped the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways. I do not see that we have, at the present moment, any other resources to build the Railway except those lands. I do not call the borrowing powers of the Dominion a resource. In times of peace, like the present, we should be able to discuss this business in a calm manner. We may have difficulties in the future. We may have war on the continent of Europe, and that would certainly affect our credit and emigration. We ought to provide against such contingencies. We may have trouble with the Indians of this or the other side of the line. They cost the Americans \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 a year to keep them at bay. All these matters should be taken into consideration in this important subject. I listened with a great deal of attention to the speech of the hon. gentleman. I am not an engineer, and I do not want to enter into figures which I do not understand, but I have learned the simple rules of addition and subtraction, and I would like the hon. the Minister of Railways to tell us what would be the actual cost of operating this Railway per mile.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I cannot say what the cost of operating any railway that is not constructed, but I am in a position to give the hon. gentleman information which I am sure he will listen to with pleasure. I will not give him the hypothetical calculation, but the

result of the operation of that portion of the Pacific Railway already constructed. I hold in my hands a return received to-day of the operations of the Pembina Branch, which shows, from the 1st of March to the 12th of April, 1880, the number of passengers carried was 5,236; the number of laden freight cars 1,246, or equal to 12,460 tons; the gross receipts, \$36,287, and the working expenses \$15,000, or a net revenue from the 1st of March to the 12th of April of \$21,287.

MR. CASGRAIN: I hold in my hands the Report of the hon. the Minister of Railways, and I hope that next year he will make it in better shape, and give us more of the exact information we want on this subject. The Report ought to show, like all the American reports, the average cost of operating per mile. Take the Report of this year. I have found out the probable cost of the working of this Railway by a comparison of the cost on other railways. In statement No. 8, we have a statement of the running expenses of the different railways in the Dominion. We have 6,484 miles in operation, the total cost of running being \$16,188,282. The cost per mile of this Railway, calculated upon the experience of the others, will be about \$2,650.50 per mile, or \$7,156,350 for the 2,700 miles, which agrees pretty well with Mr. Fleming's statement of about \$8,000,000. I have been long trying to ascertain these different items of expense, and think that the hon. the Minister of Railways ought to have told us the probable working expenses of the Canada Pacific. I challenge him to give us the approximate cost of its operation, with the average yield or income, and the gross assets the first five years. I will assume the largest possible return from its working, and yet predict the Dominion will not be able to maintain it. It is all very well to boast that we are a great people, and possess a large territory; but the city of New York possesses more revenue, and one of its Aldermen might boast, with more appropriate fitness than the hon. the Minister of Railways, it could build more railways than we. I dislike such childish boasts. When I hear the Railway can be built for \$60,000,000, and remember that eminent Quebec authorities estimate the cost at \$150,000,000, are we to rely

upon the data of the Government, which the hon. member for West Durham has shown to be totally incorrect? The boasting as to the Railway reminds me of the boasts and sanguine expectations in regard to the Grand Trunk in 1851 and 1852; the stockholders in the London market were told they were to reap 11 per cent. on their investments. We know how that enterprise turned out. I believe the Pacific Railway will yet be built, but that we can build it on the plan proposed I do not think. Why have we not been furnished with the facts as to the American Pacific Railway, and its cost per mile for working? They would afford us a fair criterion for a judgment on this subject. I see the Government do not intend to go beyond Thunder Bay to the east. Then I call Thunder Bay a *cul-de-sac*. The navigation at that place is stopped for a part of the year. Trade will not go that way in winter, but take its natural course south. The border country is flat and the natural channel for trade is in the direction of the United States. You cannot prevent it going in that direction. You may bring trade to Thunder Bay in summer and draw it to the Georgian Bay, by loading and unloading vessels; but in winter as well as in summer you will have to take the shortest cut and go by the American Railways to Sault Ste. Marie. Your Railway to that point will be tapped all along the route, the through freight being next to nothing. The project of a railway from Thunder Bay, north-west of Lake Superior, is as wild as that of a road from Winnipeg to Hudson's Bay. The hon. the Minister of Public Works said, that public opinion was with the Government in this matter. I appeal to the Conservatives of Quebec if the strongest pressure has not been brought to bear on them, to induce them to support the Government at this juncture? If they could shirk the vote, if the Government were not depending upon them, they would do so.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Vote against the amendment? Of course they will, *en masse*.

MR. CASGRAIN: We all know how they will vote. They will have to swallow the pill, however bitter. I affirm public opinion is not with the

Government in this matter. If I understand the anticipations of hon. Ministers, we are before long to have a population of 500,000 souls in the North-West, say 100,000 men, who are expected to contribute \$3,000,000 a year to the Revenue, or \$30 a head for the privilege of living in that country. With that prospect settlers would not be much encouraged. I doubt if they would pay that amount. Regarded in an impartial sense, this scheme is not the complement of Confederation. What is British Columbia after all? It would be better to lose a finger than the whole arm. We should do anything reasonable to fulfil our bargain with British Columbia; but we must not all go to the bottom of the ocean to do so. If this policy be carried we may not, but our children will, suffer all the consequences. We ought to leave behind us a better record. To endorse an enterprise of this magnitude, is assuming a great burden. Had we the means, I would not object. But we have not the means, nor will the work be done during the lifetime of the present hon. Ministers. It is not for the hon. the Premier, who has won the crown and title of a statesman, to make such a mistake. However great his majority, he should not hesitate to follow a true statesmanlike course. He made one great mistake in politics, and is going to make another, which he may live long enough to regret. I believe this country is not able to build this Railway now. Our action on this occasion will remain on record, to inspire us with pride, or produce regret, as it shall be right or wrong.

MR. McINNES: Before the motion now before the House is carried, I say carried, for I know there is enough of patriotism in this House to carry it, I desire to say a few words on the extraordinary and unpatriotic amendment moved by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), to the resolution of the hon. the Minister of Railways, and as the subject has been pretty exhaustively discussed, I promise not to occupy much of the valuable time of the House. I purpose in the first place to review briefly the vacillating and inconsistent policy pursued by the hon. member for West Durham and his leader, if he has a leader, in connection with the Columbia section of the Canada Pacific Rail-

way. It will doubtless be remembered by every hon. gentleman in this House that, in the summer of 1874, the late Administration deputed a Mr. Edgar to proceed to British Columbia, not for the purpose of treating with that Province for a relaxation of the terms of Union with Canada, but for the ostensible purpose of bribing the people and Legislature of the Pacific Province. What did we find that pure-minded delegate of the hon. member for West Durham and the hon. member for Lambton doing; doing no doubt what he was ordered to do, offering the sum of \$750,000 in lieu of building the Pacific Railway. The people and Legislature of British Columbia, in my opinion, properly considered Mr. Edgar's offer on behalf of the late Government was a mere bribe, and they rejected it, with that contempt it was entitled to. I may say here that, up to the time of the Union of British Columbia with Canada, British Columbia was a Crown colony, and not only did we receive justice, but every consideration, at the hands of the Imperial Government. Every promise made by that Government was fulfilled; every pledge was redeemed. The people, accustomed as they were to look upon treaties made by the British Government, or by the Legislatures of any of her colonies, as binding, especially a Treaty entered into with a sister Province. So strong was their faith in the integrity and honor of the Dominion Government that it took a considerable time before they could really believe the Government of Canada were in earnest in offering this bribe of \$750,000 in lieu of the Railway. Whenever the people of British Columbia realised their true position, or rather the position they were likely to be placed in by the hon. member for Lambton and the hon. member for West Durham, they immediately appealed to the foot of the Throne for protection against this new and unnatural enemy, that had ascended, or rather usurped, the the political Throne of Canada in 1874. And now let us see with what result did British Columbia appeal to the foot of the Throne. The result was, that Lord Carnarvon, Secretary for the colonies, offered his good offices, acted as arbitrator, and, whether voluntarily or otherwise is best known to the hon. member for Lambton, he (Mr. Mackenzie) agreed to build

a waggon road from British Columbia to the Canadian North-West, and to expend not less than \$2,000,000 annually on railway construction. Now, we find the hon. member for West Durham and his associates in this House endeavouring, in every possible way, to poison the minds of hon. gentlemen in this House and country against British Columbia—submitting a proposition for the violation—the gross violations of the very terms they themselves made with the Pacific Provinces only a few years ago. I ask is this the course and treatment what we should expect at the hands of honest-patriotic Canadians—I leave the House to judge. I find that in 1875 the Government of that day awarded a contract for building 600 miles of telegraph line in British Columbia. This contract was awarded for the sum of \$272,000, and one of the conditions was that the contractor should be compelled to keep the line in repair for five years, after which he was to receive the additional sum of \$250,000, making in all the snug sum of \$522,000. It is true all of this money was not expended—but \$41,600 was before the contract was cancelled. A large portion of this telegraph line passed through a heavily wooded section of the country. Through this wooded portion of the line all timber was to be cleared for a width of 132 feet. In fact this telegraph line was to form a portion of the Canada Pacific Railway. This work was done on the Burrard Inlet route. Now allow me to call attention to what appears to me to be irreconcilable statements made by the hon. member for Lambton in 1875 and 1879. I find in the Hansard of 1875, page 1,013, that he (Mackenzie) said in reply to the hon. member for Niagara, the following:—

“Hon. Mr. Mackenzie said he had already stated the line was to be put up where the road was to be located (these being the Engineers instructions based upon his original suggestion) and he did not know that a single mile of telegraph line was being erected anywhere except on the line of the railway.”

This would certainly mean that the member for Lambton, had selected the Burrard Inlet route as far back as 1875. Now, I will read a few utterances made by the same hon. gentleman last Session, as will be found in last year's Hansard, page, 1904: “Now Mr. Marcus Smith admitted himself in his reports, thus from

Waddington Harbour to Esquimalt, would take \$27,000,000, including bridging, and we know it could not take less than from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 to construct the remainder of the route, including bridging. These reasons seemed to me so conclusive against the Bute Inlet route, that we could not for a moment, hesitate, and I will say this to the House that up to two years my mind was wholly biased in favour of Bute Inlet." Now I ask, how can the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), reconcile these inconsistencies, if he can. I will be free to admit that he possesses more ingenuity than I give him credit for. I wish hon. gentlemen to note that when he declared to this House in 1875, that every mile of the telegraph line was being built on the line of the Pacific Railway, (on the Burrard Inlet route), he had hundreds of men employed in exploring the northern portions of the Province, in order to find, if possible, another line for the railway. I therefore say, that if the hon. gentleman was honest and sincere in what he stated, in 1875, he must have been insincere and innovated in making the statement he did last Session. I will do the hon. leader of the opposition the justice, in saying that, he was forced by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), to take the position he did then, and is taking now. If his course will not bear this construction, then we are forced to the conclusion that he had no railway policy, that he trimmed his sails according to every political breeze that happened to spring up. We find again, in 1875, that the same hon. gentleman sent 5,500 tons of those notorious steel rails to British Columbia. About 2,500 tons were stacked at Esquimalt, and the balance at Nanaïao. From the best information I can get, they cost this country, in round numbers, \$375,000. In addition to that, they paid in the neighbourhood of \$500 a year for the ground upon which they were piled. Again, on the eve of the last general election, a contract was awarded for the removal of those rails to Yale, at a cost of \$34,000. Now, I must confess, I never could understand why that contract was given out at that particular time, unless it was for political purposes, from the fact that there was no immediate use for them, as railway construction was not commenced, and would certainly take

two or three years before they would be required. Yet, the honourable gentleman told us a few days ago, he was not really decided, whether he would adopt the Burrard Inlet route, and go on with construction.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said nothing of the kind. I had adopted the route.

MR. McINNIS: I meant to say to go on with the work. But, I ask what good was there in adopting the route, unless the hon. gentleman was prepared to proceed with construction. Now, I find the hon. member for Lambton, spent \$1,250,000 in British Columbia, on surveys alone, during his administration. In adding up these different items, I find the amount of \$2,250,000 was expended by the late Government in British Columbia, and I ask every hon. gentleman in this House for what purpose was that large amount spent there, unless he (Mr. Mackenzie) was really serious, and intended to build the British Columbia section of that road. Surely they will not attempt to say, attempt to trifle with the good sense of this House by saying, that millions of dollars have to be spent, in order to ascertain what the capabilities of that Province were, and what it would cost to construct the road. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) endeavoured, yesterday, to lead this House to believe that British Columbia was a poor, miserable country; in fact, that it was not worth having, and if the people of that Province wished to sever their connection with Canada, all they would have to do was to go. Now, I desire to call the attention of the House, for a few moments, to some of the resources of the Pacific Province, especially the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I find according to the Gold Commissioners' report for 1878, an average of \$3,000,000 in gold has been taken out of what the hon. member for West Durham had the bad taste to call a sea of mountains. From September, 1858, to September, 1878, over \$60,000,000 has been taken out of the virgin Province of British Columbia—more than will be required to construct the entire road, from the head of Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean. And the supply does not appear to diminish. In fact, I am fully persuaded that industry is only in its infancy. It is established beyond controversy that we

have almost inexhaustible fields of coal. It is not only inexhaustible, but it is of a very superior quality, commanding, as it does, in the San Francisco market, from \$1 to \$2 more per ton than any other coal to be found on the Pacific coast. Coal has also been discovered in various places on the mainland, and only await capital to open them up to the markets of the world the same as those of Vancouver Island. Adjacent to the Nanaimo coal mines we have mountains of iron ore which assays from 80 to 90 per cent. With abundance of the best coal and iron ore, lying side by side, I see no reason why British Columbia should not become one of the first, if not the first, iron manufacturing countries, at least on this continent. Copper is to be found in every portion of the Province. A large number of silver lodes have been discovered within the last few years, some of which assay as much as \$1,500 to the ton, and only await capital and labour to work them successfully. The timber wealth of this Province cannot be over estimated. There is scarcely any portion of the sea coast from Alaska to Washington territory, and extending inland for miles, but what is heavily timbered. This is equally true of many of our valleys. Some of the largest timber to be found, not only on this continent but in the world, and of a quality certainly equal to anything to be found in the older Provinces. In order to give some idea of what we are doing in the lumber business, I may mention that one mill alone, that of the Hon. Senator Nelson, of Burrard Inlet, has shipped to foreign countries annually from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 feet of lumber. Now, I contend that, if the British Columbia section of the road is built; if we had direct communication with the great North-West of Canada, one of the great benefits that will accrue directly to the North-West, and indirectly to the rest of the Dominion, will be the shipment of lumber into that vast territory. From what I can learn of that country, the timber is scarce and of a very inferior quality. We would only require to ship our lumber 700 or 800 miles in order to place it in the very heart of the North-West. If the North-West settles up as fast as we all expect and believe it will, I contend the people of that region will be compelled to draw all their lumber

supply from British Columbia for many ages to come. I therefore say that the lumber trade alone will pay no small revenue to this country. As I brought the value of our Fisheries before the notice of the House last Session, I will merely say that in 1878 we exported over \$1,000,000 worth of canned salmon. It is only six years since the first attempt was made at canning salmon in our Province. This industry can be extended to almost any extent. Trout, herring and other valuable fish abound in our waters. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) misled the House last night—as he generally does when anything affecting British Columbia is under discussion—that we had a very small area indeed of agricultural land in the Province. I frankly admit now, as I always have admitted, that our agricultural lands are limited—that they are small in proportion to our waste lands. But what good lands we have are exceptionally good—are equal to anything to be found in the Dominion. Permit me to say that it has been my privilege to have visited every Province in the Dominion, with the exception of Manitoba, and I certainly think our arable lands will compare favourably with those even of the great empire Province of Ontario. In a small section of the district I have the honour to represent, I find, according to late surveys made by the Local Government, we have 525,000 acres of arable land. This is not in detached pieces, but an unbroken stretch from the Gulf of Georgia to Popcum. Again, according to Mr. Hunter's report—a report that will be found in the engineer's report, submitted to the House a few days ago—we have 389,000 acres of arable land on Vancouver Island. I mention this in order to show that in the small portion of the Province, I have spoken of, we have more good farming land than the hon. member for West Durham gave us credit for in the entire Province. I am not so familiar with the extent of farming land in the interior of the country; but, I may say, I am informed on good authority there are many millions of acres of good wheat land. I see the hon. members for Carriboo and Yale in their seats and have no doubt but what they will give the necessary information about their districts before this debate closes. I may

say, before I close this part of my subject, that the wheat, oats and barley grown in my district will compare favourably, in quality and yield, with any part of Ontario, as for all kinds of roots, and the hardier kinds of fruits, they surpass anything I have ever seen. The selection of the Burrard Inlet route by the present Government, as by the late Government, has given universal satisfaction, not only in my district, but, throughout the entire Province. As I said last year, it is the only route that would ever open up the great mineral and agricultural districts of the Province. This contract of 127 miles begins at the head of navigation on the Lower Fraser and runs up to the commencement of navigation on the Upper Fraser. We have 120 miles of navigable water on the Lower Fraser and nearly 200 on the Upper Fraser. The route selected is by all odds the shortest and cheapest. It is 225 miles shorter than the Port Simpson and will cost \$10,000,000 less. It is 304 miles shorter than the Bute, with Esquimault as its terminus, and will cost \$21,000,000 less. So there can be no two opinions as to it being the best route. Besides the Burrard route being the cheapest and shortest, it ends at certainly one of the finest harbours to be found in the Dominion. It is a harbour that is easy of access at all hours of the day or night, and at all seasons of the year, it is completely landlocked, and fogs are not nearly as prevalent as at Bute Inlet and Port Simpson. I would say with respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that it is an extraordinary declaration for him to present to this intelligent and patriotic House. It is revolutionary in its nature—yes, it is more than revolutionary, it is disloyal. It is disloyal because I claim anything having a tendency to disintegrate the Confederation is disloyal, were it to be carried it would be the insertion of the thin end of the wedge by which this Dominion would be dismembered. This Dominion is too dear to us, has cost too much money and valuable time in bringing it into its present satisfactory condition to allow the hon. member for West Durham to do as he proposes in the amendment before the House, such a course, I claim, is unworthy of the hon.

gentleman, unworthy of one of the leaders of a party that claims to be loyal to Canada—mark the hon. gentleman does not object to building the road from Lake Superior to the Prairie region, and why? Because Ontario will get a direct benefit from the opening up of that country. He (Mr. Blake) shows an unpardonable amount of selfishness in this matter, selfishness and sectionalism that should not to be tolerated on the floor of this House. I take it that we are here as the representative of the people of this country, to legislate for the whole Dominion, and not for any one particular Province. If there is an honourable gentleman in this House that has not the interest and prosperity of the whole Dominion at heart, he should not be here, but in a county or township council. Gentlemen on the Opposition Benches may make light of British Columbia, but the day will come, owing to the diversity and great extent of her resources when she will be recognised as one of the most prosperous Provinces in the Dominion. I have yet to hear of the country possessed of the same resources that did not attain to eminence. She has the elements within her borders of becoming one of the greatest manufacturing countries in the world. Let the hon. member for West Durham point out to me, if he can, one Province that has made the gigantic strides within so short a period. The settlement of the country can only date back to 1858, when gold was discovered. It was then a howling wilderness. While she was a Crown Colony, she went to work and built a waggon road, 500 miles, into the very heart of the country, at a cost of nearly a million of dollars. Last year our revenue amounted to \$521,000. Take our population at 50,000, and I find we paid no less than \$10.32 *per capita* in Customs duties alone, or nearly three times as much as any of the other Provinces. I ask, what did any of the old Provinces amount to when only twenty years old—did they contribute one cent. for every dollar British Columbia contributes to the general revenue of the country. I think not. The resolution of the hon. member for West Durham states, in effect, that because British Columbia is weak, Canada must take advantage of her

weakness; that because we are in her power, she is to do with us as she pleases. It will be a disgrace to the fair name and fame of Canada, if she attempts to violate the solemn obligations entered into with British Columbia on the one hand, and the Imperial Government on the other, to build our road. Anything short of this would be unbritish, and would do irreparable injury to this country. Suppose this resolution is carried, and the hon. the Finance Minister went to England to negotiate a new loan. I imagine the reply he would receive from capitalists would be: "No, we cannot give any money; in fact, we are sorry we ever gave you any." Why? "Because you repudiated your Treaty with British Columbia, and now, in the same way, repudiate your foreign debts; consequently, you cannot have any." But this is only one of the many evils that would result from such a course. It must have been remarked by every hon. gentleman in this House, that whenever the name of British Columbia is mentioned the member for West Durham becomes restive, and assumes a belligerent attitude and tone. Why it is I have never been able to understand. When the Bill of the hon. the Minister of Justice, providing for the salaries of two additional Judges in British Columbia, was before the House, he (Mr. Blake) spent hours in trying to defeat it, and on no higher grounds than that it would cost a few hundred dollars more. He was willing to allow the Administration of Justice in that Province to become inefficient and inadequate to the wants of the rapidly growing population. He never loses an opportunity in proclaiming to this House and country that we have only 10,000 of a population. This is not correct. We have from 25,000 to 30,000 whites, and 35,000 Indians. With railway construction going on, and the impetus that will be given to every industry, we may reasonably expect a white population of 60,000 or 70,000 within the next seven or eight years. I challenge any hon. gentleman in this House, or out of it, to mention one kind word he (Mr. Blake) ever uttered about British Columbia. On the contrary he has defamed and belittled her in every way he could. This is treatment we have received and may ex-

pect to receive at his hands. In conclusion, I would say, the future of this country depends on the opening up the North-West, and British Columbia, and this can only be done by building this great national highway from Ocean to Ocean—from the Atlantic to the Pacific. By this means—and this means alone will this Dominion be consolidated. If this country ever assumes that position we are entitled to—that our gigantic proportions—our varied and boundless resources—and our race entitles us to among the family of nations—it is by the building the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the Debate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Lost.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Why does the hon. gentleman say lost? What can be the objection to it?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Because we want to finish it to-night.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It cannot be finished to-night. I am quite sure I am not going to speak to-night. There is nothing to be gained by forcing on a Debate at this hour of the morning.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is only 11 o'clock, and this is the second night upon a discussion of a principle which has been discussed every Session for the last five years. I think the hon. gentleman has a right to ask that the Debate should be brought to a close.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The debate involves most serious consequences to the country. It is the most important debate of the Session. The hon. gentleman, in my opinion, is acting unfairly in attempting to force a vote to-night.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not think I am open to the charge of having acted obnoxiously or unfairly during any part of this Session or any part of last Session. I think every consideration has been given as ought to be given, by the majority to the minority of this House. I do not see why we should adjourn just now. The hon. gentleman says he is not going to speak at midnight. We do not ask him to do so, but if there are younger and stronger men than himself who desire to speak they ought to have an opportunity of speaking. If they do not speak to-night they will speak on Monday night

and we will be put over until Tuesday. Surely hon. gentlemen will not deny that the case in support of the amendment, which is now in your hands, has been ably and exhaustively put by the hon. member for West Durham. The hon. gentleman himself cannot and will not be denied an opportunity of discussing the subject. We ought, however, to get on with business.

MR. DECOSMOS: I think that every opportunity should be given for a full and fair discussion of this question. As a member from British Columbia I have much to say on the subject. I desire to demonstrate to this House that the Province of British Columbia occupies a position financially second to none in the Dominion. I gave way this evening to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and I would not have done so had I not expected that the Government would extend to me the courtesy I extended to a member of the Administration. I trust the hon. gentleman will not insist upon pushing this debate through to-night.

MR. CHARLTON: The right hon. the First Minister, last night, in a very gentlemanly manner, and greatly to the comfort and convenience of the members of this House, consented to an adjournment at about this hour. This is as late as we ought ever to sit if we have a due consideration for our health. It is impossible to close this debate to-night, and the desire that it shall be adjourned is a reasonable one. The right hon. gentleman's statements have been challenged, and we expect to hear from him on the subject, and the country wants to hear from him, and it will be taken as an act of cowardice on the part of the hon. gentleman in not consenting to the adjournment of the debate.

MR. DECOSMOS: I have as much physical strength, I dare say, as the hon. the First Minister has, and perhaps more; and if the Government are prepared to resist such a reasonable proposition as an adjournment, they must be prepared to sit here till, at the earliest, eight o'clock in the morning. I propose to discuss this question, Mr. Speaker: I would have preferred to have addressed the House within reasonable hours, but as it is the will of this House that I shall not have that privilege, I trust to your indulgence possibly for two,

or three, or four, or perhaps more hours, in which I shall speak, in accordance with the law and usage of Parliament. We have had a speech from the hon. the Minister of Railways, in which he made his annual statement on the Pacific Railway; and we have had also the annual review from the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I may say that the speech of the hon. the Minister of Railways was cheering; it was full of energy and replete with information, and gave us confidence in the future of our country. It will be unnecessary for me to go into the whole of the details respecting the Pacific Railway, for the hon. the Minister of Railways has made detailed explanations to the House. I will, however, briefly refer to the whole line, from the railway system of Ontario and Quebec to the Pacific Ocean. The first section to which I will direct attention is that between the Canada Central Railway, the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway and westward *via* Lake Nipissing to a junction with that section of the Canadian Pacific now in part completed and part under construction between the west end of Lake Superior and Selkirk. As I remarked, I will avoid detail. Several Sessions ago, I made a statement to this House showing that with a certain number of wheat-growers, and with a certain acreage producing wheat, in Manitoba, the receipts from the transportation of wheat alone to Montreal would pay interest and sinking fund on the entire cost of the road, would meet the cost of maintenance, repairs, and operating expenses, and leave a surplus to the credit of the country. In 1873, after the hon. member for Lambton became the head of the Government, I intimated to him the desirability of the early construction of this section, both as a matter of policy, and as a necessary public work, to unite the eastern Provinces with the Great West. But no step has yet been taken in that direction, except the subsidies granted to the Canada Central, and the proposed construction of the Georgian Bay Branch. The hon. the Minister of Railways, I was glad to observe, alluded very briefly to the possible early commencement of the construction of this great link of the Canadian Pacific, connecting the populations of Ontario and Quebec with the Great North-West.

I, therefore, take this opportunity to say that it will be sound policy on the part of this Government, at an early date, to construct this section connecting the Quebec and Ontario system of railways with the section from Fort William to Selkirk, so as to carry grain through, on an all-rail route, to the ships in the eastern seaports of our Dominion. I support this policy, not merely as a party matter, but as a matter that concerns the interests of the Dominion as a whole, and affects particularly the two large Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Sir, I trust that the hon. the Minister of Railways, during the Recess, will prepare a scheme for its early construction, and submit it for the sanction of Parliament at its next Session. A Railway can carry more cheaply than the canals.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. DECOSMOS: My hon. friend to my right says: "No, no," but I find, Sir, that reports respecting canals show this to be, as I state. The Railways from Chicago to New York, and the Railways from the West to Philadelphia and Baltimore, are carrying more than what goes by the water system. The steel-rail revolution has nearly overthrown lake and water transportation. Besides that the crowded passenger trains from the east, and the great volume of westward-bound freight, enables the eastern-bound freight trains to carry grain and provisions at such low rates as to make water transportation neither as profitable, nor as desirable as formerly, and consequently prevents the canals and lakes from being as great carriers now, relatively to the total volume of eastern-bound freight in the United States as they once were in the past. At any rate we have spent since 1873 more than \$15,000,000 to enlarge our St. Lawrence Canal system, and we do not get out of it enough to pay current expenses. The tonnage of the shipping in the lakes is small, in comparison to what might be expected, as a corollary to our grand scheme of water transportation. Well, Sir, returning from this digression. I say that the line between the Thunder Bay—Red River section, and the railway system of Ontario and Quebec, ought to be built, and built quickly and early. I will take up another point: I

believe the late Government made a mistake in commencing work, in expending money, on the Lake Superior—Red River section of the Pacific Railway. It is really nothing more than part of the trans-continental line, it seems to me, to run as a competing line with the Pembina section half of the year, and also as a competing line for the same period with the main trunk line between Selkirk and Nipissing when the latter shall have been completed. If proper energy had been manifested, and wisdom displayed in the expenditure of the money on the through line between Nipissing and Selkirk, the work would have been carried through and completed by this time. Now, Sir, with respect to the Pacific Railway from Red River to the foot-hills of the Rocky Mountains, the hon. the Minister of Railways, with his energy and bold determination, has enunciated a policy for building it and opening up the country, which shows him accustomed to rule a country; he has shown how the resources of the North-West can be developed and the country filled with population. I endorse that policy, and look forward to the near future covering that land with prosperous farms and thriving cities, with a network of railways like a spider's web. I believe the hon. gentleman is one of those statesmen who does not propose to put on slow engineers; but is one who wishes our navies to drive the buffalo and the deer before them on their way westerly to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. Now, Sir, we have had speeches delivered here with respect to the land policy of the Government,—the land policy propounded by the right hon. the Minister of the Interior, to settle the North-West with new provinces; settle it with a daring, peaceful, industrious population, who will clothe that naked land with cultivated fields, happy homesteads, busy villages, and ambitious cities,—the hum of their industries, along the line of the Pacific Railway, girdling the continent from ocean to ocean, and yielding Revenue more than will repay a hundred times over and over again, the cost of its construction. I will not enter into detail to show how the Government may be recouped by its land policy, for its expenditure in building the Pacific Railway. That has been well and fully

MR. DECOSMOS.

done by the right hon. the Leader of the House, when he explained the financial policy of the Government respecting the Railway. But, Sir, I will say that I believe that policy to be sound and good; and that it is calculated to build up the North-West as successfully, as permanently, and as rapidly as any policy that can be propounded. Whilst the Railway Land policy of the Government was under discussion, and during this debate, allusion was made to the growth of population in Nebraska and Kansas. Sir, when I first slept in Nebraska—rolled up in my blanket on the ground, twenty-eight years ago—there was not a white settler's house within its borders. The frontier military posts, and a few licensed Indian traders, were its only inhabitants besides the wandering tribes of the plains. When I first slept in Kansas it was the same. There was then west of the Missouri, no State of Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Nevada, or Oregon; no Territory of Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Arizona, or Washington; no British Columbia. The only organised Governments were the Territory of Utah, composed of a few scattered settlements along the foot-hills of the Wahsatch Mountains and near the shores of Salt Lake; the Territory of Oregon, which had a few settlements on the Columbia, Willamette, Cowlitz and Nisqually; the Colony of Vancouver Island, with a mere handful of whites, gathered under the guns of Fort Victoria; and the State of California, with two to three hundred thousand people. There was then but one small mail that crossed the continent, and that was carried monthly from Salt Lake, each way, during about six months in the year. Since then the whole extent of that vast territory has been covered with young nations, possessing all the elements of vigorous national life, enjoying all the appliances of modern civilisation, yielding fabulous wealth, and stoutly contending as rivals in the race of progress with States and Provinces, the work of centuries on this continent. Western Nebraska and Kansas, with Colorado, Montana, Idaho, Washington, Utah and Nevada, are no better than British Columbia, and in many important respects are far worse. Two hundred and fifty miles west of Missouri River,

Nebraska and Kansas cease to be agricultural states. Thence for sixteen hundred miles west, till the valley of the Sacramento is reached, no cultivated land exists,—except patches in Utah nourished by irrigation. North and south, east and west, it is mountains with untold mineral wealth, and vast plains that will ever remain pasture lands, amid irredeemable deserts. The consequence is that when the western limit of cultivable lands in Nebraska, Kansas, and contiguous territories, shall have been occupied, the tide of population flowing westwardly in the United States in search of arable land, will turn northwardly and spread itself over the fertile belt in our Great North West. Of this, there seems to me to be no doubt. Hence the policy of Government in pushing onward vigorously the Pacific Railway—providing rapid facilities of transportation for our own immigration and the coming tide from the south—commends itself to every patriot. The hon. gentlemen opposite, ever since the Debates this Session began, and ever since the admission of British Columbia, have declaimed against the building of a railway at such a vast cost. Why, Sir, the total amount for the whole line, some \$80,000,000, would be voted by this Parliament at once, for the purpose of defence, if a war broke out to-morrow, and would be voted without a dissenting voice. Sir, if the expenditure for the Railway, is spread over eight or ten years, it is small in comparison to such an expenditure for defence purposes; for war expenditure would be an expenditure from which we should see no great reproductive works in the future, but would be spent at once and lost for ever. But this Railway is a great work, a great national work, that will be valuable for all time; and would become more and more valuable year after year. War would ensure a vote of a vast expenditure of millions, entailing the slaughter of our sons, the destruction of our property, and manifold miseries; whereas here, we hesitate and object to a vote for a peaceful purpose; for a railway that will always be an instrument of peace, and an implement of war. Let me draw the attention of the House to some statements made by the *Toronto Globe*, while the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was the leader

of the late Government, on the 31st of August, 1876. It was made at the time that Lord Dufferin was in British Columbia on a mission that proved to be a failure; was made after the route for the Pacific Railway had been adopted

from Tête Jaune Pass to Fort George; and was published, no doubt, semi-officially by the hon. member for Lambton to influence the people of British Columbia. It is as follows:

Thunder Bay to Red River,	413 miles,	average per mile	\$28,000	\$11,430,000
Red River to Livingstone,	271 do	do	16,300	4,420,000
Livingstone to Edmonton,	516 do	do	19,000	9,772,000
Edmonton to Yellow Head Pass,	233 do	do	19,000	6,601,000
Yellow Head Pass to Stewart River,	260 do	do	20,000	5,335,000
Stewart River to Bute Inlet,	288 do	do	45,500	13,420,000
Total miles					2,031
French River to Thunder Bay,	620 do	do	40,000	24,800,000
Total through line					2,651 miles.
					Total cost
					\$75,778,500

Branches.

Georgian Bay Branch, 80 miles.....	\$1,120,000
Pembina Branch, 89 miles, at \$15,000 per mile.....	1,335,000
Subsidy to Canada Central, 120 miles, at \$12,000 per mile.....	1,440,000
<hr/>	
3,895,000	
<hr/>	
Total cost Pacific Railway.....	\$79,673,500

The hon. the Minister of Railways, I believe, estimated the cost of the Pacific Railway from Thunder Bay to Burrard Inlet at \$64,000,000. This is higher than the *Globe's* semi-official statement in 1876, for the longer and alleged more costly line from Thunder Bay to Bute Inlet, namely, \$50,978,500. Sir, if this estimate of the hon. member for Lambton and his Engineers were true in 1876, it is true now, and shows that what the hon. members opposite sometimes allege to be a work of appalling magnitude is no such thing, and that the objections that they urge are consequently unreasonable. No reasonable public man will truthfully say that \$50,978,500 to construct the Pacific Railway in ten years to come from Thunder Bay to the Pacific is a sum of such appalling magnitude that the people of Canada cannot bear the burden. But, Sir, no matter which is right, the estimate of the hon. the Minister of Railways or that of the hon. member for Lambton, we should not halt; but should complete the Railway to the Pacific within the next ten years. The line from Thunder Bay to French River was estimated by the *Globe* to cost \$24,800,000; the Pembina Branch, the Georgian Bay Branch, and the subsidy to the Canada Central at \$3,895,000, making the total cost of the Pacific Railway from French River to Bute Inlet, \$79,673,500. This differs little from the estimate of the hon.

the Minister of Railways, which I understood him to fix at \$82,000,000, for the entire Railway when completed and in operation. Now, Sir, the highest estimate of the cost of the Pacific Railway completed is nearly \$6,000,000 less than the total sum given by the Dominion, the Provinces and the Municipalities, in aid of Railways throughout Canada up to 1879. The Railway statistics supplied to Parliament up to April, 1879, are as follows:

	Amount of aid for Railway.
Dominion.....	\$65,939,900 51
Ontario.....	2,229,639 02
Quebec.....	8,513,613 27
New Brunswick.....	2,730,000 00
Nova Scotia.....	818,750 00
Municipalities.....	7,224,578 63
<hr/>	
Total.....	\$87,456,481 43

This sum has been spent within the last fifteen or twenty years. Yet the country is none the poorer; in fact, it is far richer. The people are as well clothed, fed and housed as they were before its expenditure; and are better able to-day to expend \$80,000,000 in the construction of the Pacific Railway than they were at any period during the expenditure of the \$87,456,481. The aid for railways was paid in bonds, loans, taxes; but the Dominion will repay herself the total expenditure for the Pacific Railway out of revenue received from the sales of land

along the line. The proposition of the hon. member for Lambton was that \$80,000,000 would build the Pacific Railway; and I do not think that there is a shadow of doubt but that that sum will be sufficient. Sir, this completes my review of the Railway to the foot-hills east of the Rocky Mountains, and brings me to the motion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), who wishes that the road should not be constructed in British Columbia. The Esquimalt-Nanaimo section of the Pacific Railway, we look upon as a road to be built by the Government of Canada, in accordance with the contracts with Columbia, in the Terms of Union, and in fulfilment of the Carnarvon Award; but I will select some other opportunity to deal with that question. Before I deal at length with the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, I wish to draw attention to some figures in regard to British Columbia. The hon.

gentleman said, in his speech, that we had only 12,000 of a population in that Province. Some years ago the hon. gentleman said, at Walkerton, the population was 2,000. I am glad that he has given us credit of an increase of 10,000; but, nevertheless, I will endeavour to show that he is as mistaken as a statistician as he is as a statesman. I will first draw attention to some figures in regard to the imports and exports of British Columbia, as compared with the other Provinces. I will not go into all my figures at this late hour, and weary the House, but I expect the *Hansard* report to take them in full, as they are tabulated in order that this House, and this country, may know the true relation that British Columbia bears to the rest of the Dominion. I will confine myself only to such explanations as will make my statistics more intelligible. The first table is as follows:—

STATEMENT of the Imports and Exports of the Provinces for 1878-79, compared with each other on the basis of Population.

Provinces.	1878-79.	1878-79.	1878-79.	1878-79.	Estimated Population	Per Capita Imports.	Per Capita Exports.	Per Capita Excess of Imports over Exports.	Per Capita Excess of Exports over Imports.
	Imports.	Exports.	Excess of Exports over Imports.	Excess of Exports over Imports.					
	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Ontario.....	34,105,826	21,706,806	12,399,020	Nil.	2,000,000	17 05	10 85	6 14	Nil.
Quebec.....	30,924,824	28,880,492	2,044,332	Nil.	1,500,000	20 61	19 25	1 36	Nil.
Nova Scotia..	7,062,614	7,326,018	Nil.	263,404	400,000	17 65	18 01	Nil.	0 66
N. Brunswick..	5,296,454	5,371,471	Nil.	75,017	300,000	17 65	17 90	Nil.	0 25
Manitoba.....	1,140,871	512,873	627,998	Nil.	50,000	22 80	10 25	12 56	Nil.
Brit. Columbia	2,440,789	2,755,972	Nil.	315,183	50,000	48 81	55 12	Nil.	6 30
P. E. Island...	835,569	1,831,389	Nil.	995,820	100,000	8 35	18 31	Nil.	9 95

From this table, it will be observed that British Columbia, although only twenty-two years old as a Province, stands next to New Brunswick, and fifth in rank among the Provinces as an importer and exporter of merchandise. Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba imported more than they exported; Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia exported more than they imported; and British Columbia's excess over imports was nearly as much as the aggregate excess of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The *per capita* imports of British Columbia were six times more *per capita* than Prince Edward Island, nearly three times

more *per capita* than either Ontario, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick; and more than double the *per capita* imports of Quebec and Manitoba. Her exports *per capita* were five times more than the *per capita* exports of either Ontario or Manitoba, and three times more than either Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island. These are incontrovertible facts that I submit to this House, and press upon the attention of the hon. gentleman who has moved a repudiation resolution. I will now draw your attention, Sir, to a summary statement showing the exports of each Province under their respective heads. It is as follows:

STATEMENT showing Exports of the different Provinces under their respective heads.—1878-9.

Provinces.	Mine.	Fishery.	Forest.	Animals and their Produce.	Agricultural Products.	Manufactures.	Miscellaneous.
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Ontario.....	825,769	95,531	3,253,724	5,726,453	10,410,174	885,740	229,219
Quebec.....	236,448	797,662	5,274,894	7,043,290	7,253,052	983,242	93,949
Nova-Scotia...	335,955	4,498,995	796,703	332,272	509,225	473,753	879
New Brunswick	153,449	681,124	3,622,514	121,163	185,071	1,20,062	12,952
Manitoba.....	399	2,635	Nil.	474,071	33,752	892	Nil.
P. E. Island ...	45	219,431	40,258	74,545	1,234,685	256,592	Nil.
Brit. Columbia	1,530,812	643,493	273,366	268,671	2,505	Nil.	Nil.
Total.....	3,082,900	6,928,871	13,261,459	14,100,604	19,628,464	3,700,281	386,281

This statement shows that British Columbia exported one-half of the total exports of the produce of the mines of the Dominion; and in that class of exports takes the first rank. She stands fourth in rank as an exporter of the produce of the Fisheries, and exports three times more than Prince Edward Island that is so urgently asking for a share of the Fishery Award. As an exporter of the produce of the forest, she stands fifth in rank; and fifth also in rank as an exporter of animals and their produce. In agricultural products she is the smallest exporter of any of the Provinces; but I predict that after the Pacific Railway shall have been completed, she will export more than any other Province. Besides her exports, the value of her agricultural products, farming and stock-raising cannot be less than \$1,000,000, and her productive industries of other kinds, \$750,000, making the total value of products for domestic use, \$1,750,000 in 1878-9, or the total aggregate value, in that year, of exports and productions for domestic use, \$4,500,000. Need it be wondered at, then, if British Columbia, with half her population Indians, has confidence in her own magnificent resources, and content, if need be, to stand alone, that she is proud of her position and power, and that she treats with disdain those who would violate their pledges, and trample under foot the most solemn obligations? I will now, Sir, bring under the notice of the House a statement of the trade between British Columbia and the other Provinces. It is as follows:—

STATEMENT of Inter-Provincial Trade, between British Columbia and the Eastern Provinces,

Mr. DE COSMOS.

since 1871. Goods imported into British Columbia from Eastern Provinces, since 1871.

July, 1871, to June 30, 1872.....	\$ 22,214 52
“ 1872, “ “ 1873.....	75,604 08
“ 1873, “ “ 1874.....	66,104 17
“ 1874, “ “ 1875.....	117,054 16
“ 1875, “ “ 1876.....	129,735 13
“ 1876, “ “ 1877.....	160,814 00
“ 1877, to Dec. 31, 1877.....	57,162 00
Year “ 1878.....	169,753 00
“ “ 1879.....	184,564 00

Total Imports by B. C. from other Provinces.....\$983,005 50
 Total Exports of B.C. to other Provinces in gold drafts to pay for Imports.....\$953,005 50

In round numbers, British Columbia has purchased in eight years and a-half a million dollars' worth of merchandise of Ontario and Quebec, principally the former, and paid for it in gold. The 50,000 Columbians—whites, Chinese and Indians—have, within eight years and a half paid Ontario and Quebec \$20 each for goods produced in this country. That \$1,000,000, when passed from hand to hand in trade, has added \$5,000,000 to the aggregate volume of their domestic trade, and has contributed to the support of hundreds of operatives and hundreds of families,—and yet that is but the dawning of the inter-provincial trade with the Pacific Province. When there are one or two hundred thousand of a white population on our western coasts, when the Pacific Railway, completed, shall carry cheaply across the continent, the domestic market offered to eastern manufacturers in British Columbia, will be worth its \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 or more a year. Probably neither the Government nor Opposition have noted this inter-provincial trade in the past, or forecast its

volume in the future. It is, nevertheless, a growing domestic trade that will be swollen into grander dimensions as the Pacific Railway progresses towards completion; and after its completion, our merchants and manufacturers of Old Canada and the Maritime Provinces will not merely supply manufactures for domestic consumption on our western coast and great North-West, but will enter into earnest competition with the advanced nations of the world to supply our domestic manufactures to a thousand foreign markets around the Pacific Ocean. Mr. Speaker, I will now draw your attention to the taxes paid by British Columbia and other Provinces into the Federal Treasury. I will first give a statement of what each Province paid in Customs in 1878-9. It is as follows:—

STATEMENT showing what each Province paid in Customs into Consolidated Fund in 1878-9, and what they would have paid at the rate *per capita* paid by British Columbia, on an estimated population of 50,000, including Indians; and also on 25,000, by reckoning 25,000 Indians equal to 5,000 white consumers.

Provinces.	1879. Customs Paid.	Estimated Population.	Would have paid at B. Columbia's <i>per capita</i> , \$10.42 on 50,000 popu- lation.	Would have paid, calcu- lating Brit- ish Columbia's population at 25,000, at \$20.84 <i>per</i> <i>capita</i> .
Ontario....	\$ 4,978,514	2,000,000	\$ 20,940,000	\$ 41,680,000
Quebec....	4,788,919	1,500,000	15,630,000	31,260,000
Nova Scotia...	1,204,289	400,000	4,168,000	8,336,000
N. Brunswick.	1,063,447	300,000	3,126,000	6,252,000
P. E. Island	208,435	100,000	1,042,000	2,084,000
Manitoba....	275,484	50,000	521,000	1,042,000
B. Columbia	521,443	50,000	521,443	521,443
Total....	13,040,531	4,400,000	45,848,433	91,175,443

This statement shows that the entire Customs paid by the all the Provinces into the Consolidated Fund in 1878-9, was \$13,040,331. That if Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, and Prince Edward Island, had paid in Customs into the Consolidated Fund, at the same rate *per capita* as British Columbia, the total amount that it would have reached, is \$45,848,433; and if at the same rate *per capita* as British Columbia really paid, assuming that 25,000 Indians are only equal to 5,000 white consumers, the amount paid by all of the Provinces into the Consolidated Fund would have reached the enormous sum of \$91,175,443. From this statement hon. gentlemen, Sir, will perceive the astounding disproportion

between the Customs taxes paid by British Columbia, and what was paid by the other Provinces. If they had paid in Customs dues at \$10.42, the British Columbia *per capita* rate on a population of 50,000, they would have paid more than three times the amount they did; and if on the reduced basis of population for British Columbia, they would have paid six times the amount in Customs that they did. But, Sir, I will not weary the House with further explanations under this head, but I will draw your attention to another statement comparing the percentage of Customs collected in British Columbia with that of other Provinces, and the proportion that the population of that Province bears to the other Provinces. I will read it. It is as follows:

STATEMENT of Customs collected in British Columbia during the fiscal year, 1878-9, compared with the Customs collected in the same period in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba; showing, also, the proportion of population in those Provinces to that of British Columbia:—

ONTARIO.

“Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 10½ per cent, of the sum paid by Ontario—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 2,000,000 Ontarians paid \$4,978,514, the proportion of population being 1 to 40, or 5 Columbians to 200 Ontarians.

QUEBEC.

“Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 10 7-8 per cent. of the sum paid by Quebec—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 1,500,000 Quebecers paid \$4,788,919, the proportion of population being 1 to 30, or 5 Columbians to 150 Quebecers.

NOVA SCOTIA.

“Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 43 3-10 per cent. on the sum paid by Nova Scotia—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 400,000 Nova Scotians paid \$1,204,289, the proportion of population being 1 to 8, or 5 Columbians to 40 Nova Scotians.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

“Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 49 3-100 per cent. of the sum paid by New Brunswick—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$531,443, and 300,000 New Brunswickers paid \$1,063,447, the proportion of population being 1 to 6, or 5 Columbians to 30 New Brunswickers.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

“Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 150½ per cent. more than the sum paid by Prince Edward Island—that is, 50,000 Columbians paid \$521,443, and 100,000 Prince Edward Islanders paid \$208,438, or Columbia paid \$250½

to \$100 paid by Prince Edward Island; or \$313,005 more than Prince Edward Island, the proportion of population being 1 to 2, or 5 Columbians to 10 Prince Edward Islanders.

MANITOBA.

“Columbia paid in Customs an amount equal to 87.8-11 per cent. more than Manitoba—that is, (assuming the population to be equal,) Columbia paid \$187.8-11 to \$100 by Manitoba, or \$521,443 to \$275,484 by Manitoba, an excess over Manitoba of \$245,959.”

This statement is so full and clear, Sir, that it is unnecessary for me to enter now upon an explanation. I will, therefore, come now to the Inland Revenue paid by the different Provinces, and I submit the following statement.

INLAND REVENUE.—Excise, Sources of Revenue: Spirits, Malt Liqueur, Malt, Tobacco, Petroleum Inspection, Manufactures, Seizures and other Receipts, 1878-9.

Province.	Estimated Population	Total Excise.	Per Capita	More than Columbia	Less than Columbia
		\$	\$	\$	\$
Ontario.....	2,000,000	3,383,315	1.19	0.55	Nil.
Quebec.....	1,500,000	1,472,359	0.98	0.34	Nil.
Nova Scotia.....	463,000	222,911	0.55	Nil.	0.09
N. Brunswick.....	300,000	234,369	0.74	0.10	Nil.
P. E. Island.....	108,000	50,371	0.50	Nil.	0.14
Manitoba.....	50,000	54,228	1.08	0.44	Nil.
B. Columbia.....	50,000	32,319	0.64	Nil.	Nil.

In this statement the estimated population of each Province is given, the amount paid by each Province, the rate *per capita* in excise in each, and the amount *per capita* more or less than in British Columbia. It shows that the Excise paid in Ontario is 55 cents more *per capita* than in British Columbia; 34 cents more in Quebec, 10 cents more in New Brunswick and 44c. more in Manitoba; and that it is 9c. less in Nova Scotia, and 14c. less in Prince Edward Island. This shows that British Columbia pays more *per capita* in Excise than either Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island and less than the other Provinces. What she is, however, deficient in her contribution to Excise, in comparison with some Provinces is a hundred times counterbalanced by her payments in Customs in excess of all others. Before leaving this question, however, I may remark that we had, a few days ago, a discussion on the Tariff. The whole energy of the Opposition and whole strength of the Government was directed to one point—the Customs Revenue and how it was levied. No one,

MR. DECOSMOS.

so far as I recollect, touched upon Excise and Stamps, amounting to over \$5,500,000, nor upon Post-office and Public Works, and other receipts amounting in all to over \$4,000,000. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did discuss the sale of Crown Lands; but not with respect to Revenue. His arguments were directed solely to the best mode of managing our North-West lands, with a view to settlement. Out of \$22,517,381, the total Consolidated Revenue for 1878-9, the Customs only yielded \$12,900,659. The difference, \$10,000,000, in round numbers, remained unquestioned, showing the opinion of the Opposition to be, if it showed anything at all, that the sources of Revenue, other than Customs, as managed by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, to be in a state of perfection. Even the long and wearisome discussion on the Tariff by hon. gentlemen opposite, amounted to little or nothing; for, if they were in office to-morrow, they could not reduce taxation, because the obligations of the country are such that taxation cannot be lowered; and hence some other expedient must be adopted to lighten the burdens of the people, if too oppressive. We will consider now the Consolidated Revenue, and Expenditure with respect to British Columbia, inasmuch as our Province has been supposed by hon. gentlemen opposite to be a poor contributor; also to show the payments required of each Province, and to show what British Columbia is entitled to pay at the ordinary *per capita* of the Dominion, as her share to the Consolidated Fund, and her share for Public Expenditure. I have in my hand a summary detail, from the Public Accounts, of the Consolidated Fund and Expenditure for 1878-9, which I will give to the *Hansard* reporter for insertion, and not enter upon the full details now. The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Taxes, 1878-9.

Customs	\$12,900,659
Excise	5,390,763
Bill Stamps.....	185,199
Total.....	\$18,476,613

Other Receipts.

Post Office.....	1,172,418
Public Works, including Railways	1,863,149

Interests on Investments (permanent).....	521,494
Interests on Investments (temporary).....	71,005
Ordnance Lands.....	40,849
Casual.....	47,621
Premium and Discount.....	460
Bank Imposts.....	2,853
Fines, Forfeitures and Seizures....	32,148
Tonnage Dues (River Police).....	21,361
do (Mariners' Fund)....	37,757
Steamboat Inspection.....	12,331
Fisheries.....	17,738
Cullers.....	24,715
Militia.....	16,031
Penitentiaries.....	53,115
Miscellaneous Receipts.....	15,325
Superannuation.....	41,959
Dominion Lands (Manitoba).....	23,828
Dominion Steamers.....	1,612
Gas Inspection and Law Stamps..	3,172
Insurance Inspection.....	6,134
Weights and Measures.....	13,685
Total.....	\$4,040,768

Summary.

Taxes.....	\$18,476,613
Other Receipts.....	4,040,768

Total Consolidated Fund... \$22,517,381

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE.

Charges for Debt and Subsidies....	\$11,942,641
Ordinary Expenditure.....	6,941,577
Charges on Revenue.....	5,561,162

Total Expenditure..... \$24,455,386

Now, Sir, I have framed a tabular statement that shows in the most concise form possible what each Province in 1878-9 ought to have contributed to the Consolidated Fund, and what ought to have been their respective contributions to the Public Expenditure. I will read it. It is as follows:—

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF DOMINION.—Total Consolidated Revenue, 1878-9, \$22,517,382; Total Population, 4,400,000; Average Revenue, *per capita*, \$5.12. Total Expenditure, 1878-9, \$24,455,381 56; Total Population, 4,400,000; Average Expenditure, *per capita*, \$5 56.

Province.	Estimated Population.	Approximate Average Revenue per Capita.	Share of Consolidated Revenue required of each Province as per population.	Approximate average Expenditure per Capita.	Proportionate share of Expenditure required of each Province, as based on Population.
		\$	\$	\$	\$
Ontario.....	2,000,000	5.12	10,240,000	5.56	11,120,000
Quebec.....	1,500,000	5.12	7,680,000	5.56	8,340,000
Nova Scotia.....	400,000	5.12	2,048,000	5.56	2,224,000
New Brunswick.....	300,000	5.12	1,536,000	5.56	1,668,000
Prince Edward Island..	100,000	5.12	512,000	5.56	556,000
Manitoba.....	50,000	5.12	256,000	5.56	278,000
British Columbia.....	50,000	5.12	256,000	5.56	278,000
	4,400,000		22,528,000		24,464,000

Sir, no statements can be submitted to this House that show more correctly the just charges for Revenue and Expenditure laid on each Province than the one that I have just read to this House. It shows that the rate *per capita* for Revenue is \$5.12, and that the rate *per capita* for Expenditure is \$5.86, throughout the whole Dominion from sea to sea. The burden of taxation and expenditure thus rests equally upon the entire people. When, however, the *per capita* contribution to the Revenue and Expenditure of any Province is higher than in any one or all the other Provinces, that Province is unequally and unfairly taxed. I admit that it is impossible to impose taxes with mathematical exactness upon our whole people. Some sections of our country and some classes of our people, under our

system of taxation, will contribute more to the Revenue than other sections and other classes, and our only course is so to impose taxes as to rest approximately evenly on all. British Columbia, however, is one of those sections of the Dominion that contributes far more *per capita* than any other Province: She contributed in 1878-9, an excess, over her just share to the Consolidated Fund, of \$297,762; and an excess, over her legitimate contribution to the Expenditure, of \$275,762. The former and following statements prove this clearly and indisputably to this House:

REVENUE.—CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Total sum required of British Columbia, to pay her share of Consolidated Fund, on basis of population, 1878-9.....	\$256,000.
--	------------

Total sum actually paid by British Columbia, into Consolidated Fund, in Customs and Excise, 1878-9.... 553,762

Total sum actually paid into Consolidated Fund by British Columbia, in excess of sum required as her share on basis of population, 1878-9..... 297,762

EXPENDITURE.—CONSOLIDATED FUND.

Total sum required of British Columbia, to meet her share of expenditure, on basis of population, 1878-9. \$278,000

Total sum actually paid by British Columbia, in Customs and Excise, toward Dominion Expenditure.... 553,762

Total sum actually paid by British Columbia, in Customs and Excise, toward Dominion Expenditure, in excess of amount required, on basis of population, 1878-9..... 275,762

For a people numerically so small in comparison with the populations of older and larger Provinces, the contribution of British Columbia, in excess of her just proportion, is enormous. The excess is larger than the whole contribution to the Customs Revenue by Manitoba, or the entire Customs and Excise contribution of Prince Edward Island. Yet, Sir, not a murmur has been heard from our people. We have borne the enormous burden of Federal taxation as a manly, self-reliant people. We have only asked the Dominion to meet her just obligations to the Province; and yet up to the present, the greatest of the Dominion's obligations has not been met; and an hon. gentleman opposite proposes to repudiate that. The hon. member for West Durham spoke to-day as if his own Province, Ontario, paid nearly everything: He said she was willing to spend her money throughout the Dominion. The

House ought to understand that we have ceased to be provincial, and that we meet here as representatives of the Dominion; that we pay taxes as the citizens of Canada; and no matter what the revenue may be—no matter what the expenditure—whether outside, for our agency in England, or for purposes inside, the expenditure is so much for British Columbia, Nova Scotia, and other Provinces as well as for Ontario. The hon. gentleman keeps his books in single, double and treble entry—he keeps his books for the Dominion, the Provinces, the counties, the townships, and so on, *ad infinitum*, and took occasion to read from them to-day to show how much the other Provinces received from Ontario. Nothing could be more subversive of good feeling under our Federal form of Government than parading what each Province contributes to the Federal Exchequer merely in laudation of Ontario, and thus raising invidious distinctions between the Provinces of this Dominion. None but a parish statesman could do such a thing. The statement often made in the press, that Ontario pays all the Revenue, is not correct. True, she has a large population, but the citizens of Quebec might as well say they pay all, because their number is also very large. Later on I will deal with this issue. I wish now, Sir, to submit to the House a tabular statement showing the total approximate amount of Revenue paid by British Columbia in eight years into the Federal Treasury. I will read certain portions, and hand the table to the *Hansard* reporter for insertion. It is as follows:

TOTAL APPROXIMATE AMOUNT paid by British Columbia, between July 20, 1871, and June 30, 1879, into Consolidated Fund.

	1871-2.	1872-3.	1873-4.	1874-5.	1875-6.	1876-7.	1877-8.	1878-9.	Total for Eight Years.
	§ cts.	§ cts.	§ cts.	§ cts.	§ cts.	§ cts.	§ cts.	§ cts.	
Customs.....	354,831 60	303,885 29	335,787 29	414,331 85	487,013 34	404,895 42	425,391 34	514,854 91	
Excise.....	1,457 14	5,723 93	10,674 84	11,181 01	14,913 71	20,264 60	24,985 33	31,969 20	
Total taxes....	356,321 74	309,619 22	356,462 13	425,512 86	501,927 05	425,159 02	470,326 67	546,824 11	\$3,392,152-80

CASUAL AND TERRITORIAL REVENUE.

Post-office....	777 34	16,740 90	9,504 20	2,264 11	14,074 67	13,431 08	16,644 61	16,791 23	
Ocean service.....		24,732 72	12,449 20	2,975 12	12,439 84	3,152 25	1,954 23	1,612 03	
Telegraph.....		14,310 48	10,120 72	1,483 18	9,257 08	7,325 92	8,530 57	5,179 70	
Harbour dues.....		12,513 29	295 40						
Miscellaneous.....		1,113 42	3,945 97	2,157 29				39 95	
Share Interest									
Premiums.....	7,199 06	6,310 00	8,415 00	11,674 00	13,631 82	12,881 15	11,088 82	11,262 00	
Marine Fund.....					2,349 96	1,878 09	2,312 25	2,865 66	
Steamboat Inspection.....					405 87	449 83	342 34	620 94	
Fines, etc.....					801 76	801 76	3,271 72	758 94	
Casual.....					496 75	2,440 60	725 00	911 68	
Militia.....						476 06	332 73	376 64	
Superannuation.....					630 00	670 00	686 00	688 00	
	7,976 34	75,720 81	44,730 49	38,559 70	53,255 99	43,806 74	46,186 27	41,107 83	= 351,344 17
								Total...	\$3,743,696 97

This statement shows that from July 20, 1871, to 30th June, 1879, British Columbia paid to the Dominion, in Customs and Excise, the large sum of \$3,392,152.80. In addition she paid \$351,314 in Casual and Territorial Revenue, making a gross total of her contributions, from 20th July, 1871, to 30th June, 1879, of \$3,743,696.97. It must appear to hon. gentlemen somewhat singular, if the statements of the hon. member for West Durham be true, that if our small population is only 12,000 whites,—it must appear singular how they could have paid in those years, nearly \$4,000,000 into the Dominion Treasury. The people who contribute thus, without croaking like the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)—the people who can show themselves willing and generous enough to bear such a burden, and to put their shoulder to the wheel and push on the state car, should receive a higher appreciation than has been extended to them since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. Before leaving this branch of my subject, Sir, I will give a summary showing the total amount paid by British Columbia in excess of her proportionate share. It is as follows:

British Columbia during eight years, from July 20, 1871 to June 30, 1879, paid in Customs and Excise into Consolidated Fund..... \$3,392,152 80

British Columbia contributed to Consolidated Fund from Casual and Territorial Revenues, from July 20, 1871 to June 30, 1879 (under estimated)..... 351,344 17

\$3,743,496 97

Proportionate share of Consolidated Fund required of British Columbia in eight years, July 20, 1871 to June 30, 1879, at \$256,000 per annum, taking the financial year 1878-9 as the basis for the whole period.... 2,048,000 00

Total amount contributed by British Columbia from all sources to Consolidated Fund in excess of her proportionate contribution, based on Returns of Revenue for 1878-9, in eight years, ending June 30, 1879.. \$1,695,496 97

Let me repeat that the revenue we have paid in excess of our legitimate share, assuming that each citizen should pay at the same rate, approximately, throughout the Dominion, nearly \$1,750,000, and, at the same time, we have not received that return we ought to have received from the Dominion.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: How much have you received?

MR. DECOSMOS: It is quite immaterial how much we have received, so long we have paid our proper share of taxation. We are not dealing in provincial politics; we are not here as Provincials, but we are here as Federalists. The sooner the hon. member for Westmoreland takes that large view of the matter the sooner he will cease to look at his own small Province solely, or to condemn a rising Province, but twenty-two years old, that pays half as much revenue as his does into the Consolidated Fund. In respect to Dominion Expenditure made in or for British Columbia, allow me to mention that there are certain sums of money that are to be paid for British Columbia that are provided for by Sta-

tute and the Terms of Union. There are other sums that are under the direct control of this Parliament, and either party in the House can oppose them if it pleases; and any contribution, beyond the statutory provision of the House takes the responsibility for, and not British Columbia, *per se*. Now, Sir, I have another statement showing the amount British Columbia would have paid in Customs duties in 1878-9 at the *per capita* paid by each of the other Provinces, and also the amount she would have paid at the average *per capita* rate of the Dominion, and also the amount British Columbia paid in excess of each of the other Provinces and Dominion at their respective *per capita* taxation rates. I will read it. It is as follows:

STATEMENT showing the amount that British Columbia would have paid in Customs Duties in 1878-79, at the rate *per capita*, paid by each of the other Provinces; and, also, the amount she would have paid at the average *per capita* rate of Customs of the Dominion; also the amount British Columbia paid in excess of each of the other Provinces and the Dominion at their respective *per capita* Customs Tax Rate.

Estimated Population, Indians and Whites.	British Columbia Customs per capita, \$10.42.	Customs Ontario, per capita, \$3.66.	Customs Quebec, per capita, \$3.97.	Customs Nova Scotia, per capita, \$3.05.	Customs New Brunswick, per capita, \$3.67.	Customs Manitoba, per capita, \$9.14.	Customs P. E. I. land, per capita, \$2.19.	Customs, average, per capita, Dominion, \$3.50.
50,000.....	\$ 521,443	\$ 153,000	\$ 198,500	\$ 152,500	\$ 183,500	\$ 457,000	\$ 109,500	\$ 175,000
Balance that would not have been paid by British Columbia if Customs had been collected at the the respective rates of Taxation for other Provinces and the Dominion.....	368,443	322,943	368,943	337,943	64,443	411,943	346,443
Total.....	521,443	521,443	521,443	521,443	521,443	521,443	521,443	521,443

I have prepared these figures in order that this House may understand the true financial position of the Province of British Columbia. I have prepared it with the view that hereafter the croaking against that Province, may cease. To illustrate my object, I will tell a story: I once heard of a person who lived in South Carolina, on the edge of a swamp. The frogs were very numerous, and greatly annoyed this man, and prevented him from sleeping at night. He tried every expedient he could think of to stop the frogs from croaking, and finally he

hit upon the plan of constructing a huge lantern, and whenever the frogs began to croak, he opened the door of the lantern, throwing a flood of light upon the denizens of the swamp, and reducing them to silence at once. I sincerely hope the statements I have made here to-night, to throw light upon the finances of British Columbia, will have the effect of stopping this eternal croaking that we have heard in this Parliament from time to time, up to the present day. My hon. friends opposite, and notably the hon. member for Durham, have been talking about rail-

MR. DECOSMOS.

way expenditure in British Columbia, surveys, and all that sort of thing. I have endeavoured to find out the total amount of expenditure in that Province for Pacific Railway surveys, and will give it shortly, Sir, though there have been three Governments in existence since the arrangement was entered into, to commence construction of the Pacific Railway in that Province, yet not a pick has been struck in the ground in the way of construction, not a shovel full of earth has been lifted; not a cart full of earth or stone has been carried; not a culvert has been built, not a bridge erected, not a tie laid, not a rail stretched,—nothing has been done whatever; yet we have been told here that a large sum of money has been expended in surveys. Now, before I name that sum, I will call the attention of the House back to the time before British Columbia entered the Dominion. We find such men as Sir George Cartier saying that all the money expended for surveys should be charged to the company who was to undertake the construction of the road. When the Allan Charter was granted, all expenses for surveys were to be borne by the parties holding the charter. Hence the charging of surveys to British Columbia is wrong in principle, and contrary to the utterances of Government in Parliament. I will show this House, nevertheless, on the basis I have just presented, that British Columbia has paid dollar for dollar, and more, into the Dominion Treasury for every dollar expended in connection with the Railway surveys in that Province. I will show you also what we paid in excess. I draw attention to the following statement, namely:

STATEMENT showing surplus paid by British Columbia over her *pro rata* contribution into Consolidated Fund, compared with Railway Expenditure in and for British Columbia up to June 30, 1879.

Surplus of British Columbia over <i>pro rata</i> contribution (see former statement)	\$1,695,496 97
Total Railway Expenditure in and for British Columbia; directly to June 30, 1879	1,499,956 19
Balance in excess of Railway Expenditure, held by Dominion Government.....	195,540 78

A large proportion of this money for Railway surveys was squandered, first, through incompetency, and in the next place this money was not all expended in

British Columbia. In making this statement I do not expect you to believe that I acknowledge the right of British Columbia to pay anything more than her *pro rata* share to the Consolidated Fund, I want, however, to show you that after deducting this vast sum for Railway surveys, \$1,499,956.17, from the surplus in our Treasury, there is \$195,540 to the credit of British Columbia, showing that the railway surveys in Columbia actually cost Canada, as a whole, nothing. Yet, we have the hon. member for West Durham, and all the brilliant lights around him, condemning the construction of the Railway in British Columbia, and attempting to repudiate the solemn obligation entered into between Canada and British Columbia, and Lord Carnarvon. We had yesterday and to-day, a long and elaborate speech from the hon. member from West Durham, and in it the hon. gentleman made a statement that the total population of British Columbia was 12,000. I presume it has not been denied by anybody, and I am sure, for the purpose of reviewing his statement. I will not. I find in my notes that I have headed a table founded on this statement: "Blake, the Statistician," of which the following is the substance: If only 12,000 people paid \$521,443 into the Customs, the *per capita* rate would be \$44.43; 12,000 paid \$32,319 in Excise, the *per capita* would be \$2.70; total sum paid in Excise and Customs, \$553,762; hence total *per capita* of the population at that rate, \$47.13. Now, if Ontario with an estimated population of 2,000,000, paid an equal *per capita* sum in Customs and Excise into the Dominion Treasury, as British Columbia on the Blake basis, she would have paid \$94,260,000! I think if we had all that money in our Treasury, the genial face of the hon. the Minister of Finance would be lit up with unusual pleasure, and he would then have no difficulty in pushing on to completion all the great public works this country has ever dreamed of. Now, Sir, we will consider the cost of the Yale-Kamloops section of the Pacific Railway. I am not in possession of the statistics that were used by the hon. the Minister of Railways yesterday, and subsequently by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, but, knowing the country

through which this section of the Railway will pass, I estimate, that when completed, it will not cost this country over \$8,000,000. I have heard a gentleman, who is somewhat familiar with railways, state it would not cost over \$7,000,000. But I have added the \$1,000,000 named as contingencies to that sum, and fix the total cost of Yale-Kamloops branch at \$8,000,000. Sir, I wish to show to this House that if this Railway is constructed it will have been with British Columbia money, and not with Dominion money, except so far as our contributions to the Consolidated Fund belong to the Dominion. I wish to show that this Dominion, outside of British Columbia, will not be called upon to contribute to the construction of the Yale-Kamloops Section of the line, and that all we ask is the credit and management of the Dominion. I believe I can demonstrate this beyond controversy. I will read my statement :

STATEMENT showing annual cost to Canada for Interest on Capital invested in completion of Yale-Kamloops section of Pacific Railway. Also, Statement showing how Canada is repouped for Interest.

TOTAL COST.

1. Yale-Kamloops Lake Railway 127 miles	\$8,000,000
EXPENDITURE AND INTEREST, 1880 TO 1885.	
1880-1 Expenditure, \$1,000,000, at 4 per cent., 4 years	\$160,000
1881-2 Expenditure, \$1,500,000, at 4 per cent., 3 years	180,000
1882-3 Expenditure, \$1,500,000, at 4 per cent., 2 years	120,000
1883-4 Expenditure, \$2,000,000, at 4 per cent., 1 year	80,000
1884-5 Expenditure, \$2,000,000, at 4 per cent., to allow for interest on inter-yearly payments	80,000
Total Interest, June 30, 1885	\$620,000

EXCESS OF RECEIPTS AND SAVING TO CONSOLIDATED FUND.

1. Annual amount paid by British Columbia in Customs in excess of the proportionate contributions to the Consolidated Fund required of her on the basis of the annual average <i>per capita</i> Customs Tax of the Dominion, namely, \$346,443 in five years, from 1880 to 1885, (See previous statements)	\$1,732,215
2. British Columbia Loan Act, 1863, for £50,000 sterling, expires July, 1883, so there will be 10 per cent. Sinking Fund and	

MR. DECOSMOS.

Interest saved in 1883-4 and 1884-5	50,000
3. Vancouver Loan Act, 1862, for £40,000 sterling, expires in April, 1882, so there will be saved 10 per cent. for Interest and Sinking Fund for 1882-3, 1883-4 and 1884-5.	60,000
	<hr/>
Total Interest 4 years on Expenditure of \$8,000,000	\$1,842,215
	<hr/>
Total Excess paid by British Columbia after paying the interest on \$8,000,000, 4 years, on Yale-Kamloops Railway	\$1,222,215

I think, Sir, that I have now done what I promised. I have shown that when the Yale-Kamloops Branch shall have been completed, the total interest on the capital—8,000,000—invested in its construction and completion, namely, \$620,000, will be repaid by British Columbia; and that the total amount of receipts in excess of her *pro rata* contribution for Customs, to Consolidated Fund, and the Saving on Expiring Loans, will be, between 1880 and 1885, \$1,842,215, leaving a balance, in excess of the interest, in the Dominion Treasury of \$1,222,215. Now, Sir, it will be perceived that British Columbia has no desire to oppress any portion of the Dominion to construct the Pacific Railway from the Pacific to the Rocky Mountains. All she asks is for the Dominion to use her credit in raising the funds, and to exercise a wise and economical management in the construction of the Yale-Kamloops Railway. The total annual interest on its cost of construction, after completion, will be \$320,000, and, if the road were not to earn a sufficient surplus to meet the interest, the \$1,222,215 referred to will pay the whole for five years longer, when the increased contributions to the Dominion Treasury will continue to pay it and the interest on the extension easterly and westwardly. I regret that the hon. member for West Durham is not here, for I wish to refer to his remarks about the vast sums of money Ontario and Quebec contributed to this enterprise. But, Sir, no statistician, no actuary, could, by any possible means, discover the sum these two Provinces respectively paid into the Dominion Treasury, except as given in the Returns. The hon. gentleman gave us figures showing that the total charge against British

Columbia, from all sources in excess of Receipts, was some \$844,000 in eight years. But I have shown that, according to my way of treating that subject, which, I think, is the correct one, that we are not indebted in that sum, nor any sum, no matter how many similar statements my hon. friend may make. But I will assume, for argument sake, that British Columbia has received, in excess of what she paid into the Dominion Treasury, on the *pro rata* of the Dominion, \$840,000. Now, any statesman worthy of the name, looking upon that vast Province, only twenty years old, would have said: This total sum of \$840,000 at the end of eight years, will amount to \$33,600, a year at 4 per cent., and the present population of this Dominion will not suffer an iota; for it will be passed to Capital Account, and met by loans that will not be redeemed in this generation; and that, in a few years, Columbia will recoup the Dominion a thousand fold. I wish my hon. friend were present to hear these calculations, for they would, possibly, convince him of the error of his way in making this charge. If I were holding the important public position of my hon. friend, who aspires to control the Government of this country, instead of playing the rôle of a croaker, I would select a more dignified occupation. My policy would not be to croak against the Government that they went too fast, but I would say, you are not going fast enough. That would have been a worthy policy for a leader of the Opposition, if he wished to take a new departure and cast away the miserable traditions relating to this question. Then we would have had the leader of the Opposition vying with, and out-bidding for popular favour, the energetic Minister of Railways and the large minded leader of this Government—although I may differ with both of them occasionally, I am glad to concede their just merit—to show who could “best work and best degree,” and who could best promote the interests of the country, and force it ahead. Then we would not have heard so much about the United States; how progressive their people are, and how slow we are. The argument of the hon. gentleman is simply this: that the people of the United States are a progressive

people: that we rush there, but they do not rush here. And so we have this everlasting lowering cloud cast upon the country. I will not say that the hon. member for West Durham, and the hon. gentlemen who surround him, are unpatriotic. I never use the word disloyal without attaching some meaning to it. I have generally found, with respect to those people who are always prating about their loyalty, that, if you scratch a little beneath the skin, you will find very little loyalty. Our material interests modify our sentimental opinions, and when the two come into conflict, it is the opinions which give away. I do not like more lip-loyalty, either from the Government side or the Opposition side. I like that loyalty which upholds order, maintaining the laws of our country inviolate, and if ever we have to change our relationship with the Mother Country, we will do it in a constitutional way and not hypocritically. We have heard a great deal about the great milch-cow of Ontario. I have not yet completed my enquiries into the sum of money expended in Ontario, during 1878-79. But as far as I have gone, I believe that in 1878-79, Ontario received more from the Dominion Treasury than she paid in. The Customs, Excise and Stamps—the only taxes imposed—collected in Ontario in 1878-79 was in round numbers, \$8,460,000; and the expenditure for Salaries, Public Works, Interest, etc., \$8,560,000. Thus showing that the great milch-cow of Ontario has received dollar for dollar, and more than she contributed in taxes in that year. Of what then has she to complain? For what reason shall her public men attempt to dominate this Dominion, and insultingly tell smaller Provinces in the language of the late Government to Lord Carnarvon: “It is especially the duty of the smaller Provinces to defer somewhat to the opinions of the older and more populous Provinces from which the Revenue for building all such public works is derived?” The sooner the systematic delusion of Ontario, that she is the great milch-cow, is blown to the winds, the better. The two millions and a-half of Canadians outside her border will not submit to be treated as though they were objects of charity, and that by a Province that never had a surplus dollar in her Treasury, till after she had united with

them. I now propose, Sir, to speak about the Carnarvon Award. We have a Repudiation Resolution placed before this House, by the hon. member for West Durham. He proposes to repudiate a solemn obligation. He proposes to repudiate the Railway clause of the Terms of Union, and also the Carnarvon Award, made in 1874, and accepted with thanks by the Government led by the hon. member for Lambton. The hon. member for West Durham appears on the Parliamentary stage this Session in two very distinct parts: one, as Award-preserver; the other as Award-breaker. Hon. gentlemen, Sir, will recollect that the hon. member for Algoma moved for a Committee to enquire into all matters connected with the disputed boundary of Ontario. On that occasion the hon. member for West Durham, supported by the hon. members for Bothwell, Elgin, and Lambton, opposed the motion, denouncing it as an attempt to violate a solemn Convention, as the entering wedge to break the Ontario Boundary Award, and concluded his speech by impressing the House with the necessity of maintaining the Boundary Award intact, as it was "infinitely more important in its moral than in its material aspect," that faith should be kept with Ontario in that matter. So full of saintly fervour did the hon. gentleman appear, so exercised seemed his righteous soul over the possibility of disturbing the Ontario Boundary Award by granting a Committee of Enquiry, that he reminded me of Milton's invocation of the Muse:

"What in me is dark
Illumine; what is low, raise and support,
That to the height of this great argument
I may assert eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men."

The House, however, decreed that the motion should be carried; so all the mental agony of the hon. member for West Durham, excited by a majority of this House who were so lost to the same high sense of pure international morality as that which swelled his patriotic bosom, seemed wasted till the echoes of his pathetic appeal were caught up by the *Globe* and spread far and wide throughout the land. The hon. gentleman, however, has now appeared in the part of Award-breaker. He seems to have forgotten the pure doctrines of international mor-

ality that he, with the assistance of his hon. friends from Bothwell and Lambton, had applied to the Ontario Boundary Award. When he applied those doctrines, no doubt the motion of the hon. member for Algoma made him feel sick: the possibility of losing 120,000 square miles of territory awarded to Ontario, that Judge Armour and Judge Ramsay, counsel employed by the late Dominion Government, testified recently that Ontario was not entitled to, was indeed a heavy prospective blow to Ontarian supremacy. That may partially account for the high moral stand taken by the hon. member for West Durham on the Ontario Boundary Award—an Award that, by his own admission, required a Statute to make it valid and binding. Now, however, when the Government proposes to keep faith with British Columbia, to abide by the Carnarvon Award, to vote \$1,000,000 for Railway construction, the hon. member for West Durham comes forward to break, to repudiate the Carnarvon Award that the late Government accepted as a settlement, and told Lord Carnarvon that it was not contrary to any Resolution of Parliament or Statutory enactment, and consequently held to be valid. He quotes no high and pure principles of international morals and applies them to the Carnarvon Award to account for his change in opinion in a few weeks with respect to International Awards, or to justify his course; but he manifests, by the production of his Resolution to postpone Railway construction, such a remarkable change in his code of inter-state morals as can only be explained by himself, and then the public may decide whether his international morality is or is not "false and hollow." The parts taken by the hon. gentleman, respecting the Ontario Boundary Award and the Carnarvon Award remind me somewhat of another great Reformer referred to in the couplet of Rabelais:

"The Devil was sick, the Devil a saint
would be;
"The Devil was well, the Devil a saint
was he."

Before I conclude this branch of my subject, Sir, I desire to draw still further the attention of this House to the opinions entertained by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and outside of it, when the Terms of Union, in 1871, were

under discussion in Parliament and before the country; and, also, to the speeches made by the hon. members for Bothwell, West Durham and Lambton, this Session, respecting the Ontario Boundary Award, and to a comparison of their utterances on that occasion with the course they are now pursuing in endeavouring to repudiate the Carnarvon Award as well as the Railway clause of the Terms of Union. I will first direct attention to the Railway clause of the Terms of Union. It is as follows:

“The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously, within two years from the date of Union, of the construction of a railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocky Mountains towards the Pacific to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the Railway system of Canada, and further to secure the completion of such Railway within ten years from the date of Union.”

The first interpretation of that document, I find, is given by Lord Lisgar, on February 1st, 1871, when he said:

“The Terms of Union are in the nature of a Treaty.”

I will give you the opinion of another Governor, Hon. Mr. Letellier, who in a speech in the Senate, on the British Columbia question, said:

“The Resolutions respecting the Union of all British America were first brought up in the Legislative Council of Canada by the late Sir Etienne Taché, and I cannot understand why there should be any difficulty now in discussing a question of the same nature though of far less magnitude. Those Resolutions were a sort of treaty between the Provinces; the Resolutions in question will also be a quasi-treaty between Canada and British Columbia.”

These are the opinions of two distinguished public men; and both unite in holding that the Terms of Union were in the nature of a Treaty. But it remained for two other distinguished lights of Parliament to explain the binding force of that Treaty: they were the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir A. J. Smith). I find that the hon. member for West Durham on that occasion used this language:

“Were not hon. members justified then in asking for further information before taking this irrevocable step. If this measure should become law, the faith of the Dominion would be plighted, and without the consent of British

Columbia could never break one jot or tittle (of) these cast-iron obligations.”

Now, notwithstanding the fact, that the hon. member for West Durham made this statement on the floor of this House, in 1871, that hon. gentleman produced a Resolution here to-day, asking for the postponement of the construction of the Yale-Kamloops Section of the Railway in the Province of British Columbia. He stated, in 1871, that the Terms of Union could not be broken “without the consent of British Columbia;” and yet without her consent he attempts to break them, to repudiate the Railway clause by refusing to sanction the vote asked by the Government. The next great authority on this matter is the hon. member for Westmoreland. That hon. gentleman is reported to have said, in 1871:

“The faith of the country was pledged by the Resolution to complete the Railway within ten years no matter if the result should be ruin. No verbal reservations could have effect; the written record alone could hold, and the words of the Resolution were clear, and if in two years the Railway was not commenced British Columbia could appeal to the Imperial Government.”

The understanding of the hon. member for Westmoreland was then that this Treaty was a binding obligation on this Dominion; yet strange as it must now appear, the hon. member for Westmoreland was the gentleman who seconded to-day the Resolution of the hon. member for West Durham repudiating it. We have in these extracts the opinions given, nine years ago, by the hon. members for West Durham and Westmoreland as to the binding force of the Treaty of Union; and we have the unexampled spectacle, to-day—after seven years continuous violation of the Terms of Union, including five years' administration of the Government they supported, and of which they had been members—of the self-same hon. gentlemen shamelessly moving and seconding a resolution to continue to violate that solemn and binding obligation. I wish now to draw the attention of the House to the utterances of the hon. member for Bothwell, on the question of the Ontario Boundary Award raised by my hon. friend from Algoma, this Session, and apply the principles he has expressed to the course the hon. gentleman and other members of the Opposition are now pursuing in respect to the Carnarvon

Award. He said, on page 64 of the *Hansard*, this year :

"I am opposed to the Committee for which the hon. gentleman asks in his motion. I think, Sir, that the Parliament of Canada, or at all events, the Government of Canada, are in honour and in good faith bound by the Award of the Arbitrators appointed to decide this question of boundary.

Now, Sir, I maintain that, if the language used here is correct, as regards the Ontario Boundary Award, it is still more correct in regard to an obligation, in regard to the Terms of Union for which we have the sanction of an Imperial Statute, and the sanction of the Parliament of this country; and that if "the Government of Canada are in honour and good faith" bound by the Boundary Award, it is undoubtedly more closely bound by the Carnarvon Award which it had accepted. He further says, on page 66 of *Hansard* :

"For this House to grant a Committee of Enquiry, for the purpose of attacking the Award of the Arbitrators in this matter, instead of confirming it, would be acting just as our southern neighbours would have done, had they refused to abide by the Halifax Award. It would be just as flagrant a breach of good faith as if Great Britain had refused to pay the money awarded by the Geneva Arbitration. The Government of Canada is continuous. Its obligations are not ended by a change of Ministry, and Ministers are solemnly bound by any action of a previous Government.

"Would it be proper for Mr. Hayes, at Washington, to ignore the Halifax Commission as an obligation undertaken by his predecessor, Mr. Grant? Would that be a right and proper mode of proceeding? And yet that might as well be done as to repudiate the Award of these Arbitrators.

"The gentlemen composing the Board of Arbitrators had a full opportunity of considering the case, and they gave it their fullest consideration."

Allow me to tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that we have, in these utterances of the hon. member for Bothwell, a statement of principles to the effect, when applied, that we would be guilty of a breach of International Law by not carrying out the Treaty of 1871 with British Columbia, and the Carnarvon Award made and accepted by the Government of which he was a member. Notwithstanding this, we have had an ex-Minister of Justice placing before this House a Repudiation Resolution. The hon. member for Bothwell complained that the appointment of the Boundary Committee was to break the Award, when no such object was

ever expressed, so far as I know. But the vote before the House, that is intended to fulfil the conditions of the Carnarvon Award, in some small measure, he and his hon. friends opposite unitedly propose to reject. They want the Ontario Boundary Award to be recognised, whilst they repudiate the Carnarvon Award. The hon. gentleman says it would have been "a flagrant breach of faith" if Great Britain had not paid the Geneva Award. Then why is it not "a flagrant breach of faith" not to pay the Carnarvon Award? The principle is the same. He says: "The Ministers are solemnly bound by any action of a previous Government." Then why did the Government of which he was a member not carry out the Railway clause of the Terms of Union, if the obligations of a Government are not ended by a change of Ministry? If the obligations of a previous Government are not ended by a change of Ministry, why is the hon. member for West Durham, and the entire Opposition, trying to prevent the present Government from carrying out the Carnarvon Award that was made and accepted by the Government of their predecessors, of which the hon. member from Bothwell was a leading member? He says, that the Ontario Boundary Arbitrators gave the question their fullest consideration. So did the late Government the Carnarvon Award. Yet the hon. gentleman and his friends propose to reject that Award, if possible. Mr. Mills adds :

"To sanction the appointment of this Committee to seek to set aside the Award of these gentlemen, would be as great a wrong, as gross a breach of faith, as if one Administration of this country were to repudiate the public debt incurred by another Administration, or do anything which, in the public estimation, it is derogatory for a Government to do.

"I think this House ought not to grant this Committee; such a Committee cannot, without dishonour and bad faith, be appointed."

Now, what has been the whole course of the hon. member for West Durham? It has been, ever since 1873, an attempt to relax and repudiate the original Terms of Union. It is now to defeat, if possible, the attempt of this Government to fulfil the conditions of the Carnarvon Award. If it would be "a great wrong," "a gross breach of faith," to repudiate the act of a

former Government, what is the motion of the hon. member for West Durham to stop Railway construction in British Columbia, but an attempt to commit "a great wrong" and "a gross breach of faith." If the appointment of a Committee to enquire into a matter of which nearly the entire House is ignorant, cannot be made "without dishonour and bad faith," how can hon. gentlemen opposite free themselves from the charge of "dishonour and bad faith," when they attempt to repudiate the conditions of the Carnarvon Award, of which no hon. member is ignorant? Mr. Mills goes beyond this, and says:

"If the Government think that the Arbitrators were bribed, or that they were wholly incompetent men, then they ought to assume the responsibility of opening up the question, only with the consent of the other party,—and by obtaining information through the proper channels, instead of appointing a Committee,—a course which can lead to nothing but delay in the confirmation of the Award."

I am willing to concede the right of asking for a relaxation of the Terms of Union. The mission of Mr. Edgar for that purpose, however, as is well known, failed. What attempt has been made to get the consent of British Columbia to the Resolution of the hon. member for West Durham? None. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not propose to ask any relaxation. They will not even recognise the relaxation of the Carnarvon Award, that extended the time from 1881 to 1890 to complete the Railway from the Pacific Ocean to Lake Superior only. They propose to repudiate all railway obligations to British Columbia. That Province surrendered certain rights and revenues to the custody of the Dominion, and has fulfilled all her obligations, and expects the Dominion to perform her obligations. But hon. gentlemen opposite want to hold the surrendered rights and revenues, and repudiate the obligations they incurred. It is quite natural then for us to state that we have not, as a Province, violated our obligations; and it is also quite natural that we should exact from the Government a fulfilment of theirs; and if they are unprepared to fulfil their obligations, let them aid the Province in separating from the Union. the whole of British North America is

not yet consolidated. There is an outlying Province, Newfoundland, that is not within the Confederation: and how can we expect the Province of Newfoundland to enter a Dominion that has violated its solemn pledges over and over again. The bad faith of hon. gentlemen opposite tends to destroy all hope of the complete consolidation of British America. I will next take the utterances respecting the Boundary Award of the hon. gentleman who proposed the repudiation Resolution to-day. On page 72 of *Hansard*, this year, that hon. gentleman stated:

"A very great responsibility is assumed by that country, whatever its rank in the scale of nations, which declares it will not be bound by the results of a solemn convention.

"I esteem this in the same light as a convention between two different countries; for, as between Canada and Ontario, they are separate and distinct in this matter."

Now, Sir, if a very grave responsibility is assumed by a country that declares that it will not be bound by a solemn Convention, is there not a very grave responsibility assumed by the hon. member for West Durham, when he declares by his Resolution that Railway construction in British Columbia ought to be postponed? And if he could carry his Resolution, would he not force Canada to assume a very grave responsibility by declaring that she would not carry out the Carnarvon Award? He says that the relationship of Canada to Ontario is that of two different countries, so far as respects the Boundary Award. If that be true, Canada and Columbia are two different countries so far as the Terms of Union and the Carnarvon Award are concerned. And yet the hon. gentleman shows no hesitation in attempting to break that solemn Convention. If his position be correct respecting the Boundary Award, the stand that he has taken to-day in moving a Repudiation Resolution is totally indefensible, as it is calculated to cover this country with the infamy of attempting to break faith with one of the Provinces of this Confederation. Referring to the power of an Act of Parliament, to decide questions of boundary, Mr. Blake continued:

"But while that power exists, the question of international morality subsists also, and

what we have to consider is whether a case is here made out clearly sufficient to justify the procedure suggested to-day, based as that procedure is on a disregard of the Award as a cogent instrument.

"Now the first proposition I shall advance is that, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) well observed, there is a continuity in government.

"I say this question rests, with respect to the Government of the day, just in the same position as if the Government of the day had been responsible for the original commission. No hon. gentleman opposite can say that the present Government, or any of its supporters, are any the less bound than was the Government of my hon. friend from Lambton in reference to the issue of this commission and its consequences."

These are the utterances of the hon. gentleman who declared to-day, that he would not be bound by those solemn obligations to British Columbia. It will be observed that the hon. member for West Durham, in opposing the motion of the hon. gentleman for Algoma for a Committee to enquire into all matters respecting the Boundary of Ontario, said that there was "a question of international morality" to be considered. But, Sir, he has not questioned "international morality" in connection with his present motion. He assumes that the mere granting a Committee to enquire into matters connected with the Ontario Boundary raises "a question of international morality"; but he boldly undertakes to break faith with British Columbia, without ever touching on the moral aspect of the question. I take it, Sir, to be the duty of every hon. gentleman in this House to do all in his power to cause the Provinces to love each other, assist each other, and work together for the common good of our common country. But the course of the hon. gentleman is the very reverse. It is to induce the Provinces to hate each other. He says that the present Government is no less bound than the Government of the hon. member for Lambton for the issue of the Boundary Commission and its consequences. On the same principle the present Government is bound by the Carnarvon Award and its consequences; and yet the hon. gentleman repudiates the latter, and upholds the former. It is lamentable to see a public man occupying the position of the hon. gentleman reduced to so pitiable a condition. He also stated:

"My second proposition is that if it be

MR. DE COSMOS.

proposed not to ratify the Award, but to open the question again, and throw that instrument aside, such a proposal as that should be made upon the responsibility of the Government of the day, and with all the gravity which such a course of action demands."

Now, Sir, if this doctrine be true, the hon. gentleman, instead of moving a Repudiation Resolution, ought to have urged the Government to re-open the question of the construction of the Pacific Railway with British Columbia, and ought to have moved, "with all the gravity such a course of action demands." But the course adopted by the hon. gentleman is not statesmanlike; it is simply that of a man who has no regard for the undoubted rights of others. Why did not the hon. gentleman, when he was in the Government, endeavour to secure such modifications of the Carnarvon Award as would have satisfied both parties to the Award? All he did was to offer \$750,000 as compensation for all future delays that might take place respecting the construction of the Railway in British Columbia. That was very properly rejected; and there the hon. gentleman left the subject, till he came forward to repudiate entirely the work of construction. If any one, after this, can see anything statesmanlike, any capacity, in the hon. gentleman to keep the Provinces of this Confederacy together, they have better discernment than I possess. The hon. gentleman stated further:

"What a novel and entirely indefensible proposal it is, that a private member should take charge of this great material and moral question—moral as to whether a national award should be set aside, and material as to the extensive territory involved.

"It is the bounden duty of the Government itself, if disposed, to take steps, which in its opinion, the interest of the country requires—steps tending to the disturbance and upsetting of this Award,—so to state, frankly, itself, to propose those steps on its own responsibility, and justify its course."

The hon. member for West Durham here holds that it is a novel and entirely indefensible proposal that a private member should take charge of the great material and moral question of the Boundary Award; and yet, Sir, he, as a private member, comes forward to nullify the Carnarvon Award. To call such a course inconsistency would be to apply a mild term, for what in plain Saxon must be designated as a deliberate attempt to

commit a breach of public faith. I beg now to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at

Twenty minutes after

Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 19th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STAMPS ON NOTES AND BILLS AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)

FIRST READING.

MR. COCKBURN (West Northumberland), in introducing a Bill (No. 104) To amend the Statute of 41 Victoria, Chapter 17, relating to Stamps on Notes and Bills, said: I regret to see that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue is not in his place, as I had conferred with him on the subject of this Bill. A doubt has arisen as to the true construction to be put on the word "cheque" amongst the exemptions in the Act of last Session, and some banks treat all demand drafts as being, equally with cheques, free from the operation of the Stamp Act. The consequence is that, if it was intended by the Act of last Session that demand drafts should not be exempt, there is, in fact, a very large loss of revenue. [The hon. gentleman here read, with the permission of the House, a few lines from the Manager of the Bank of Montreal, pointing to the doubt, and to the difference in the practice of different banks.] He then proceeded: Now, Sir, it is to remove this doubt, and to provide either that all demand drafts drawn by one private person on another private person shall be clearly made subject to duty, or that they shall be as clearly exempted, that I desire to introduce this Bill. I would propose that the Bill be read a first time, and, if the Government should decide that the Act of last Session already covers the ground, a declaration to the effect that demand drafts, not being cheques on banks, should be subject to duty, may be considered sufficient. I, therefore, move the first reading of the Bill.

Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion (Sir Samuel L. Tilley): That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and on the proposed motion (Mr. Blake) in amendment thereto.

MR. DECOSMOS: In resuming the debate gave a brief summary of the previous part of his speech, and concluded by saying: I do not believe it is desirable to do so at any length, as I shall take occasion, I hope, in another way to bring all the facts and conclusions that I then presented to this House, before the members of this Parliament and the country. We come, again, sir, to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), he who sets himself up more than anybody in this House, or in this Dominion, as the pink of morality, as the pink of all that is great, as an example to the people of this country. That hon. gentleman said on the occasion of the Ontario Boundary debate:—

"But my main proposition is, that the responsibility properly devolves on the Government of dealing with the question which, as a resident of and member from the Province of Ontario, I do not hesitate to declare I regard as infinitely more important in its moral than in its material aspect."

Sir, the man who could regard the Ontario Boundary Award as infinitely more important in its moral than in its material aspects, comes to this House and repudiates not only the Carnarvon Award but the Statute. The hon. the leader of the Opposition stated, through Lord Dufferin, that the Award was accepted—that it was not contrary to any Resolution of Parliament or any Statute, and that the Terms of the Award would be fulfilled; but we find his hon. colleague prepared to vote for the violation of that solemn compact. On the same occasion to which I have referred, the hon. member for Lambton said:

"I have no objection whatever to the hon. gentleman using his power in this House to set aside the legislation of the last Government if he thinks it wrong; but I fear if he were living in another country, he would find some difficulty in setting aside solemn treaties that have been entered upon: such as the Treaty for the settlement of the San Juan question.

"If the decision on that occasion of the Emperor William were to be set aside, it would be as justifiable from an international point of view as the setting aside of the Award in the present case.

“The hon. gentleman would have no more right to set aside the Award than he would have to set aside the Treaty of Washington.”

These are the hon. gentleman's views who proposes to vote now with the hon. member for West Durham. He said in 1874 that the Carnarvon Award should not be broken, but he now wishes to repudiate the obligations made by himself with British Columbia. As it is not my intention to occupy the House long, I will quote from an authority which the other side of the House regard with reverence. On February 20th the *Globe* said this:

“It is bad enough for a Premier, who has not the moral courage to oppose something he does not want carried out, to shirk his responsibility and take shelter behind a Parliamentary Committee, but it is infinitely worse for him to be the means of making one of the parties to a solemn arbitration break faith with the other after an Award has been made. It is vain to say that the Dominion Government is not bound by the decision of the Arbitrators. If one Administration is not under obligation to carry out the engagements of its predecessor, what is the good faith of the country worth? As Mr. Blake put it in his speech, the moral considerations are in this instance far more important than the material interests at stake, though these are so considerable that we venture to predict a long and obstinate struggle before Ontario surrenders her present vantageground.”

Here we have the *Globe* and the three great lights of the Opposition, the hon. members for West Durham, Bothwell and Lambton, denouncing anything like breaking up of the Boundary Award and yet each of them is now prepared to vote against the Government of Canada attempting to keep faith with the Province of British Columbia, in the fulfilment of the Carnarvon Award. I have another extract to read, which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will listen to. This is also from the *Globe*, of February 23rd:

“What is thought of a private man who refuses to accept the award of impartial arbitrators on his case? What was thought by the whole world of the United States journals that invited their Government to disregard the decision of the Halifax Commission? The mere objections of Secretary Everts were held by the nations to have disgraced our neighbours in some degree. What if their Government had refused to pay the \$5,500,000, and had constituted a Committee of Congress to take the evidence over again and decide what should be done? What if the Cabinet of Mr. Hayes had refused to ratify the Award because the Halifax Commission had been determined on by their predecessors in office? But it may be said that an arbitration between independent nations is quite different from one between a

federation and one of its parts, in a much as war might be the result of bad faith in the former case. We hold that a disregard of obligation is rendered more disgraceful by the plea that it can be indulged in with safety. The stability of the Confederation depends on the general confidence of the Provinces in the central Government, and hereafter it will be impossible to respect the Administration at Ottawa while conducted by the leaders of the Tory party.”

If the *Globe's* assertions be correct, that “a disregard of obligation is rendered more disgraceful by the plea that it can be indulged in with safety,” then we must assume that the proposal of the hon. member for West Durham and his friends, to disregard the Carnarvon Award, is “disgraceful” indeed. I now come to the denunciations of a number of the members for Ontario in that journal, of which the following is a specimen:—

“The names of the Ontario members who voted for the national dishonour and feared to stand up for the just Award to their Province, are worthy of record. Let the electors of Ontario note the following list of men, who have at once been traitors to Canada and to their own constituents:

J. B. ROBINSON.	JOHN MCLENNAN.
R. HAY.	GEO. JACKSON.
S. PLATT.	T. S. SPROULE.
JOHN MCRRORY.	WM. MCDUGALL.
S. J. LAWSON.	F. E. KILVERT.
WM. FITZSIMMONS.	THOS. ROBERTSON.
ALEX. SHAW.	JOHN WHITE.
THOMAS WHITE.	MACKENZIE BOWELL.
JOHN ROCHESTER.	T. FARROW.
DARBY BERGIN.	E. STEPHENSON.
J. S. ROSS.	J. G. HAGGART.
A. T. H. WILLIAMS.	C. F. FERGUSON.
THOMAS ARKELL.	ED. HOOPER.
J. A. KIRKPATRICK.	J. C. RYKERT.
D. MACMILLAN.	T. COUGHLIN.
J. B. PLUMB.	W. WALLACE.
JOS. KEELER.	J. M. CURRIER.
S. R. HESSON.	J. TASSÉ.
G. HILLIARD.	J. BURNHAM.
F. ROUTHIER.	J. S. MCQUAIG.
PETER WHITE.	DALTON M'CARTEY.
W. C. LITTLE.	O. FULTON.
A. MCQUADE.	HECTOR CAMERON.
H. KRANZ.	S. MERNER.
G. A. DREW.	A. BOUTBEE.
	SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

This is what we find the hon. gentlemen opposite to have said and done through their organ the *Globe*. The very reverse they propose to do with respect to British Columbia, the only Province in the Dominion which has paid a larger sum into the Treasury than of right she should have paid. If Ontario members voted for the “national dishonour” when they simply voted for a Committee

to enquire into all matters connected with the Ontario Boundary, and if they were "traitors to Canada and their own constituents," will not hon. gentlemen oppose vote "for the national dishonour," and prove "traitors to Canada and their constituents," when they vote for the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham to break the Carnarvon Award? But I will now read some passages from a writer on International Law, for the benefit of the member for West Durham, who presents himself here in the character of an international law-breaker, whose moral instincts are so readily touched when anything concerns Ontario, but who is deaf and insensible when British Columbia is concerned, and when she asks for justice. I will read some passages from Vattel, a standard authority on International Law, as Blackstone is on Common Law, and Adam Smith on Political Economy:

"It is a settled point in natural law, that he who has made a promise to any one has conferred upon him a real right to require the thing promised,—and, consequently, that the breach of a perfect promise is a violation of another person's right, and as evidently an act of injustice as it would be to rob a man of his property. The tranquility, the happiness, the security of the human race, wholly depend on justice,—on the obligation of paying a regard to the rights of others. The respect which others pay to our rights of domain and property constitutes the security of our actual possessions; the faith of promises is our security for things that cannot be delivered or executed upon the spot. There would no longer be any security, no longer any commerce between mankind, if they did not think themselves obliged to keep faith with each other, and to perform their promises. This obligation is, then, as necessary as it is natural and indubitable, between nations that live together in a state of nature, and acknowledge no superior upon earth, to maintain order and peace in their society. Nations, therefore, and their conductors, ought inviolably to observe their promises and their treaties. This great truth, though too often neglected in practice, is generally acknowledged by all nations: the reproach of perfidy is esteemed by sovereigns a most atrocious affront; yet he who does not observe a treaty is certainly perfidious, since he violates his faith. On the contrary, nothing adds so great a glory to a prince, and to the nation he governs, as the reputation of an inviolable fidelity in the performance of promises. By such honourable conduct, as much and even more than by her valour, the Swiss nation has rendered herself respectable throughout Europe, and is deservedly courted by the greatest monarchs who entrust their personal safety to a body-guard of her citizens. The Parliament of England has more than once thanked the king

for his fidelity and zeal in succouring the allies of his crown. This national magnanimity is the source of immortal glory; it presents a firm basis on which nations may build their confidence, and thus it becomes an unfailing source of power and splendour.

"As the engagements of a Treaty imposed on the one hand a perfect obligation, they produce on the other a perfect right. The breach of a Treaty is therefore a violation of the perfect right of the party with whom we have contracted; and this is an act of injustice against him."

It remains, then, for history to state, that the member for West Durham bargained with his colleagues and the leader of his Government to violate the Treaty and compact with British Columbia—the bargain between her, Canada and England, which every honourable Province and honourable man would say was a binding obligation—and that he would only enter the Ministry on condition it should be broken; and yet we have had, this Session, the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that no Treaty can be broken except with the consent of both parties to it. I will read this passage on the subject:

"Who can doubt that Treaties are in the number of those things that are to be held sacred by nations? By treaties the most important affairs are determined; by them the pretensions of sovereigns are regulated; on them nations are to depend for the acknowledgment of their rights, and the security of their dearest interests. Between bodies politic,—between sovereigns who acknowledge no superior on earth, treaties are the only means of adjusting their various pretensions,—of establishing fixed rules of conduct,—of ascertaining what they are entitled to expect, and what they have to depend on. But treaties are no better than empty words, if nations do not consider them as respectable engagements,—as rules which are to be inviolably observed by sovereigns, and held sacred throughout the whole earth.

"The faith of treaties, that firm and sincere resolution, that invariable constancy in fulfilling our engagements,—of which we make profession in a treaty, is therefore to be held sacred and inviolable between the nations of the earth, whose safety and repose is secured: and, if mankind be not wilfully deficient in their duty to themselves, infamy must ever be the portion of him who violates his faith.

"He who violates his treaties, violates at the same time the law of nations: for, he disregards the faith of treaties,—that faith which the law of nations declares sacred; and, so far as depends on him, he renders it vain and ineffectual. Doubly guilty, he does an injury to his ally, he does an injury to all nations, and inflicts a wound on the great society of mankind. "On the observance and execution of treaties," said a respectable sovereign, "depends all the security which princes

and states have with respect to each other: and no dependence could henceforth be placed in future conventions if the existing ones were not to be observed."

"As all nations are interested in maintaining the faith of treaties, and causing it to be everywhere considered as sacred and inviolable, so likewise they are justifiable in forming a confederacy for the purpose of repressing him who testifies a disregard for it—who openly sports with it—who violates and tramples it under foot. Such a man is a public enemy who saps the foundations of the peace and common safety of nations. But we should be careful not to extend this maxim to the prejudice of that liberty and independence to which every nation has a claim. When a sovereign breaks his treaties, or refuses to fulfil them, this does not immediately imply that he considers them as empty names, and that he disregards the faith of treaties; he may have good reasons for thinking himself liberated from his engagements; and other sovereigns have not a right to judge him. It is the sovereign who violates his engagements on pretences that are evidently frivolous, or who does not even think it worth his while to allege any pretence whatever, to give a colourable gloss to his conduct, and cast a veil over his want of faith—it is such a sovereign who deserves to be treated as an enemy to the human race."

The hon. member for West Durham proposes delay, and every hon. member can perceive that his conclusions are at variance with his statements and promises. But he is the man of subterfuges and flimsy reasons, in order that the Treaty with British Columbia may not be carried out. Vattel, page 234, speaking of subterfuges says:

"His Catholic Majesty, Ferdinand, having concluded a treaty with the Archduke, his son-in-law, thought he could evade it by privately protesting against the treaty: a puerile finesse! which without giving any right to that prince, only exposed his weakness and duplicity."

Now, what applies to Ferdinand will apply to hon. gentlemen opposite. This resolution has only again exposed their weakness and their duplicity. I quote again from Vattel on Treaties, page 450, and I ask the House to observe its applicability to the course of the hon. member for West Durham. As is well known, the hon. gentleman has ever been in favour of delays in connection with the fulfilment of Canada's obligations to British Columbia. Now, what does this great writer on International Law say about delays? He says:

"Studied delays are equivalent to an express denial, and differ from it only by the artifice with which he who practices them seeks to palliate his want of faith: he adds fraud to

perfidy, and actually violates the article which he should fulfil."

Sir, I am astonished that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House can support so perfidious a resolution as that of the hon. member for West Durham. I am astonished that the hon. gentleman himself should wish to cover his country with such infamy, as must cover every state that breaks its treaties. If war be the sum of villainies, the breaking of treaties must be the sum of infamies. My hon. friend, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, stated the other night that the Union of the four Provinces was based upon the construction of a Railway connecting the Eastern with the Western Provinces. Without the Intercolonial Railway there could have been and would have been no real Union. Now, suppose that after that Union had been proclaimed, after the Federal Government had been organised, and the several Provinces had begun to pay their money into the Federal Treasury, that the Dominion had refused to construct that road, would not every man from those Eastern Provinces have denounced the Federal Government for its perfidy? But, when such a course is actually proposed to be pursued towards British Columbia, many hon. gentlemen seem not to understand that equal perfidy is involved in the proposition to break faith with British Columbia. Now, we will take the Carnarvon Award. The leader of the Opposition, while head of the late Government, and Lord Dufferin, concurred in accepting the Award, and thanking Lord Carnarvon for what he had done. And they added this: We accept this for a present settlement, as it is not at variance with any statute. We accept it because it is not at variance with any Resolution of Parliament. What duplicity on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, who deliberately, down to the present hour, are still prepared to implement that Award by supporting a proposition to ignore it. The hon. the Minister of Railways has brought under the notice of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the late Premier did not propose to build the Emory-Savona section of the Pacific Railway, although he put this country to an expense of thousands of dollars in moving rails. What greater infamy can we conceive of if this

charge be true? When knowingly and deliberately using the public money of Canada for a mere partisan purpose, he wasted \$32,000 to make the people of British Columbia believe that the Government intended to build the road, whilst in fact they did not intend to do so.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I made a mistake in the amount; it was over \$34,000.

MR. DE COSMOS: I thank the hon. gentleman for his correction. I think it will also be found that the late Government, in order to provide themselves with a means of escape, did not pass any Order in Council calling for tenders. I believe the call for tenders was put into the papers, and no Order in Council, authorizing the call, was ever passed. In 1871 the Government of Canada, with a full sense of their obligations, made a Treaty with British Columbia. The obligations of that Treaty put a first lien upon this Dominion after the charges upon the public debt and the ordinary and current expenditure for government. Under that Treaty the Railway was to be commenced simultaneously on the Pacific coast and at some point east of the Rocky Mountains. Fifteen million dollars have already been expended by the late Government in the work of construction, and not a single dollar has been spent in British Columbia in the work of construction. Is it not right that the Parliament now, at the end of seven years, from the time fixed for its commencement, should fill, in a small measure, the obligations assumed in 1871? Again, about \$15,000,000 has been expended on the canal system since 1873. We find the system of canals between Lake Huron and Montreal have cost over \$15,000,000, and the interest that is being paid, at the rate of 5 per cent., amounts to \$750,000 more per annum. If this Government had wished to have kept faith with the people of British Columbia, it would not have entered so readily into the enlargement of canals, because the obligations to British Columbia was a prior lien on this Dominion.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. DE COSMOS: More than that! We find that they have relieved the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec of some \$600,000 or \$700,000 a year interest, or nearly \$11,000,000 in capital. Making a total expenditure of principal and interest of about \$50,000,000 in nine years, con-

trary to the spirit and letter of the compact with British Columbia. I take it that anyone to whom this matter may be referred will see that the first duty of the Dominion was to fulfil its obligation with British Columbia, but we hear nothing of that in the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. I desire now to allude to the address of my hon. friend the hon. member for Yale, when the reply to the Speech from the Throne was before the House. The hon. gentleman stated that I took ground in my speech on that occasion against the route of the railway selected by the government. The very contrary: I expressed myself as follows on this point: "I am glad that the government has at last decided upon a route on the West Coast." He, also, stated that I represented the people as being dissatisfied with the route selected. Now, I made no such statement,—as will be seen on reference to the *Hansard*. He questioned my remarks with relation to "the fertile district of Kamloops," referred to in the Speech. Now with the object of placing myself right on that subject, and correcting the error into which the hon. member has fallen, I have prepared some statistics on Kamloops district and the neighboring districts, which I will ask the House to allow me to place among other reports of my utterances on this occasion. These statistics will show the extent approximately of Kamloops and contiguous districts, from which the section of railway, now under contract, will get its business. The total area in square miles and acreage in Yale Commons district, exclusive of Kootenay, is:

	Square miles.	Acres.
Yale and Hope districts...	3,300	2,112,000
Lytton	2,200	1,518,000
Cache Creek	1,200	768,000
Kamloops	4,500	2,880,000
Nicola	3,600	2,304,000
Okanagan	2,700	1,723,000
Rock Creek	2,325	1,488,000
	19,825	12,798,000

Containing in 1879 the following polling districts, voters and farmers:—

	Voters.	Farm's.
Yale and Hope polling district...	67	13
Lytton district	51	23
Cache Creek	56	26
Kamloops	126	58
Nicola	67	54
Okanagan	70	63
Rock Creek	15	2
	452	239

In all the sub-districts, giving the 239 farmers 320 acres each, the total acreage of the farms would be 66,480 acres; while in the ten settlements in the Kamloops district the 58 farmers at 320 acres each, the total acreage would be only 18,560 acres. North of Yale district is Lilloet district (a sub-district of Cariboo Commons district), the total area of which is 18,000 square miles, or a total acreage of 11,520,000 acres. The total acreage in occupation is: 83 farmers, at 320 acres each, 26,000 acres, the total voters being 108. In 1874 the list of voters stood:

	Total Voters.	Farmers.	Stock-raisers.
Yale and Hope.....	54	12	Nil.
Lytton.....	30	10	"
Nicola.....	43	40	"
Okanagan.....	58	9	"
Kamloops.....	87	36	6
Cache Creek.....	37	17	Nil.

The total lands taken up in 1878 in Kamloops was 8,160 acres, in quantities from 36 to 640 acres. The following statement will show the increase of farmers in the above districts during the period between 1874 and 1878:—

	1874	1878	Increase.
Hope and Yale, farmers ...	12	13	1
Lytton, " ..	10	23	13
Cache Creek, " ..	17	26	9
Kamloops, " ..	36	50	14
Okanagan, " ..	9	61	52
Nicola, " ..	40	54	14

The following is a summary of the Yale and Lilloet districts:

Yale, total square miles.....	19,825
Lilloet, " "	18,000
Total	37,825
Yale, total acres.....	12,798,000
Lilloet, " "	11,520,000
Total acreage.....	24,318,000
Total voters, Yale.....	452
" " Lilloet	108
Total voters.....	550
Total farmers, Yale.....	239
" " Lilloet	83
Total farmers.....	322

I will not on this occasion enter upon an estimate of the amount of business that the railway may transact with these districts—as way traffic. I will say this, that with respect to the railway that is proposed to be built by the Government, that whilst I do not believe that the Fraser is the best route for our trans-continental

railway, yet at the same time I am wholly indisposed to be factious. The Government have arrived at a decision, and I am prepared to support the Government in their decision to build that section of the road. I believe, however, that the Pine Pass route will yet prove to be the great through route. I believe that after this section is built it will enable the whole of British Columbia to be opened up, by connecting the Pine Pass route through British Columbia with the Yale—Kamloop section, via Fort George, Quesnelle, Clinton and Cache Creek. To benefit the Western Province, the railway ought to start at Cache Creek, and go on to Fort George; that would be the means of opening up the entire interior of the Province of Columbia. My hon. friend from Yale, also stated, on the occasion to which I have previously alluded, that there were not twelve persons in my constituency who were opposed to the Frazer route. Allow me to state, that that was an incorrect statement. He also stated that, in an eloquent speech, I spoke in favour of that section. At that time we had no terms of Union with Canada. We were not even within the Confederation, and the question of a railway across the continent, was an unsettled one. The question was put to our Legislative Council, of which I was a member, and of which my hon. friend was a member at that time. The statement was made that we might get a trans-continental railway, if Canada accepted our terms. I said then, that if we were going to have a railway, it would be better to put in a positive provision, that it shall be constructed between Yale and Savona's Ferry. I believe that this route will be valuable to this country, and I believe that the territory south of Kamloops, which is nearly five times large as the Province of Prince Edward Island, and that in the districts to the north and south of Kamloops, some very fine country, can be opened up. As far as Kamloops is concerned, I do not believe very much traffic can be obtained. My hon. friend opposite, does not want anything to be built in the way of a railway in British Columbia, until the settler has reached the Rocky Mountain Range. I think the hon. gentleman is labouring under a very great mistake indeed. He has to know that there is only one great commercial mart on the Pacific coast, and

that that great commercial mart is San Francisco; that it has formed commercial relations with every people, on the west coast of America, the east coast of Asia, the Indian Archipelago, down through Australia and New Zealand. Now, I take it, if we wish as a Canadian people, if we wish to establish a foreign policy, if we wish to find a market for our surplus products, we ought to have railway communication with the shores of the Pacific, in order that we might distribute our surplus goods among the markets of the Pacific Ocean. The hon. member for West Durham wants delay. That is a great mistake; for the sooner we are enabled to move our manufactures across the continent, and enter into commercial rivalry around the shores of the Pacific Ocean with our neighbour to the south, the sooner we will be enabled to occupy a similar commanding commercial position to the provinces on the Atlantic. Allow me to call the attention of the House to the trade of the port of San Francisco. The total imports of merchandise during 1879, in San Francisco, amounted to \$34,124,417. The total exports, \$36,564,328. I find that the domestic exports from the State of California amounted to \$29,000,000. Now the total value of the imports of Canada in 1878-79 was \$81,964,427; and total value of exports, \$71,491,255. By comparison, it will be seen, that San Francisco, a city only thirty years old, imports and exports nearly half as much, exclusive of coin and bullion, as the Dominion of Canada. Now there is no good reason why this state of things should exist, if we are true to ourselves, and develop by railway the Great West. A few years ago, I employed an engineer to make a measurement of our territory from the 110th meridian, west, to the eastern boundary of British Columbia, and between the 49th and 60th parallels of north latitude. The result showed that there are 257,000 square miles of territory east of the Provincial boundary that must find its market through a port in British Columbia. That added to the 330,000 square miles of British Columbia gives us a territory of 587,000 square miles, which must also find its chief markets on the coast of the Pacific. The United States, west of the 110th meridian and between the Canadian

boundary and the Republic of Mexico, have 800,000 square miles of territory, and we have just as good a country as they have. The agricultural products of Canada sent from the Atlantic side to England in 1878-79 were worth about twenty millions of dollars. Now, the exports of wheat alone, from the port of San Francisco, last year were \$16,788,772. I maintain that if we have a railway running from the cereal region east of the Rocky Mountains to within a short distance of the Pacific coast, that we will be just as able to ship our wheat to England as the people of San Francisco. We trust also to find a way traffic for this railway. By the settlement of that region east of our boundary, we will get this through traffic and by that means the railway will assist most materially to build up the country. I shall not go into detail further. I desire now to summarize a few facts from what I have already said upon this subject. We, British Columbia, import and export more than any other Province, *per capita*. We have contributed during the last year \$521,443 in Customs alone to the Revenue, whereas, at the same rate per head as we have been paying Ontario, would have contributed more than \$20,000,000. I contended on Friday night that 200 Ontarians paid as much as five Columbians; that five Columbians paid as much as 150 Quebecers; five Columbians paid as much forty Nova Scotians; that five Columbians paid as much as thirty New Brunswickers; and that five Columbians paid 150 per cent. more than ten Prince Edward Islanders. I showed that British Columbia paid into the Consolidated Fund last year \$275,762 more than she was lawfully bound to pay at the *per capita* rate of the Dominion. I showed that during the eight years, from 1871 to 1879, she paid in a total, in Customs and Excise, of \$3,392,152. But let us leave out of consideration the comparison with the Provinces separately, and come down to the average for the Dominion. Our proportion of Customs per capita of the Dominion is \$3.50; that is the amount per capita which we ought to pay, and, as our population is 50,000, we should by right contribute \$175,000 altogether; but the fact is we paid \$346,343 in addition to the \$175,000 which we should not pay by right. Yet

we do not grumble. All we want is the Canadian Government to come to the front and carry out their obligations in the best possible way. The 50,000 population is based upon careful calculations. During the six months preceding my arrival here I gave a great deal of attention to the matter, and I came to the conclusion that, including our Indian population, our white population and the Chinese and every other nationality the number, our population, in the maximum, is 50,000. Now, it has been stated that \$1,449,956 has been expended on surveys in British Columbia, and as British Columbia has contributed, man for man, the large amount which I have stated more *per capita* than all the rest of the Dominion, it will be seen that over and above all railway expenditure, the Government hold in hand a net balance contributed in the eight years by British Columbia, over the remainder of the Dominion, of \$195,540. I am glad to see the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) in his seat; because I want to make reference to his statement, at Walkerton, that we had only a population of 2,000.

MR. BLAKE: No, no,

MR. DECOSMOS: The hon. gentleman stated that there were about as great a population in British Columbia as in the audience he was then addressing at Walkerton, and that audience was about 2,000 in number. I have it here in the *Globe*.

MR. BLAKE: I neither swear by, nor at the *Globe*; but what I really stated, was that the population numbered as many freeholders as the number then present; and I estimated the freeholders as one to five.

MR. DECOSMOS: Oh! freeholders. The hon. member for West Durham is well able to make that look better which looked so much worse. He stated that there were only 2,000 freeholders in British Columbia. I find also that he gives 12,000 paying \$553,362 in Excise and Customs in one year; that would be about \$47 *per capita*. Oh! I wish I were such a statistician as the hon. member for West Durham. I told the House the other night that I would deal with the Vancouver section of the railway at some other time. I know it will be built. I am only dealing with the

Yale-Kamloops section; the total cost of which I estimate at \$8,000,000. I have shown that we pay \$340,000 a year more in Customs than the average taxation of the Dominion, and, therefore, we really shall pay all the expenses, in the shape of interest and sinking fund for the building of this railway.

MR. MACKENZIE: It will naturally be expected that one who has had so much to do with the practical work connected with the Pacific Railway as myself, will have something to say on a motion of so much importance, and, therefore, I desire to speak on the subject, not, however, going over the ground trod by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), but endeavouring to confine myself to such points of the case as have not received his attention, though I will be obliged occasionally to repeat some portions of what fell from that hon. gentleman, in order to be concise and consistent in my narrative of events. I listened to the able speech of the hon. the Minister of Railways, but, although it was an able speech, I listened to it with a sense of disappointment, for the reason that, at least, two-thirds of it was taken up with a hostile and unfair criticism of his opponents, and not one-third of it was taken up with an exposition of his own and the Government's policy. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that if he could succeed in fastening inconsistency on the late Administration, he found an excuse for doing unjustifiable things now. He took up several matters, having an important bearing on the proposed continuation of the work, which I shall endeavour to notice. While I will not pretend to follow his points *seriatim*, I shall endeavour to arrange them so as not to miss anything seriously important. The hon. gentleman meant his speech to bear something like a historic character, for he commenced at the beginning and attacked the late Administration, and notably myself, for having opposed the scheme of the Government of 1872, in connection with the Union with British Columbia. It is quite true that we did oppose the scheme, and my only regret is that we did not oppose it successfully. We opposed it because it would entail burdens which this country cannot bear; we opposed it because it was wholly unneces-

MR. DECOSMOS.

sary for the purpose of obtaining the Union; we opposed it because the Administration of the day, under the leadership of the hon. the present Premier, deliberately entered into engagements not asked by British Columbia, and against the strong remonstrances of the country, and even of his own friends, against sound policy, and with the poor excuse—which it would have been—that British Columbia, without such terms, would have remained out of the Union. If British Columbia had remained out, it would have been a disaster that could be borne, although, if it had, I should have regretted it, because I desire to see an entire Confederation of British America accomplished as soon as possible. But I was not able to agree to the terms on which that Province was brought into the Union, and I am sure there is not one hon. gentleman on the Opposition Benches who is, at this moment, prepared to justify the extent to which hon. gentlemen committed the country, in order to accomplish that object. I was hardly, and yet I was, prepared for the hon. Minister's undertaking to excuse the whole bargain by asserting that the Resolution, passed some days after the Union was assented to in this House, was a rider to the Terms of Union. Such was not the opinion of the hon. the leader of the Government for years afterwards, and such was not the opinion of the hon. the Minister of Railways, until he developed that theory in a speech during the North Renfrew election contest in 1876. Assuming that the hon. gentleman's ground is correct, that the Resolution which was passed at the instance of the then hon. leader of the House (Sir George E. Cartier) did govern the Terms of Union, hon. gentlemen will see the extent to which it commits them. The hon. gentleman says that what are known as the Carnarvon Terms were binding on the country, but that the Terms of Union were not binding; and I was a little surprised to find the last speaker (Mr. DeCosmos) administer no rebuke for what he would call "bad national morality" and bad faith. It was quite true that the Resolution regarding the non-increase of taxation was adopted after the Terms of Union were assented to by this Parliament, but when the same Resolu-

tion was embodied in the Lieutenant-Governor's Act of 1874, it did not seem to the hon. gentleman to excuse us from being bound by the Carnarvon Terms.

MR. DECOSMOS: Not a whit.

MR. MACKENZIE: But the other does, it seems.

MR. DECOSMOS: No. We Columbians never admitted the right of the Parliament of Canada to impart a provision into the Terms of Union by their own act, neither did we ever attempt, or claim, to impart a condition, or Terms of Union, by the Parliament of Canada. We maintain that the Terms made by the Parliament of Canada had no binding effect upon the people of British Columbia. I can turn up statements of the hon. member for West Durham to prove that fact, because it cost me two Sessions labour to get it into his head.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will find such a declaration made last week, and he will also find that on no occasion have we asserted, on this side of the House, that that declaration was of equal authority with the Terms of Union, and, while that is our position we hold further, namely, that the Terms of Union cannot take precedence of other public obligations previously incurred. Where it is evidently impossible to maintain both, in the present state of the public finances, we have to determine which of the public works concerned are thus likely to be most beneficial to the entire country, and not to a few thousands of its population. If the hon. the Minister of Railways, and the present Administration, took the ground that the Resolution passed, after the assent to the Terms of Union, were of equal authority with those terms, and released Parliament and the country from the enormous obligation incurred, then, I might equally plead that the safeguard the late Government provided, in their Act of 1874, placed us entirely in the same position. Our sole object then in opposing the scheme, in 1872, was to obtain such Terms as could be reasonably carried out. I admit, to the utmost extent, the desirability of our keeping faith in all public obligations, even when they do not partake of the nature of a treaty; but, on the other hand, British Columbia had every notice, by the discussion which

took place in the House, when the majority of its members did not believe it was possible to carry out that bargain.

MR. DE COSMOS: Being one of those who took probably as large a share to induce British Columbia to enter the Union as anyone else, allow me to state that the discussions here were over, and the Resolutions passed, almost before we heard of them in British Columbia.

MR. MACKENZIE: British Columbia had notice of the fact, and Mr. Trutch, who was then in Ottawa as a delegate from that Province, in the published speech made in this town, admitted that the Terms of Union must be determined by the public necessity. I cannot quote his language, but I think I have paraphrased correctly what he said on this subject. The hon. the Minister of Public Works alleged that the Opposition, in 1872, had endeavoured to prevent Sir Hugh Allan succeeding in England, and that we prevented his success. All I have to say about that is that we knew nothing about Sir Hugh Allan's success or doings, except from remarks made by the hon. gentleman opposite, in this House (Sir Charles Tupper), when he announced, towards the close of the Session, in 1873, that the Allan delegation, in England, were meeting with most gratifying success. No act of the Opposition, good, bad, or indifferent, could have influenced the English public in the matter. But the scheme broke down, and the Government had to fall with the scheme they brought into existence. We came into office in November, 1873, two years and some months after the commencement of the tenth year period, which was to witness the completion of the Railway to British Columbia, and after the time of the first protest by the British Columbia Legislature that the Terms of Union were not being observed. We can say that the Terms of Union had not been observed up to the moment we assumed the cares and responsibilities of office. It has been said by the hon. the Minister of Railways, and I commend his remarks to the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia, that we were then in a position to repudiate the entire Railway—that it was quite possible for us to say to British Columbia that we are not able to succeed with the work. This,

MR. MACKENZIE.

Sir, was the conclusion reached by the hon. gentleman opposite. We took the ground all along that we were bound, as public men, to endeavour to carry out the obligations to British Columbia, so far as was consistent with the security of our financial condition. We were bound so far to give every possible opportunity that could be given to obtain public contractors and financial men interested in order to carry out the Terms as soon as possible. Within a very few weeks of the time we assumed office, we despatched a representative of the Government to the Province to endeavour to arrange for a modification of the terms to the extent that we believed we might be able to carry out. These modifications were not assented to by British Columbia, and we afterwards accepted the good offices of Lord Carnarvon, or more strictly speaking, we assented to Lord Carnarvon expressing his opinion upon the subject in something like these terms: That we were willing to submit to him whether the exertions of the Government, the diligence shown and the offers made, were or were not just and fair and in accordance with the spirit of the original agreement. Seeing it was impossible to comply with the letter of the Terms of Union in this particular, Lord Carnarvon expressed the opinion that we should make a little advance upon the offers made to Columbia through Mr. Edgar. While we expressed a willingness to make further concessions rather than forego an immediate settlement of so irritating a question, as the concessions suggested might be made without involving a violation of the spirit of any Parliamentary resolution or the letter of any resolution, the declaration of our Act in 1874, as well as the Parliamentary Resolution which preceded it, and the Parliamentary enactments of 1872, all pointed to the same determination, only to proceed as fast as our resources and Union obligations permitted. This was the position of affairs in 1874. I shall not, for a moment, deny that we intended to carry out the terms of the arrangement with Lord Carnarvon, and nothing but the want of means would have prevented us from accomplishing that object, an object which could not but be desirable to anyone who wished to see our trade extended. No one who looked to the de-

sirable extension of our business across the continent could avoid seeing that if such an extension could possibly be obtained without too great a sacrifice, it would, in itself, be desirable. I was in favour of such a scheme of Railway extension as soon as it could be proceeded with, subject to conditions stated. It was impossible to set such conditions aside, merely to gratify the opinions of a small portion of the people who live beyond the Mountains, for their views must be subject to the opinions of the four millions who live on this side of the Mountains who pay for the enterprise. The Ultramontanes have, of course, their decided and extreme opinions on the subject, but I think they will understand that they must be subject to the governing power who live on the eastern side of the continent. The hon. gentleman who spoke last referred, in very strong and very indignant terms, to the fact that certain canals had been constructed, while the obligations with British Columbia had been unfulfilled. If the hon. gentleman reads the Resolutions of the Quebec Convention, which were the basis of the Confederation Act, he will find that the Intercolonial Railway and Canadian Canals were to be constructed as conditions of the Union, and as he will also find that so far from our fulfilling the first obligations before admitting the second, we have not yet really completed the first; we have only barely completed the Intercolonial Railway, and the late Government set aside, as not to be completed for the present, the following part of the Canal system: The deepening of the St. Lawrence, the construction of the Beauharnois Canal and the St. Lawrence Canals, west of Beauharnois, estimated to cost nearly nine millions of dollars. I do not say the people of Ontario and Quebec are entitled to come before Parliament, and denounce the Government and Parliament because these works have been postponed indefinitely by the late Administration, though they would do so if they followed the example of British Columbia. I believe the present Administration are in that respect following our footsteps, for they have asked for no vote for the prosecution of these enterprises. The people of Ontario and Quebec might as well come before Parliament and denounce the late Administration and the

present because they have not fulfilled the obligations incurred in 1867 to the old Province of Canada, as the British Columbia members denounce us for not fulfilling the Pacific Railway obligations as they affect to understand it. All such obligations must be governed by national exigencies—by the national capacity to prosecute them. Circumstances might change; and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. DeCosmos) should say that no circumstances would justify the postponing of such works, I ask him what would happen if this country was unfortunately to be plunged into war, or to be torn by internal dissensions, such as brought disasters on our neighbours? Under such circumstances all public works would, no doubt, be suspended. The hon. gentleman's demand for the fulfilment of this contract, would be about as senseless as the demand of the emigrant who, when the ship was about sinking in the middle of the Atlantic, declared he had a contract for his passage to America, and would compel the captain to fulfil it. It is somewhat difficult to compel a nation to any course, and strong words and warm denunciations of those who claim to be the sufferers, is not the way to induce it to stretch a point and endeavour to reach the desired end. We passed an Act, immediately on obtaining office, to enable us to build a portion of the Railway, and, if it should be found desirable, by direct Government contracts, paid for like all other Public Works. I took the ground from the first that, if this Railway has to be built, it must be built by Canada. We may obtain an Imperial guarantee for part of the cost, but we have to pay the debt all the same. Unless somebody builds the road for the lands, Canada has to do it out of her own resources. I am not at all certain that it is always advisable to obtain the Imperial guarantee. I know that, if it had been refused for the Intercolonial, we should have saved \$400,000 a year in interest. The only excuse given for adopting the northern route for this road was that the Imperial guarantee could not otherwise have been obtained. I then said it would be better to borrow the money ourselves, and adopt the cheapest and best commercial route. That guarantee is worth about one-half of 1 per cent. This is not such a benefit as

should induce us to depart from our established principle of progress in regard to such a work. The hon. the Minister of Railways thought he made a very strong point in saying that I declared, in my speech at Sarnia, that Canada itself would have all the profit under our plan. He is not remarkable for the fairness of his quotations, as seen in his omission of a part of Mr. Foster's speech, the other day, which misrepresented that gentleman's meaning. I was speaking of Sir Hugh Allan and his associates as not being contractors, but mere speculators in the Pacific Railway Charter; saying that they had no intention themselves of building the road; that they proposed, in England, the issue of \$180,000,000 of bonds, to be manipulated by themselves in such a way that, whoever built it, the original speculators would have a handsome profit. Our plan was not to proceed with any contracts until we had some reasonable view or idea of the country through which the Railway was to pass, till it was partially surveyed and we were able to decide, in the main points, of the best route and points of departure. It became necessary for us, under the circumstances, to proceed with the surveys as rapidly as possible. I am not quite aware whether the hon. the Minister of Railways blamed the late Administration for expending so much money on the surveys.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I did not.

MR. MACKENZIE: In that case I will not make the remarks I intended; but I may remark on this point that, when we entered office, more than \$1,000,000 had been expended on surveys, while not a mile of the road was located. We practically left the matter in the hands of the Chief Engineer. We knew it was necessary to satisfy British Columbia, that the explorations and surveys should be conducted as rapidly as could fairly be done; and at this moment the only thing I blame myself or the late Government for was our proceeding far too rapidly with those surveys. Looking back on the progress made and money spent on them, I think we could have accomplished the same results with much less expenditure by taking a year or two more to it. On the American line they spent nearly twenty years, and filled twenty volumes with the result of

their surveys, and yet they experienced difficulties when they came to the work of construction. We were hurried, by the impossible and preposterous bargain made by the hon. gentlemen opposite, in such a way that it was impossible to give much attention either to the saving of money or the accomplishment of a particular part of the survey until we had the whole line looked over. We proposed, in 1874, our general plan in introducing the Canada Pacific Railway Act. It had been anticipated in my election address, the Premier, as usual, speaking for his colleagues. Our plan included the keeping of the section from Lake Superior to Nipissing in abeyance, and proceeding with the sections west of Lake Superior as fast as we could conveniently do so, in order to reach the lakes in the interior, and between the lakes and the branch of the road to be built, that we should, as soon as possible, make a continuous line of travel into the country. The hon. the Minister of Railways has, on several occasions, accused the late Administration of having abandoned what he calls their amphibious plan. We find the present Government have not abandoned it, or, if they have, why do they not ask Estimates from Parliament for the construction of the road in that region, north of Lake Superior? Are they still to use the water-stretches of the Georgian Bay and Lake Superior? They have not departed from that plan yet. They have announced their intention of departing from it some time in future, but no plan is given, or principle avowed. The hon. gentleman accused us of having departed from our original line from Fort William to Shebandowan, saying we commenced a work at that and the other end of the line without knowing whether we could connect in the middle. He has no warrant whatever for that statement. We knew we could connect in the middle. When we gave out the first contract from Lake Superior to Shebandowan, we expected to be able to take a line south of the one ultimately adopted. It passed near to Sturgeon Falls on the upper branch of Rainy Lake, and thence proceeded by a more southern route to Rat Portage; or, to adopt the line Mr. Dawson had foreshadowed, it crosses the Lake of the Woods at the Narrows. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dawson) was good enough

MR. MACKENZIE.

to plant an island at those Narrows where none exists.

MR. DAWSON: That island was set down by a surveyor, Mr. Ross, a gentleman quite fit to set down islands there or anywhere else where they do not exist.

MR. MACKENZIE: The islands disappeared anyway.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I have seen those islands at the Narrows.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Have you seen the islands not there?

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman saw them before they moved off, I fancy. When the engineers reported that this route was more or less impracticable, and advised us not to adopt it, we were obliged to deviate from the line we projected at a certain point. The line to Shebandowan, on which Contract 13 was let out, was altogether about forty-five miles, but thirty-two and one-half miles from Lake Superior was reached before any deviation was necessary, in order to adopt the present line, and the contractors were simply told that they must take the same distance on the new line or confine their contracts to the point of intersection of the old and new. There was nothing whatever lost by giving out that contract. It is one of the few contracts that have been kept almost strictly within the limits of the estimates of the Engineer. It was our purpose, when we commenced this contract, and had in view the construction of the Fort Frances Lock, that when we reached Sturgeon Falls, we should have continuous navigation from that point to Rat Portage without any break, and there is no doubt, whatever, that would have been accomplished. Then we deviated to the northward, making the line somewhat longer, and pointing to the north instead of the south. That line touched the north side of Lac des Mille Lacs, and from that point, except a few portages, we could also have a line of travel all the way to Rat Portage. We also commenced from the east side of Red River, where we considered the prairie country was fairly entered, and communications established with the navigable waters of Red River and Lake Winnipeg. We are accused of doing wrong in beginning at the west end. We began at both ends, to have the double force of labour to make

up, and it is quite evident we could construct the road more rapidly in that way than by depending altogether on commencing at the east side. That was our motive, design and plan. I assert it was a wise plan, and the only mode by which more rapid progress could be made. It was our intention to build that road as rapidly as possible, because there was no means of communication between Lake of the Woods and Winnipeg, except the ordinary waggon-road, which was of no use for general traffic. It will be observed, from my remarks at my election in 1873, and in 1874, that we contemplated still further using the waters of the Saskatchewan for navigable purposes. We knew it would not be difficult. Indeed, surveys had been made before we entered office, showing that something of this kind was in contemplation. We found surveys extending from the Assiniboine to Lake Manitoba, and thence into Lake Winnipegosis, by Water-hen River, and by one lock, the lift being only about 17ft. 9in., and from thence to the Moss Portage into Cedar Lake or the Saskatchewan. Those works would give us, at a small cost, continuous navigation to both branches of the Saskatchewan to the Rocky Mountains. We had this in view as a means of settling the prairie country, and saving as much as possible while keeping faith with British Columbia, to some extent, in procuring a public highway for commercial travel across the continent. We have often been attacked for our policy in the water-stretches. We announced to Parliament our policy in the Act. No one on the other side, none of the present Ministers, none of the party behind them at that time, ventured a single amendment to that policy. None objected even to it. Our policy was this: We believed that the Pacific Railway was undertaken as a great national highway from one end of the Dominion to the other, and that whatever termination we made of it, near Lake Nipissing, it must be placed in connection with some other lines, and we provided for paying a subsidy to some connecting lines east of Georgian Bay. Our object was to have, as speedily as possible, a Railway from the waters of the Georgian Bay, to have a connection with the Quebec lines, through the Canada Central, as a connecting medium.

Our idea was that the travel from the far west would naturally take such a channel in seeking the far east. We thought, and my belief now is, that had that branch been constructed, had the present Government allowed it to be proceeded with, the grain from Duluth, until it can be got to Fort William, would find its way, in large quantities, to the east end of the Georgian Bay, and in much larger vessels than can navigate other portions of the lake, and that the trade of that country would, to a greater extent, find an outlet in that way than by any other route. Besides, we could not overlook the fact that the western end of Ontario had already possession of two or three lines of through travel: one from Detroit, by the Great Western, to Toronto, and connecting with the Grand Trunk; one by the Grand Trunk, from Sarnia eastward, all the way to the ocean; the Northern Railway from Collingwood, and the smaller Railroads to Owen Sound and Kincardine, to connect with the lines tending eastward. Our plan would form a through line to the Ottawa Valley, notably and notoriously the shortest line to the east from our western territories. Hon. gentlemen opposite have given up all the advantages that the Province of Quebec and the Provinces east of that would have derived from our plan, and the President of the Council is not apparently at all disposed to avoid cheering himself because he adopted this course; he deliberately injured his own Province, and now laughs at the injury he has done.

MR. MASSON: The hon. gentleman is too fast; something better than that is going to be done for Quebec.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then it seems that something is to be developed which the Government has not yet disclosed. How is it that a Minister is allowed to get up in his place here and say it is quite true that something of this kind will injure Quebec at present, but they have something far better for it? What is it? I will sit down for a moment and allow the hon. gentleman to state what it is, because it may materially affect my opinion. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not wish me to proceed upon false ground.

MR. MASSON: The question of the Georgian Bay Branch is not on the *tapis*;

MR. MACKENZIE

the question is about stopping the work in British Columbia.

MR. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend will not get out of it in that way. I was under the impression the question of the whole Pacific Railway was under review. I was under the impression the hon. gentleman was present and heard his colleague discuss the Georgian Bay Branch, the eastern section, and now he wants to prevent me from discussing it by the intimation that they have something better to satisfy the people of Quebec. Well, there are some people from Quebec on this side of the House, and I think they have a right to know what is this good thing that is coming. Is it possible the hon. the President of the Council heard this good thing developed at the several caucus meetings that were held with the object of trying to procure uniformity in the Ministerial ranks? and is that what causes the bright smile of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), who looks so good naturedly? My hon. friend says it is. Now, what was this wonderful arrangement?

MR. MOUSSEAU: What do you want to know from me?

MR. MACKENZIE: I want to know what passed in your caucus.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I will tell you next week.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, I will pass that by, as my hon. friend has not yet made up his mind to give me definite information on the subject. I hope he will before the debate is over; it is a most important thing to know what is in reserve for us all.

MR. MASSON: The hon. gentleman has done so very little for the Province of Quebec; he must do a little more.

MR. MACKENZIE: I was under the impression I had done for Quebec everything that was reasonable and proper, and I am quite willing to contrast it with what the hon. gentlemen opposite have done up to this moment. But I am not to be led off my line of argument by any such side issue. I am speaking, at present, of the bearing of the Pacific Railway scheme upon the interests of Quebec. I am speaking of the plan we adopted to carry trade by the Ottawa Valley to the great cities on the St. Lawrence, and I have asserted, what no one will deny, that

that plan was one which promised well for the prosperity of these cities. I have now endeavoured to show that the scheme which we advised in 1874, upon which we went to the elections, upon which that House was returned, and upon which was based the Act of 1874, was to subsidise the Canada Central and enable the roads to make connection with existing systems eastward, build a short branch to connect that road with the waters of the Georgian Bay, build a line from Fort William to the chain of lakes in the interior, and from the western end of that chain of lakes build a railroad to Red River, thus forming a continuous line of communication. I have only to add, as I have said, that from Fort William to Selkirk we did not depart one yard from the route of Railway, which is necessary for an all-rail line, in our efforts to connect the systems of water navigation. So that it was entirely open for us, at any moment, to proceed with the construction of the intervening link of 185 miles, or it was open for us, if we felt that it would not be in the interests of Canada, in a financial point of view, to construct that, to delay it and utilise the means we had otherwise for securing communication with that country. But the hon. the Minister of Railways also found fault, in his speech, with having commenced to build the Pembina Railway some years ago, not finishing it, and for having graded the line and then left it. Now, the hon. gentleman was most unfair in this. He knows, in the first place, that his own Government was bound to have that road finished and in operation by the 31st of December, 1874. When we came into office, one of the first things we did was to enquire as to the prospects of a railroad being built in Minnesota from existing lines up to the boundary, and we were not able to induce any of the parties to proceed with these works. It was constantly stated to us that, if we proceeded with that line within our limits, it would no doubt induce some of the Minnesota companies to build their lines to the boundary. Under the belief that this object would be thus accomplished, we gave out the contract for grading the road, omitting the bridging, the ballasting and the tracklaying, omitting everything but the ordinary grading. Where this contract

was carried out, and there being no sign whatever of any action on the part of the Minnesota people, we did not proceed any further; but the moment we found that the Minnesota Company was prepared to build a road to St. Vincent or Pembina, then we at once gave out the contract for the completion of the Pembina Branch. So that when the Minnesota roads were about completed ours was also about completed, in order to form a connection. Under the circumstances, I am extremely surprised that the hon. gentleman should have ventured to blame us. Suppose we had completed the road in 1874-75, the hon. gentleman would then have denounced us for having built a line of road sixty-five miles long, having neither beginning nor end. He would have asked, what was the use of spending so much money in building a railway that had no connection with any other system, and to which we would have had to take our rolling-stock by boat and teams. I am sure there is no man in Canada who would sooner join in that denunciation of us than the hon. gentleman himself, had we attempted to carry out the policy that he blamed us in his speech for not carrying out. The hon. gentleman stated that we let out sections of work upon insufficient and improper surveys. Now, I ask the close attention of the members of the House, particularly on the opposite side, to a statement I now make. Up to the present time there has not been a mile of railway let out that was not let out upon surveys that the late Administration made and completed, except the 100 miles west of Winnipeg—and that has had no survey at all—and the section of 100 miles which he is now letting is also without any survey, except the exploratory survey which has been undertaken within the last two years, and a part of which we also undertook in 1877 and had reported upon as impracticable. The 185 miles forming the connecting link between Fort William and Selkirk, we had surveyed in a most careful manner, and during 1878 we sent out four parties afresh, after the survey and location had been really completed, in order to improve the location, if possible, and see that everything was in as good a condition as possible for letting the works. The hon. gentleman had the benefit of all this. We had also sent parties two sea-

sons in the Fraser Valley, after the survey and location had been completed, to re-survey it, with the view of determining whether it could not be made still more favourable. That survey the hon. gentleman also had the benefit of; and when he accuses the late Administration of letting the contract upon imperfect surveys, he accuses himself, because he has let out, as I have said, no work upon any surveys of his own since he assumed office. But the hon. gentleman says I led the House and the country astray in stating that the road from Fort William to Selkirk could be constructed for about \$25,000 a mile. He says I had nothing to go upon but Mr. Fleming's estimates, and the hon. gentleman himself ventured a statement to the House, two nights ago, in which he declared that from Fort William to the Pacific Ocean, Mr. Fleming had certified to them, and, in consequence of Mr. Fleming's certificate, he certified to the House that it could be built for \$62,000,000. It seems the hon. gentleman opposite is at liberty to make any statement he pleases upon the authority of Mr. Fleming, but the moment hon. gentlemen on this side of the House venture upon that, they are accused of doing something not justifiable. The hon. gentleman says we had no accurate statement of quantities; I had precisely the same statement of quantities the hon. gentleman has. My hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) showed that even in his latest contracts he had taken pains to inform the contractors, by a note at the foot, that the estimates were not correct, that the statement of quantities was not reliable, and that they were only roughly approximate, and that in some of them there were none at all. Well, I was not aware of anything of that kind in the estimates prepared by Mr. Fleming for these three sections, that is: Sections 13, 14 and 15. I received the approximate quantities from Mr. Fleming in good faith, after the country had been visited by himself, after surveyors had been over it, and if Mr. Fleming led me astray in giving false quantities, there is no epithet too strong to address to him. But until Mr. Fleming says that, with his own lips, I will not believe that he could be guilty of such an act of perfidy. Having Mr. Fleming's

MR. MACKENZIE.

estimates of the approximate quantities, I proceeded to let the works. The works were let upon those estimates; upon those estimates I based my calculation of the cost of the entire line, and I am prepared, at this moment, upon those estimates to maintain that valuation.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Allow me to ask the hon. gentleman if he was not present at a Committee where testimony was given upon this whole question by Mr. Fleming and all the rest of his engineers, who testified that they were yet upon mere guess work, and that they had no knowledge of the amount of work to be done on those sections to which I have alluded.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, I never did.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: If the hon. gentleman will read the testimony given by those officers, he will find the statements proved.

MR. MACKENZIE: I never heard Mr. Fleming state it was mere guess work. I can only say this, that the quantities are there; the estimated quantities of Mr. Fleming are there over his own signature, and either they are correct, or they are incorrect. How it is possible that Mr. Fleming or his engineers could state specific quantities, from mere guess work, I leave to the hon. gentleman to find out for himself. It is impossible it could be guess work; and more than that, the estimates for No. 13 turned out approximately correct. The hon. gentleman has, therefore, no more accurate quantities for the contracts that he let recently, and that he is now letting, than I had, indeed they are not so accurate. The quantities for the western 200 miles cannot possibly be accurate estimates, because there has been no time to produce them. If Mr. Fleming, or any other engineer, now says that he had no intention of setting forth those specific quantities as approximately accurate, I can only say that the Department was grossly deceived, and the Minister was grossly deceived. The hon. gentleman has tried to make the House believe that the late Government was guilty of some wrong in connection with Section 15—that the ultimate estimate would exceed the original statements by about a million dollars. I can only say that, up to the time the late Govern-

ment left office, they did not pay anything upon the works which were not included in the estimates, and whatever has been paid since has been paid upon works undertaken without being authorised by us, or, if so, the authority has been given by the present Government. The hon. gentleman has said that Mr. Fleming recommended the substitution of stone and earth for wood in some of the work; that Mr. Fleming left for England under the impression that that change would be made. I have only to say that immediately after Mr. Fleming's departure he had brought the matter before the Privy Council for discussion, and that after discussing it the Council decided not to proceed with the additional works recommended by Mr. Rowan and Mr. Fleming on account of the increased cost. I did not, as the hon. gentleman stated, approve of the work. I told Mr. Fleming that the change would be a vast improvement, and that if I had been acting for myself, instead of on behalf of the public, I thought I would probably have adopted the recommendation, but as it was we were bound to do the work as cheaply as possible, and that as the trestle-work would only last a certain number of years it would be comparatively easy to replace it afterwards by the more substantial class of work, as had been done repeatedly on the Great Western and other Railways. The hon. gentleman then found fault because we did not communicate our decision to the engineer. Surely the hon. gentleman knew that we were not bound to communicate a negative decision, but that, in other words, the engineer and contractor were bound to go ahead with the original plan unless they were advised and instructed to the contrary. The hon. gentleman and his friends, both in this House and in the Senate, have tried very hard to fix upon the late Government the responsibility of this additional expenditure; and when the Senate Committee learned with dismay that I had not authorized this expenditure, they turned round and rent themselves. The hon. gentlemen were themselves responsible for that expenditure; but had they discovered that it could be laid at the door of the late Administration, the country would ring with their denunciations of such extravagance and bad management. With regard to the

termini of Sections 14 and 15, I do not know precisely, at this moment, what was the condition of matters: whether the filling in of the water in Cross Lake was wholly on Section 15, or, as I believed, partly on Section 14; but, at all events, that filling was done mostly, if not wholly, after I left office, and without my order or knowledge, and formed an important part of the additional expenditure. The hon. gentleman said that I should have known that the quantities were being exceeded. The fact was, I did not know it until after the estimates showed that most of the contract-money was paid out, when I immediately called the attention of Mr. Fleming to it, and he was directed to enquire into the causes of the excess.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: He was in England.

Mr. MACKENZIE: On the contrary.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Did you announce that to the House or the country. You repeated your statement during the elections.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I was defending my statement, which was made as based on the engineer's estimates, and I defend it now. It was entirely consistent with the figures of the various contracts. The hon. gentleman is quite willing to adopt our policy, but he will not take anything that will tell against his own side of the case.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Not only that, but the hon. gentleman will find, in his own Department, that an enquiry was directed to be made into the over-estimation upon these contracts. My own recollection is, that Mr. Smith was directed to enquire—some one was, I am sure—so that whatever was wrong about it, it was simply a wrong in consequence of inaccurate estimates of the engineers. The hon. gentleman has discovered a patent remedy for over-estimates upon public works, and takes care that they must be done within the limited amount, and in order to afford an opportunity for that, he has added a quarter of a million to each contract in British Columbia, or \$1,000,000 in all, in order that there may be a fair margin beyond which he will

not go. He has only provided that it shall not go beyond that, because, on the Kamloops Branch and between Fort William and Selkirk, the surveys are more elaborate. The late Government were repeatedly attacked because they had commenced the surveys at Fort William; and I, once before, called attention to one extraordinary circumstance, when we sent to Nepigon, then thought to offer a nearer line, we were attacked by the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite—the *Mail*—which said: That everybody knew that Fort William was the proper place; and when, after giving up Nepigon, we adopted the Fort William route and completed the surveys there, we were vehemently attacked by that organ, which now said that everybody knew that Nepigon was the right place. Indeed, it was not I that sent surveyors, in the first place, to Fort William. Some time before we assumed office, a party had gone to Kaministiquia River, and had actually worked for months before we had an opportunity of communicating with them. I do not blame hon. gentlemen for that; I merely allude to the circumstance to show how careful one should be in attributing blame to any party. The hon. gentleman also formerly denounced the spending of money on the Sault Ste. Marie line. We never propounded that scheme; we never spent a dollar on it, although there can be no question that it would be a very fine line of railway from east to west. We, however, never advocated it or proposed it to Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite surveyed it before we came into office. This shows how reckless hon. gentlemen have been in trying to find some occasion for censuring their opponents. I believe that hon. gentlemen opposite are sincerely desirous of making the best of the position in which we are placed; but when I say that I deprecate the attribution of evil motives to us, in the conduct of public affairs during our incumbency, by hon. gentlemen opposite—and I cannot refer to it without dealing with some of the misrepresentations made from time to time—no one could listen to the hon. the Minister of Railways' speech, the other evening, without perceiving that, although there seemed nothing specially objectionable in the language, still there ran a vein of deception,

an intentional effort, apparent throughout, to misrepresent the action of the previous Administration, and an endeavour to contrast it unfairly with the action of the present Government; and it was this which led me to consider that it was rather a sort of invective against our policy than an exposition of their own. I will not enter at length into the question attending the modification of terms accepted by us and called the Carnarvon Terms, simply because the circumstances are well known to the members of the House; but I will say that it has generally been understood that my reply of the 3rd of March, 1873, to my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), was that we did not intend to ask the sanction of Parliament to any portion of those Terms. No one can help seeing, by the phraseology that I used in that reply, that what I referred to was simply the expenditure upon the Pacific Railway proper, either on telegraph line or trail, to be made in advance of the road, and really forming part of the road itself, or the expenditure upon the construction proper which was to be \$2,000,000 a year, that was all provided for in the Act of 1874, and we only required the vote in Supply to enable us to proceed with that part of the Terms; but as to the Nanaimo road, that being an entirely new enterprise, it was impossible to proceed with that work without an Act of Parliament, and an Act of Parliament was brought in to sanction that; it was clearly beyond our scope to deal with it without an Act of Parliament, whatever might be said about the other points regarding the construction of the telegraph line, or trail, or the construction of the work proper. For the Nanaimo and Esquimaux line we had to ask a special enactment. We failed in this, because we were not able to obtain the necessary Legislative authority, the Senate having rejected the Bill. The hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to insinuate that it was possible that the Act was not passed through the Senate, because it was not desired. I can only say that I hope that no one will accuse us of any such dishonourable course as that implied. The hon. gentleman must have supposed that we induced some of the Senators to vote against it, so as to prevent its passage. I had no knowledge of any serious opposition to it in the Senate, by our friends,

until it was rejected. Messrs. Penny and MacMaster voted against the Bill, but they did so upon their own responsibility, and without any communication with them by any person, that I know of. I know that the Vancouver line was of value on account of the value of the minerals; but when we assumed the responsibility of accepting the proposition of Lord Carnarvon, we did it as a matter of course, subject to the reservation previously made in the Order-in-Council, that it was predicted upon, and subject to the enactments already in existence, and the Parliamentary Resolutions prohibiting increased taxation; and the mere fact that we had increased taxation, in 1874, is no argument that we should increase it more. We increased it then to meet other obligations; and we believed we have reached or gone beyond the limit which it would not be safe to pass. We then proposed a substitution of a money vote for these Terms, and with which the people on the Island could either build the Island road, or expend it in such other public works as might be approved of. We had expended all we could on that matter.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Do I understand that the vote of \$750,000 was given to the people in lieu of the road on Vancouver Island?

MR. MACKENZIE: If the road had been built it would not have been voted.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: We understood the hon. member for West Durham to say, that the \$750,000 was in compensation for delays in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Was that so, or was it in compensation for the abandonment of the Nanaimo road?

MR. MACKENZIE: I was about to come to that point. Had we proceeded with the Island Railway there would have been no necessity to adopt money compensation proposal; but we failed in that and the main portion of the Terms broke down, and hon. gentlemen will find that the exact words used were: "compensation for delays."

MR. DECOSMOS: For delays that may take place.

MR. MACKENZIE: Of course the Esquimalt road was in compensation; it was a road we were not obliged to build, except on the agreement as compensation for delays.

MR. DECOSMOS: I think it was not given in compensation.

MR. MACKENZIE: Our friends on the Island made that contention, but it will not bear any other construction than that it was in compensation for delays past and prospective. Why should we build that road, unless for some special reason of that kind? It was in connection with the delays in beginning the Pacific Railway that it was undertaken; that was the inducement; it was an object greatly desired by the people on the Island; we had reason to know that few would object elsewhere, though there was a little complaint on the mainland; the road was only in compensation, but when that broke down the main portion of the Terms broke down; the other portion are not broken to this day, except the non-completion of the telegraph line and the trail in connection with it, and even that part can hardly be said to be broken. The surveys were not completed until 1878; and if there has been any delay, which can be called breaking a portion of the Carnarvon Terms, it has taken place under the hon. gentlemen opposite; they will very likely claim that their expedition in continuing the surveys was also in continuance of the work, and that they have not broken the Terms; and if they take that view they have not any excuse for an attack upon us. Now, with regard to the line in the Province of British Columbia, a very vigorous attack was made by the hon. gentleman on the late Administration, because, having adopted the Burrard Inlet route, and having advertised for tenders for 125 miles from Yale to Kamloops, they were therefore bound and committed irrevocably to go on and give out the contract. I admit that a very plausible appearance can be put upon that, but it was not our intention to be bound by our asking for tenders to at once commence construction. We had to determine what route from Yellow Head Pass to the Pacific Ocean should be taken. I had repeatedly mentioned, in the early years of the survey, that Bute Inlet seemed to me the best, and Dean Inlet was considered afterwards the best for a time; it is the shortest still, but high grades and an inferior harbour induced us to reject it. I will not go into the considerations which induced us to adopt the Burrard Inlet route, as I went

into that fully in 1878. Having decided in the spring of 1878 to adopt the Burrard Inlet route, we had then to consider how far we could carry out a part of the construction, to what extent and within what time. To have the House understand thoroughly the position of the late Government, I will call to their recollection that, in my speeches in Parliament, I pointed out that it was the intention of the Government to have an instrumental survey made from Lake Superior westward to the ocean. We proposed, in the first place, to have such an instrumental survey across the continent as would enable us to complete a profile of the road from Lake Superior to the ocean; and when Mr. Fleming went to London he was directed to call the attention of capitalists and contractors to the position of the road. These profiles, as fast as they were completed, were transmitted to London, to be placed on exhibition at the Government offices. When the operations of 1877 were completed, and the profile of Burrard Inlet route was obtained, the completed profile was transmitted to England. It was always the intention of the Government to ask for tenders under terms of the Act of 1874, and we did ask for tenders under terms of that Act. In the meantime, we compiled, in one volume, a mass of information about the country, its flora, fauna, soil, climate, geology, minerals, etc., and sent copies to all parties who might enquire concerning the work. We also had the Act of 1874 reprinted, and sent a sufficient number of copies to London, and distributed others here. We, in short, did everything in our power to make the country known contemporaneously with our asking tenders for the entire line, offering \$10,000 a mile, and asking a guarantee of 4 per cent. for twenty-five years. We adopted this last item to establish a basis of computation. We also called for tenders for the Columbia Kamloops section, as an ordinary public work, in order to have the fullest information. We could not have let that work on both systems. The very asking on the plans shows what our object was. It was upon the tenders so asked for, as ordinary public works, that hon. gentlemen opposite awarded the contracts, on the Yale-Kamloops Branch, of 125 miles. We had also asked for tenders for

185 miles, with the intention, if at all possible, of proceeding with the construction of that part, under one or other of the plans, as it was most desirable to have a complete Railway system, as soon as possible, into the prairie country. We expected that would require, at least, four years for construction, before it would be possible to utilise it for through traffic from Fort William. We had not, however, actually determined to place either part under contract, but we were to consider the whole circumstances. We hoped that, if anything could produce tenders upon the plan contained in the Act, our advertisement would result in producing such tenders. The hon. gentlemen opposite seem to glory in the fact that the late Government got only one tender, and that one which could not be considered. We were accused of adopting the hon. gentlemen's plan in that Act. I confess that, after the hon. gentlemen opposite had committed themselves to the building of this road, the late Government were bound, as the successors of those hon. gentlemen, to give effect to their plan, if possible, and we tried our best to do so. Our modifications of their plan were all in favour of parties tendering, and, therefore, should have produced tenders, though theirs failed. We only gave out tenders for Sections 13, 14, 15 and 25, in order to facilitate the construction of the whole line. These initial portions of the road were begun when it was of the least importance to get into the prairie country. We knew that, without getting a large population thrown into that country, it was utterly hopeless to expect that the road could pay, and we therefore determined, in anticipation of surveys being completed, to proceed with that particular section, so that when the surveys were completed we might ask for tenders for the entire line under very favourable circumstances. The hon. gentleman said that he could have got a contract on the terms advertised by the late Government. If so the hon. gentleman committed a great mistake in not advertising for tenders. The plan of the late Government provided for the payment of \$10,000 in cash per mile, extending over the entire 2,600 miles. This would make the total \$26,000,000, to which add \$3,000,000 for surveys, according to the hon. gentleman's statement,

MR. MACKENZIE.

would make \$29,000,000, leaving \$1,000,000 still to be devoted to the eastern end to pay the greater portion of the subsidy to the Canada Central Railway. If the late Government could have obtained offers which would have enabled them to construct the road for \$26,000,000, I think it would have been their duty to have accepted them. They did not have any offers made them, and the hon. gentleman knew that he could not get any or he would have asked for them. It has come at last to what I invariably stated formerly, when in Opposition, that the hon. gentleman would have to count on the people of Canada to pay for this road, if it was to be built. The hon. gentleman had alluded to the removal of rails from Vancouver Island to Yale, as an indication of the intention of the late Government to proceed with the work in the Fraser Valley, or else of their intention to deceive the public for the sake of the elections. The late Government, I am sure, had nothing to gain by ministering to any party in British Columbia, because British Columbia had always been hostile to them, and they had no reason to expect that a single member would be returned to support their Administration. But they had determined on Burrard Inlet as the terminus. They had determined also that as soon as they could, whatever time that might be, they would build the road, and, if they had remained in power, to devote some portion of public money, as soon as it could be spared, to place the rails on that road. How soon that could be spared was a matter of discussion, but they knew that the rails had to go there. They had a great deal of difficulty in getting them landed on the Island; heavy storage dues had to be paid, and they felt that the sooner these rails could be brought to their own property, where no charges would have to be paid, and where they would be nearest the place where they would be ultimately used, I deny that the late Government deceived any one in this matter. They made no promise. They asked for tenders, and when these tenders could be examined they would decide as to the advisability of the eastern end, or the Columbia section, being proceeded with. They had to determine, in fact, on an entirely new

policy as to the mode of procedure in the construction of this work, and while they asked for tenders in perfect good faith, on both plans, for the purpose of obtaining information, they were not bound to accept the lowest, or any tender, with a view to immediate construction. With regard to the speech which I delivered in Ottawa, and from which the hon. gentleman quoted, I have no doubt it was correctly reported, but the hon. gentleman will find in that speech the strongest possible expression of the opinion that the expenditure must be controlled in the way indicated in the Act. The hon. gentleman has given the House a long table of estimates of the cost of the Railway, compiled by the Chief Engineer. Mr. Fleming gave the total amount from Fort William to Burrard Inlet, including surveys, at \$64,859,616, or with the extension to Lake Nipissing, \$88,869,616.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I wish to correct the hon. gentleman as to the last-named estimate. It was not Mr. Fleming's, but my own; but I have seen him since and he puts it at \$20,000,000, or \$84,000,000 in all.

MR. MACKENZIE: It would be interesting to the House to take some of Mr. Fleming's estimates on other occasions. Mr. Fleming gave an estimate from Lake Superior to Selkirk at \$14,700,000; now it is \$17,000,000, or an increase of 16 per cent. His previous estimate of the cost of the Prairie region was \$26,000,000, or double what he now states it to be. From Nipissing to Lake Superior his estimate to the late Government was \$26,000,000, or \$6,000,000 more than now, and \$2,000,000 more than that of the hon. Minister. From the Summit Line to Burrard Inlet, his estimate was \$35,000,000, which was now reduced to \$30,000,000. The Pembina Branch was formerly \$1,300,000; now the hon. gentleman stated it to be \$1,700,000. If the same percentage is applied to the Chief Engineer's calculations on other sections, namely, 16 per cent., the whole cost will be about \$114,000,000, instead of \$84,000,000 as the hon. gentleman now states. Such wild estimates shows how utterly impossible it was for anyone to ascertain the probable cost, and I feel pretty certain that the estimates now presented are the

merest guess-work. I will take the description of the engineers themselves as to the character of the work upon the several sections from Fort William to Selkirk, and carry out figures elsewhere on the same description. Seventy miles were described as heavy, 226 miles moderate, and 114 miles light; and in order to reach the \$18,000,000, which the engineers had recently estimated, they would have to take the seventy miles of heavy work at \$75,000 per mile; the 226 miles of moderate might, at \$39,000, and the 114 light, at \$20,000, making altogether, with the rolling-stock valued at \$1,656,000, \$18,000,000. From Selkirk to Battleford the first 112 miles are described as light, which, with the rails, fencing, etc., might be estimated at \$14,000 per mile, or \$3,000 less than the Pembina Branch; and the second 100 miles I have taken and calculated as to the materials furnished by Mr. Marcus Smith, and I do not believe that any gradient can be obtained on that section to build the road at less than \$20,000 a mile. We have in some miles a quantity of 39,000 cubic yards of earth to move, and all grades steep, only kept under fifty-three feet to the mile—many of them are fifty-three feet. The average of excavation is 16,000 cubic yards per mile. We have, in short, 1,600,000 cubic yards of earth to move which, at the lowest price per yard obtained on other roads, say twenty-five cents on the average, this of itself will cost \$400,000, and yet the hon. the Minister of Railways told the House that the whole road could be constructed for \$428,000.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: For \$438,000.

MR. MACKENZIE: This was almost the exact value of the earth work alone, leaving nothing for bridges, ties, rails, building fences, and other items.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The rails are included.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, but they have to be added to the price. We have the estimate of Mr. Smith, the acting Chief Engineer, and even with the degraded character of this road—the high grades and sharp curves—descending into valleys and ascending again on steep gradients, he has an estimate showing the cost, even then of grading the line, would be between \$700,000 and \$800,000. It

is impossible it should cost only \$438,000. From the end of the second hundred miles to Battleford, we have 377 miles. This is not any heavier on the whole. There are some more formidable bridges, but the line is further off for the carriage of the rails. I place that section at \$21,000 per mile. Then from Battleford to Edmonton, it is reported by the engineers as thirteen miles very heavy; this I estimate at \$60,000 a mile, being \$10,000 less than the other heavy work east of Selkirk; forty-nine miles more of the line classed as moderately heavy, I put at \$39,000 per mile; and seventy miles very moderate, at \$25,000, with ninety-eight miles of light work, at \$20,000 per mile, which makes for this section altogether, an average of \$27,000 a mile. From Edmonton to the Summit, 256 miles, the road is divided in this way by the engineer: heavy, seventy-six miles; medium, sixty-three miles; light, 117 miles. I calculate the "heavy" at \$60,000 per mile,—being \$10,000 more than the cost of heavy work east of Selkirk; medium, at \$40,000 per mile, and light, at \$20,000 per mile, making in all \$9,472,000, or an average of \$37,000 per mile. Assuming the Pembina Branch to cost \$1,500,000, this would make the entire cost of the road west of Lake Superior, including \$1,440,000 Canada Central subsidy, and \$100,000 Selkirk bridge, and \$300,000 construction, engineering to be 1,946 miles, \$89,002,000; while from Fort William to Nipissing, about 650 miles, at \$50,000 a mile, making \$32,500,000, or a total \$121,500,000. It will be observed that if we apply the figures as I have applied them, that is, calculating the expenditure west of Red River as it occurred, from Lake Superior to Selkirk, that it would be impossible to obtain the same description of road as to gradients, curvatures and construction, for less amounts than I have estimated. I am sure I am within the line in stating these figures, and that it will be impossible to construct anything that can be called a railroad, nothing else than a mere tramway for the amount now given, as the hon. gentleman says, by the Chief Engineer. It is quite possible to have a very steep grade and enable an engine to climb that grade with a very light load. In some places, on the Alps for instance, or the White Mountains, there is over

300 feet to the mile, but it is good for nothing but a mere tourist traffic. The road on the American Pacific in one place is about 150 feet to the mile, for a short distance, but they have to keep additional engine power at such places. I pointed out, a few evenings ago, the extreme desirability of having good grades, not merely for the purpose of obtaining the advantages of the kind I have mentioned, but for cheapening the traffic to be carried over the road. On the Canada Southern, the most favourable road we have as to grades, they are able to carry over forty loaded cars, and on our own Intercolonial, where the steepest grade is about sixty feet, and there are many between that and forty, we are not able to take quite twenty. The hon. gentleman said he thought that any grades sufficient on the Grand Trunk or Great Western ought to be sufficient for the Pacific. But it was one of the most fatal mistakes ever committed to have such excessive grades on those roads. It has already cost both companies millions. It would have been better if they had at first expended a large amount to obtain reasonably good grades. The hon. the Minister of Railways thinks it matters little what grades we had west of Winnipeg; he thinks any will suffice for the traffic. I observe that the Chief Engineer, with his usual caution, has very carefully refrained from speaking of this road as the Pacific Railway at all; he speaks of it as a colonisation road, and it is only that. If we are to build a Pacific Railway, we had better do it. If we are merely to build a line that jumps up and down hill, possessing no regard to grades and curves, nor to the traffic to be carried, let the fact be understood. It will be quite impossible, with a road of that description, to take a pound of traffic from beyond our boundaries. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. DeCosmos) adverted to the trade of San Francisco, and the only reason he could find for advocating a good port in British Columbia was, that grain would be brought there by the Railway and seek to be carried round Cape Horn. It would be very much cheaper to take the grain of the prairies to the east instead of to the west. There is no land in British Columbia that could justify the most sanguine in ever expecting its farm

produce to be exported to Britain. Up to the present it has not sustained itself in breadstuffs. It imports a very large amount from the western States, although some of the best of land is to be found in the delta of the Fraser. Still it has not been cultivated to such an extent as to supply their domestic wants. There is, therefore, no probability of any agricultural products ever being shipped from that Province to Britain. I might say no possibility.

MR. DECOSMOS: It shipped 150 tons of wheat to England last autumn; it went from my own district.

MR. MACKENZIE: There may be some change lately, but I know that up to this year there was not enough wheat grown in British Columbia to furnish flour for its people. I am glad there was a change lately.

MR. DECOSMOS: The agricultural, the lower portion of our Province, never devoted itself to growing corn; it never had mills to make flour; but under the changed condition of agricultural matters, the people are turning their attention to wheat-growing.

MR. MACKENZIE: The last Tables of Trade and Navigation show that the Province exported no breadstuffs, but imported between 4,000 and 5,000 barrels of flour. If there are private reports on the subject, we have not been furnished with them. My statement, then, taken from the public official information, was absolutely correct—that British Columbia, up to the 30th June last, exported no breadstuffs, but imported the amount stated. I propose to consider the proposal to build this road by the sale of lands. If the consent of this House is obtained to the Government proposition upon the faith of its obtaining the entire cost of the road, and a great deal more from the land sales, then hon. members will be deceived. I believe it is impossible to obtain the means in this way. I believe that in that vast western country there is an immense amount of the finest farming lands in the world. I believe that there, as in the Province of Ontario, there is an abundance of good land for an immense population, but I believe also that, as in Ontario, one-half the land is not suitable for cultivation. I believe that, while we have much rocky land in Ontario, much land that is

covered by water or swamps and that never will be available, in the North-West also there are swamps and water, and a vast amount of arid soil, which can never be made productive. What we have to do is to ascertain to what extent these arid plains, these swamps and reaches of uncultivable lands, are to be found in the North-West. I have no doubt a considerable portion of the land in districts that are utterly unfit for cultivation, will be of greater or less use as pasture lands, which can be made available, though very little that can really be farms. And so with the North-West Territory: there is a considerable portion of land which we must make allowance for, that will be of some use as pasture land, though of no use for other agricultural purposes. Now, we have a map laid before us by the hon. gentleman, and he has the parts coloured brown, which are said to be arid or barren in what is called the prairie section. He told the House, in his speech, that he estimated the amount of fertile lands within the belt at 150,000,000 acres, of which amount he estimates 30,000,000 acres to be barren. Now, I have examined these spots, which he has coloured brown; I measured them roughly, not having drawing instruments in my possession, but I think I measured them tolerably accurately, and the House will be surprised to learn that there are considerably under 9,000,000 of acres, instead of 30,000,000, showing how utterly unreliable is this map as a source of information. The hon. gentleman can measure it in his own office at his leisure—those dark spots upon his favourite sun—and he will find that they cover very little of the arid plain he himself admits to exist. Now, I have read almost everything I could lay my hands on about that country—books of travellers, the notes of surveyors, and the productions of men who examined the country many years ago, before a Railway to the Pacific was spoken of or contemplated, and I find a wonderful concurrence of testimony as to the existence of a very large extent of desert and arid country. Archbishop Taché, who knows, perhaps, that country better than almost any one else, has the following in respect to it:—

“Everybody has heard of the great American desert, but all may not know that it extends

MR. MACKENZIE.

into British possessions, passing the boundary at 100 west longitude, and 49 north latitude, then following a line more or less winding in a general north-westerly direction, passes still further towards the north, and bends again towards the northwest of 113 west longitude, and 52 north latitude, thus forming an area of at least 60,000 square miles. Here is a desert—an immense desert. It is not certainly moving sand, and quite dried up; but it is quite vain to think of forming considerable settlements upon it.”

I will not wait to give the Archbishop's description of the climate, except to say it is very severe. He estimates the prairie district cultivable lands at 60,000 square miles, equal to the desert country, or 38,400,000 acres of each, and adds that much of the good land “has not all the advantages attributed to it.” This is the opinion of Archbishop Taché. Mr. Fleming, quoting Mr. Macoun, Professor of Natural History at Belleville, and who has travelled over that country at the instance of the Government, in Sessional Paper, 1878, pages 89-90, points out that the entire quantity of arable land is about 80,000,000 acres. Sir William Palliser, in his travels in the North-West, arrives at precisely the same conclusion. He travelled over and surveyed a very large portion of the country, and gave us the only good map we have to this day. Colonel McLeod, who has been over the country, perhaps, more than any of our own strictly so-called officials, says:

“What is called the ‘barren lands’ of the United States extend into the North-West Territories, forming a triangle, of which, roughly speaking, the boundary line commencing forty miles from the mountains and extending to the Grand totéau of the Souris, forms the base. A line drawn from there to the elbow of the Saskatchewan, a little south of the 50th parallel and north-west of Fort Walsh, a side; and a line drawn from the last-mentioned point to the place of beginning, the other side.”

This gives nearly 30,000,000 of acres; but very much of the arid or barren lands extends north far beyond the 50th parallel, some of it beyond the 52nd parallel. Now, this belt that Colonel McLeod describes, covers in itself, as I have said, an area of something well on to 30,000,000 acres. It is not, of course, entirely desert, because there are patches, like an oasis in the desert, here and there, showing some signs of fertility and where some settlement is possible. Mr. Marcus Smith, in the very latest paper we have

from him, speaks in these general terms of another district through which the railway is made to pass from Livingston westward to the Pembina River, on the line of Railway, not more than one-half of the lands are fit for cultivation. This is a very strong expression of opinion from the Assistant Chief Engineer, who has passed over this country on several occasions, and who, from his own reports, and from the reports of his officers, must have a pretty intimate knowledge of the country. Now I propose to give, from official papers, a brief description of the whole of this tract of country, where the arid land is said to prevail. Hon. gentlemen who have the Paper 43, of 1879, will find the passages I propose to read, commencing at the 100° west longitude, some little distance west of Manitoba. [The hon. gentleman then read a series of extracts from the Sessional Papers of 1879, being Official Reports from Engineers, Surveyors, and others, to show the probable extent of the barren lands, showing that they extended north of the line of Railway in some places, and that saline and brackish lakes were to be found in many places, the desert sage in others, and alkaline dust in others.] I will not trouble the House with reading any more of these extracts. It will be observed, from what I have read, that the portion of country which exists so extensively in the western States, which makes Montana almost uninhabitable, which makes Nevada unhealthy and unproductive, which makes a great portion of Dakota unsuitable for agriculture, enters our North-West Territory, a little west of 100° west longitude, and gradually increases as it ascends northward and westward, extending northward over the land lying between the two branches of the Saskatchewan, almost to the junction of the rivers, and thence south-westward, to the boundary line near the mountains. This tract may be described as an arid, desert country, with occasional patches of good soil, of considerable extent and containing lands suitable for producing grasses. The quantity of good soil is variously estimated at from 38,000,000 acres to 60,000,000. It is impossible, after examining the official reports, to avoid coming to the conclusion, that something less than half the entire area

of the land is fertile; and, after deducting from the lands available for sale to settlers, all Hudson's Bay lands, free grants, Indian reserves, school lands, etc., it will be found that the hon. gentleman's calculations, as to the money to be realised from these lands, will be very wide of the mark. We know when we come to the Pembina River, we partially arrive at the end of the fertile lands. Mr. Smith says: a farm may be obtained here and there, west of that to the British Columbian boundary line. There is no doubt that there is as yet much that is unknown respecting the country I have so feebly endeavoured to describe, and we can only hope that further discoveries will prove that there are more valuable lands there than we now know of; but we can only make our calculations on what is known. From the description given, it will be found that the projected line passes through the land described as rich land, through the first two hundred miles west of Selkirk. Some hon. gentlemen in the House insisted always that the land on the located line, from Selkirk to Livingston, was a very wet country, with deep morasses, and that the telegraph poles sank deeply into the soil. It is undeniable that, until that country is drained, which borders on Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis, a large portion of the soil will not be available for settlement, although it may produce very good grasses or pastures. We have to deduct from the present availability of the lands, a considerable portion of what is even good soil, besides having to deduct the whole area of the lakes and rivers; and taking that into account, together with the description of soil given we necessarily—with every desire to come to a favourable conclusion—can come to no other conclusion, that not more than one-half can be counted available for settlement, even if it reaches that. Having thus satisfied myself—indeed, I do not require any additional information to satisfy myself—on this point, that it is impossible for the Government to build the road from the produce of the lands on the North-West, I have to consider what is the best course to be pursued. I have always held that whatever revenue is realised from the lands, will be absorbed, mainly in settlement and Governmental expenses, and that the money

must be contributed by the people of Canada, for the building of this Railway; that, therefore, any extravagant expenditure would simply involve us in an amount of debt such as we cannot venture to carry. The United States, at the present moment, notwithstanding their heavy debt, are in a better position than we are.

MR. PLUMB: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am glad to find that the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) agrees with me in that. In the year 1865, the actual amount of that debt, less cash in the Treasury, was 27,056 millions of dollars. In that year their debt represented an average amount per head of \$78.75, while the interest on the debt was at the rate of \$4.29 per head. In 1879 the debt itself was reduced, less cash in the Treasury, to something under \$2,000,000,000, while, by the increase of the population, and the decrease of the debt, the amount *per capita* was only \$40.42, and the interest, \$1.69 per head. We have now \$1.75 per head to pay for interest on our debt every year, and it is quite evident, when we pay one-fifth of the entire value of the goods we consumed in taxes, that we were not in a position to bear further taxation, and if the work were continued at the rate proposed by the Government, there will be no escape from further and immediate taxation. The hon. the Finance Minister has stated that he can get over this year by using the cash balances in his hands to the extent of six millions, and by issuing a certain amount of paper money. I have no confidence that the hon. gentleman will be able to float so large an amount as eight millions, floated more than what is now in circulation, and though he will get some aid from the banks, it must be borne in mind that that amount is obtained at the expense of the general business of the country. I have no hesitation in cordially agreeing with the proposition submitted by the hon. member for West Durham, because it involves no departure from the line we have adopted all along. We determined from the very first that we would limit and bind the expenditure by the capacity of the country to pay without imposing additional taxation. I have shown that we have expended money to the extent of

nearly nine millions over works which, by the Terms of Union, should have been built before now, and I have no hesitation in asking those who were interested in further expenditure upon this Railway, at the present time, to adopt the course that has been adopted in Ontario and Quebec, and wait patiently until circumstances enables us to prosecute the work. I believe that when the time comes to go on with the work in British Columbia, the first section to which money should be applied is that which the Government has recently placed under contract, because it will connect two systems of navigation, inland and seaward. The hon. gentlemen, of course, repudiate any intention of availing themselves of the water-stretches, but while we denounced one for suggesting that they were available in the east, he has himself favoured such a connecting link in the west. The hon. gentlemen opposite are good enough to charge the Opposition with lack of patriotism, lack of loyalty, and lack of devotion to the Empire. This is peculiarly noticeable in the hon. the Minister of Railways, who, with his friends, has frequently charged us, not only with being unpatriotic in the extreme, but even disloyal to the Throne. I attach very little importance to these assertions; it is an old trick of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I protest against any imputations of that kind. We are as much interested in the prosperity of this country as hon. gentlemen opposite. Our interests are all centred here, and anything that administers to the prosperity of the country administers to our own prosperity. Hon. gentlemen opposite, during the whole term of the late Administration, never ceased to accuse us of something like lack of patriotism. They never ceased to paint, in the blackest colours, the state of the country, and to represent that people were leaving it by thousands. It has been shown that during their term fewer people have left the country than during previous years, and that when they ceased to administer the affairs of the country, the exodus to the United States increased again. I will not follow the example of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and say that they wholly caused this state of things, but I will say this: that their commercial policy, their taxation policy,

MR. MACKENZIE.

and their imprudent expenditures, are all at this moment driving people out of the country at a speedier rate than they ever left this country before.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: To go to a country with higher taxation.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, not higher taxation, but with Protection. I claim that if there is a country where Protection may possibly exist without doing infinite harm to the people, the United States is that country. I deny that Protection has promoted the prosperity of the United States. That country has prospered in spite of Protection, and not because of it. Our present taxation is very heavy. In proportion to our means, our debt is even larger than that of the United States, and any increase of it at the present time would, in my opinion, be a very serious calamity to the country. The hon. the Minister of Finance and his leader has, on several occasions, endeavoured to picture the growing prosperity of the country at this moment, although they know that the present exodus, from this country, was never equalled, and although they know there is intense dissatisfaction, especially in the Lower Provinces, with the policy of the Government. The hon. gentleman seems to think that there is no alternative between the severance of the Union and the adoption of their Railway policy. Well, if the Union must be severed—if the east or west must be chosen—I would select that portion which contains the smallest number of people to be severed, for hon. gentlemen cannot shut their eyes to the fact that the people of the Lower Provinces are openly complaining that they have been deluded in joining in Confederation, that they have been cheated, by its terms and promises not being fulfilled. We, on this side of the House, would take our stand on the resistance of increased taxation, especially for purposes which can only benefit a very small number; and as it is impossible in our situation to adopt the policy of the Government, without increased taxation, there is nothing for it but to vote for delay in the more expensive and useless portions of the work, and those which will confer the least benefit to the people. I believe very much depends on the expression of public opinion in relation to this matter, and

while we shall all be glad if we are able to carry out in its entirety the Treaty o-called, the hon. gentleman opposite made, we must be content with carrying out as far as our means will permit, those portions of the Railway which were of most use to the greatest number of people. And with regard to the patriotism of this proposition, I maintain that that man alone is truly patriotic who looks beyond the present, who entrusts no one with unlimited power of taxation in order to carry on works which were of no immediate benefit to the great mass of the people, and which is opposed to the general sentiment. Why it is intolerable that nearly 4,000,000 of people who live on the eastern side of the Rocky Mountains should be taxed to such an enormous extent as they are now, and will be in future merely to keep up the appearance of complying with Terms which, in their strict interpretation cannot possibly be complied with. The late Government was bound by Parliamentary Resolutions, passed after the Terms of Union were agreed to, to the same extent as hon. gentlemen opposite and no more, and when accused of lack of patriotism or loyalty, I can only reply in the manner in which Burke met a similar accusation in the English House of Commons. Burke, when accused of disloyalty in opposing some measures of the Ministry, replied that: "He yielded to no man in his loyalty to the Queen, but he did not feel bound nor at all inclined to extend that feeling of loyalty to her Majesty's manservant, her maid-servant, her ox, nor her ass."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We have heard that before.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, I think I have had occasion to say that before, and to an audience, to some considerable extent, the same as the present one. The hon. gentleman was certainly present at the time, but he cannot have it repeated to him too often. The hon. gentleman and his party think they have a divine right to rule this country, and, not only that, but to say who shall and who shall not be ranked as patriots. As we believe every man in the country is not only entitled to express his opinion freely on all such matters, but will fail in duty if he does not do so, the sooner we have this question discussed on its busi-

ness and political merits the better, instead of accusing people of being actuated by motives they are constantly obliged to repudiate. I have endeavoured to meet the points in the speech of the hon. the Minister of Railways, who endeavoured to throw the blame of all mistakes and misdeeds on the late Administration, and then to show, by contrast, how much better the present had managed affairs; I have shown that, as to the chief points on which he claimed credit, he is entitled to none. The only point on which he is entitled to any credit, or discredit, is the new plan of degrading the Railway into a track that will not be fit for heavy traffic—for adopting a plan not at first contemplated, and which, though it will be of material advantage, running 200 miles into the prairie country, of which I doubt the wisdom. I thank the House for the patience with which it has heard me, one of my objects being to describe the country, including the desert, and show its capacity for sustaining a large population, in which our whole principle of action depends. If it has that capacity, the Railway will the sooner pay. If the quantity of good land is not comparatively very great, then I think the calculations of the hon. the Minister of Railways will fail, although we shall still have a very large emigration into the country. But it must enter gradually. It is impossible to expect the vast numbers to reach that country in the time predicted by hon. gentlemen opposite. It will be difficult to procure the settlement of some parts of it under any circumstances. I can only hope that hon. members will decide on this question dispassionately, and after consulting the authorities on the various points raised. Hon. gentlemen opposite, no doubt, calculate upon their majority, as usual, but the majority in cases where a moral wrong is committed will not always adhere. I am satisfied that the opinion of the country generally, in this matter, is thoroughly with the course we pursue in asking for a postponement of the work to a great extent, the cost of which will be so great while promising, immediately, so little result.

MR. PLUMB: The attention of the House and country has been painfully drawn, within the last four or five days, to the important discussion proceeding in

this House. We were prepared for a very able review of the fiscal history and policy of the country by the notice given by the hon. member for West Durham, and the expectations of the House and public have been in some degree justified by the elaborate manner in which that hon. gentleman has treated the great questions reviewed by him. He has made a speech which must be regarded, in connection with that of the hon. member for Lambton, as the *pronouncement* of the fragment of the party which they lead and represent. The hon. member for West Durham has been distinguished by his erratic course. He first joined the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton, being for a time a Minister without a portfolio. Then the hon. gentleman quitted the Government, and re-entered it, remaining until it was overthrown.

MR. BLAKE: No.

MR. PLUMB: He continued to be a member of the late Government at least until the last Session, in which it was dominant, was over—an erratic and uncertain coadjutor, first without portfolio, then after sitting one Session on the back benches, he re-entered it in succession to Mr. Fournier, as Minister of Justice, then again, taking the chair left vacant by his colleague, Mr. Cauchon, he gave up the Department of Justice to another colleague, Mr. Laflamme. The hon. gentleman went in and out and shuffled about so many times that it is difficult to follow his movements. His last utterance on a public platform during the election campaign was at Teeswater, in his then constituency of South Bruce, when the country was anxiously waiting to hear him defend the Administration of which he was a member. His friends were greatly disappointed. He scarcely referred to the issues of the campaign so far as they turned upon the acts of his Government, and his and half-hearted support of his associates was their implied condemnation. He did not fail, however, to deal most minutely with matters connected with his own Department of Justice, claiming great credit for having achieved, without difficulty, what his predecessor (Sir John A. Macdonald) had failed to accomplish—for having cleared up accumulations of business left on his hands, I infer, by Messrs. Dorion and Fournier,

who had gone to their reward on the Bench where electors cease from troubling, for having despatched promptly and with ease the ever-increasing business of the Department; and yet, at the following Session, the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to support a measure of his Government for the division of the Department, and the new appointment of an Attorney-General at a salary of \$7,000 a year, on the ground that the labour was too heavy for one chief officer. At the Teeswater meeting it was noted that the hon. gentleman was very lukewarm in justifying the course pursued by his colleagues. He was amply able, if he had so chosen, to find arguments, whether sound or otherwise, for the defence of the Government of which he had been a member; but though he failed to do so, the public has always held him responsible, and will always hold him responsible, for the whole course of the Administration of which he formed a part. We have heard for the first time, now, the conditions upon which he says he took office under the hon. gentleman who led the late Government (Mr. Mackenzie). The chief characteristics of the hon. gentleman's political career are its capricious inconsistency and its utter inconsistency. At one moment, "letting I dare not wait upon I would," he refuses a seat in the Government; at another, he accepts a position befitting his professional standing; at another, retires from it to a comparative sinecure made vacant by the promotion of a colleague whose presence was a perpetual reminder of unsavory transactions, while his own place was filled by an arrangement for which he is directly responsible, and which ought to have received his indignant opposition. The hon. gentleman says he retired, but he carried with him the responsibilities of which he cannot rid himself, complicity with every act of which he had been cognisant while he remained in office. We were then told that the hon. gentleman intended to withdraw from political life. He doubtless knew far better than we did the sins which he would be called upon to justify if he remained. The anxious electors of South Bruce sent urgent delegations to him urging him to accept re-nomination, and he at last, when they brought him a requisition having a

formidable array of signatures, "vowing he would ne'er consent, consented," but wisely left his supporters to fight the battle while he turned his back upon the campaign and remained absent from the country until the elections were over and his own signal defeat had been secured. Again he coquetted, month after month, with those of his party—and they were not by any means the whole of his party—who desired to bring him back to the present Parliament, one Session of which had been held without his presence. When it was announced last autumn that the retirement of Mr. Burke had been arranged, and that the hon. gentleman would accept the nomination for West Durham, we waited with much curiosity to hear what ground he would take in the platform for his canvass. We expected to hear additional theories, unsubstantial as those of the Aurora declarations, and perhaps more startling and disturbing, for at one time he appears as the advocate of radical changes in our political system, involving a progress which is almost revolutionary, and which many less ardent but perhaps more sincere and practical levellers deem dangerous. At other times, as we have just now heard, he calls upon us suddenly to halt in the midst of our career, to make a swift retreat and entrench ourselves behind the dismantled and decaying fortress of 1871, a retreat that would involve the abandonment and surrender of all the great advantages we have gained since that period. When, however, at West Durham he proclaimed his platform, we were surprised to find that part of his speech—and a very large part of it was—which bore upon the National Policy, was made up of stale quotations from the *Globe*—was in fact an argument prepared apparently out of the threadbare editorial articles of that paper. He entered Parliament and took a seat on the back benches with ostentatious humility. He has shown that he is not to be contented with that position. He has now placed himself in such an attitude that his utterances must be dealt with as of a party character, and it is almost distressing to see the manner in which his late colleague, and I may now say his late leader, the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), humbly takes up his argument, and even goes further than the hon. gen-

tleman himself in decrying the ability of the country to build the Pacific Railway, which was the gravamen of that hon. gentleman's argument. I followed him (Mr. Mackenzie) through a great part of his speech with surprise and deep regret, as I have no doubt did many other hon. gentlemen who noted its tone and spirit. There has been nothing said or done in the House so well calculated to dishearten and discourage this country as the remarks of both those gentlemen. The speech of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) especially, was a funeral dirge from beginning to end—a doleful sound from the tombs—a wail over the lost Israel of power—a Jeremiah, like the lamentations of the Hebrew Prophet whose name has become an adjective. He warned us we were going too fast, that we had no justification for claiming that we were making healthy progress; that this country could offer no attractive inducements for emigrants; that the Teutonic races were led to form settlements in the United States by common political sympathies and Democratic sentiments: that the Celtic expatriation was always towards the great Republic, which heard and responded to the appeals of down-trodden Ireland, and that the expatriation would now be checked by reason of the change in the Imperial Government, in the "so-called United Empire,"—and we marked the sarcastic, sneering emphasis with which he pronounced these words—and we might hope through that change for the sunburst of Home Rule, and for the resulting justice so long denied or delayed. He said we had practically nothing to look for to take up our vacant lands except the immigration of a few English tenant farmers, who would be attracted to the Dominion by similarity of institutions and political sympathies; that there was no hope for us except in immediately reversing our whole policy; that otherwise the country could not possibly meet its pecuniary engagements, or sustain the burthens which could not be thrown off. But the hon. member for West Durham did not utter warnings of this kind during the five years of the rule during which he sanctioned by his presence on the Treasury Benches the diastrous depletion of the Treasury, the reckless increase in

Departmental expenditure, and the extravagant and blundering Railway policy of a Reform Government that had nothing to reform except their own mal-administration. During the great depression under which the country was suffering in that trying period, when the colleagues with whom he was associated were proceeding with the extravagant schemes he now denounces—were engaged in expensive enterprises of which they have thrown upon the present Government the necessity of carrying forward—building railways, opening up new territory, and increasing in every manner, which the hon. member for West Durham now eloquently condemns, the Public Debt, while the Treasury suffered from increasing deficits, for which no provision was suggested by the hon. gentleman, or by his immediately culpable colleagues, he did not lift up his voice of warning. He did not take the position he now assumes, though there was a greater reason for it then. He allowed his friends to go on and deplete the Treasury; he saw the House filled with contractors, yet never uttered a word in denunciation of that iniquitous system by which the late Administration disgraced the country. He was a consenting party to everything done by it, and it does not become him or anyone on his side to hint at an exploded thread-bare scandal, when they have proven scandals of their own of ten times its magnitude. In his attack upon a sister Province he spoke of the madness of throwing our gold into the canyons of British Columbia; he charged us with squandering the public money in the undertaking of the construction of the railway line along the Fraser, an undertaking we feel ourselves bound in honour and good faith to proceed with. For the first time I heard in this House, during this debate, that there was never any sincere intention on the part of the gentlemen on the opposite side to build any portion of the Railway in British Columbia. I supposed that when they accepted the Carnarvon Award—when they introduced the Bill to sanction the construction of the Nanaimo and Esquimalt line, and especially, latterly, when they transported the rails provided for that line to a convenient point on the main land, and drew attention to the fact as an earnest of their good faith, they in-

tended in all honour to carry out the scheme agreed upon. That agreement was ratified time after time by the House, and while the Carnarvon Terms were accepted, the hon. gentlemen were so intent upon fulfilling them that they left out the proviso in respect to increase of taxation, which had been adopted in all previous legislation, and, it is said that the resolution offering that reservation was an afterthought of the hon. member for West Durham, who put it in the hands of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) by whom it was moved several days after the debate on and acceptance of the Carnarvon Terms, in a speech in which that hon. member propounded the doctrine that emigration into the North-West must precede railway construction. I can scarcely undertake to follow the hon. member for West Durham in his five or six hours' speech. In the array of figures that he produced during his treatment of the financial branch of his argument, I think I recognised a practised hand, one that can make figures assist an argument on one side as well as on another. The hon. gentleman from West Durham himself used them as a pleader handles a brief on which he must make an argument, before he has time to study it. It was evident that his forte was not statistics compiled from the Public Accounts, and in deductions therefrom he was evidently at sea. The state of things which my hon. friend has brought forward does not prove his case. It is useless to say that this country is not in a state in which we may look for progress and improvement. If there has been no satisfactory progress attained since 1873, we all know where the responsibility belongs. It does not belong to the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who have honestly endeavoured to promote the public welfare, but it lies upon those who, from the moment of their accession to power in 1873, whether on the Treasury Benches or in opposition, have endeavoured in every possible way to alarm capitalists and prevent them from investing their money in undertakings which would enhance the prosperity of the country. My hon. friend complained a little while ago that we charged him with being unpatriotic. I say the charge is a general one against his side of the House, although I

regret to say that the chief offender of all, because I believe he sins against light and knowledge, is the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), whose utterances are still ringing in our ears. It is painful to hear what that hon. gentleman has said of the state of affairs in this country, and it would be still more painful to hear it if we did not know that it was but a mere figment of his bilious imagination. It is more than two years ago since the late hon. Finance Minister jauntily predicted, from his place in this House, that the culminating point in our commercial depression had been reached. That hon. gentleman, when it suited him, could speak as cheerily about the prospects of the country as any one upon this side of the House. But he wished merely to cover his shortcomings; he had no actual knowledge that the time had come when the depression was to pass away. But that hon. gentleman never tired of pointing out the condition of the United States as an example to be shunned. He told us that that highly protected country, having committed suicide by adopting a protective system, was in a state of fiscal ruin, from which it could never recover. Now the tune is entirely changed. Consistency cannot be expected from desperate partisans, and I was not surprised to hear the hon. member for West Durham lauding the United States, and quoting it as an example of prosperity which we could not hope to reach, or even approach. But when I ventured, as I thought I might, to ask him whether that country which he was so highly lauding, was not a highly protected country, the hon. gentleman, instead of answering me candidly, put his hand upon his heart, and said he was too feeble to be interrupted, and trusted he would not question him and allow him to go to the end of his speech with interpellation. I have always endeavoured to treat that hon. gentleman with the courtesy to which I think every hon. gentleman has a right. I refrained, therefore, from pressing for a reply, although I believe that the interpellation had its effect, and will take a place in the official reports as a parenthesis in the hon. gentleman's speech, and be, perhaps, a small antidote to a great bane. My hon. friend said there was a large increase of population in the United States. He

must remember that the system of exclusive protection was initiated in that country in 1861, when the Morrill Tariff was passed, and the great increase of population and the rapid growth of prosperity to which he refers, notwithstanding the civil war, dates from that period. But the hon. gentleman did not state half the case when he gave the quantity of the sales of land that had been made in the Western States, and built upon it an argument against the calculation of the Premier. He then only stated the sales the Government had made, which are not, I venture to say, although I have not made the calculation, 10 per cent. of the entire sales. The great sales of lands in that country have been made by railway corporations holding enormous grants of the public lands under the very system we propose to adopt here, that of building railways in advance of settlement, and trusting to their sale of lands to recoup the outlay. The railways of the Western States preceded the influx of population which the hon. gentleman emphasises, and acted as potent colonising agents. Kansas, which the hon. member has specially referred to, would be nothing without the great railways which run through it. It was by a combination of railway charters, with land grants, that the Western States had been built up, and have increased so rapidly in population. Northern Missouri and Illinois were largely populated by such means, and Illinois was one of the first which felt the influence of that system. The Illinois Central Railway was greatly instrumental in filling that State with inhabitants, and giving it wealth and power. Now, we have proposed to take a leaf out of the book of that country, which my hon. friend says is so prosperous, and which, under his commendations, we may, perhaps, venture to imitate. Why should not the same system prove successful here that has proved so successful there? What have they got which we have not? What advantages have the North Western States which our own North Western Territories have not? The whole argument of the hon. gentleman opposite is that our country does not present advantages to intending emigrants which are presented by the States upon the borders of

Manitoba and southward, including Texas; that owing to the difficulty of transport of supplies, absence of markets, isolation, and many other objections, with which we have been made familiar, emigrants will not be induced to take up our lands, that the climate is inhospitable and last and worst, that the system adopted by the Government is calculated to deter actual settlers, and throw the lands into the hands of speculators. It is claimed by the hon. gentlemen opposite that the experience of the Western States confirms their provisions. I think they are greatly mistaken. We have seen that the great Railway which extends from the Missouri to the Pacific Ocean has been built by private enterprise. Notwithstanding the enormous sums spent upon it, there has never been a day in which the bonds of the California Central Railway have below par, even in the greatest period of depression. We are told now that we must halt after having expended millions on our Pacific Railway, after having fully committed ourselves and the country to the great enterprise, although we believe we are fully in accord with public sentiment in the course we are pursuing, and that the country reposes full confidence in the wisdom and prudence of our leaders in respect to the rate at which the work shall proceed, although we feel assured that the task can be accomplished without permanently, or presently increasing the public burdens. My hon. friend from West Durham presents his budget to the House containing a dismal, but, I fear, not a candid array of statistics, and demands that we shall abandon a scheme which the Government of which he was a member, equally with that which I support, are bound to fulfil. Nothing can be imagined which would be more detrimental to the interests of this country than the acceptance of this proposition. I undertake to say that, if the policy he urges were adopted, our securities in the English market would immediately fall, and continue to decline in price. To adopt that policy would be a confession of judgment, and we should soon see the effects of it. The hon. gentleman is trifling with the best interests of this country when he proposes to go back upon our word in regard to that great undertaking. I have never advocated going on with it.

n such a way as to press unduly upon the tax-payers of this country. But the first act of the hon. gentleman and his friends, when they came into office, was to increase the taxation by a sum declared by the late Finance Minister to be \$3,000,000. It is useless for them to say it was because there were other obligations resting on the country than that of building the Pacific Railway which were to be thus provided for. It can be shown that money raised under the Tariff of 1874 was spent in the abortive Pacific Railway schemes of the late Government, contrary to the solemn pledges of Parliament. I was surprised at the disingenuousness of the manner in which the hon. member for West Durham brought before the House the charge—so often repeated and never substantiated—that there was something culpable in the increase of the expenditure of ten millions in 1874, as compared with 1867. I took the pains to examine every item of the increased expenditure; I produced them here, and challenged our friends opposite to show where there had been an increase in any one of them which was not necessary and justifiable. I pointed out that there had been no objection made to them at the time by any member of the then Opposition. I asserted, without contradiction, that nearly a million of dollars of the expenditure, properly chargeable to 1875, was fraudulently thrown upon that of 1874. The hon. gentleman instituted a comparison between the expenditures of 1871 and 1874.

MR. BLAKE: I made no such comparison.

MR. PLUMB: My hon. friend will not interrupt me, because I claim the same privilege that he did. I say fraudulently, in a political sense; and I say that the hon. gentleman can easily be shown that the growth of the country—her recognised obligations and her necessary duties, to say nothing of her best policy—absolutely forbids and makes it impossible for her to go back to the scale of expenditure of 1871, which he urges, as one that should be adopted. And I defy my hon. friend to take up item by item of the increased expenditure, which he so strongly condemns, and show a single instance, up to 1872, to which there was any objection made at all. In the spring of 1873, I acknowledge that the

hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) did make a feeble criticism of the Budget of my hon friend then, and now the Finance Minister. He had previously confined his financial criticisms to a few feeble utterances upon the Militia Estimates. In 1872, it will be remembered, the *Globe* newspaper denounced that eminent financier as a mixer and muddler of figures, and violently opposed his election; but my hon. friend from West Durham accepted him as a colleague holding the portfolio of Finance, in 1873; and is from that time responsible for every act which he sanctioned by remaining in office. Between 1867 and 1874, every item of expenditure had been made necessary by circumstances and obligations connected with the Union of the Provinces and the extension of our territory; and I defy the hon. gentleman to point to a single item of expenditure which has not been accepted and continued by the Administration which succeeded the Government overthrown in 1873. They were entirely untrammelled when they came into power—and I would ask: Why did they not cut off that expenditure; why did they not reduce that expenditure; why did they not fulfil their loud-mouthed promises of economy and retrenchment? We may admit, for argument's sake, that they were bound by the Pacific Railway agreements with British Columbia, although my hon. friend argues that they were not. But why did they go on with that expenditure, as a Government work, when, as is asserted on the other side of the House, our scheme had failed? Why did they make the obligations larger year by year? Why did they at the outset throw away immense sums on useless telegraph lines, long before the railway line, to which they were to be an adjunct, had been located or even surveyed? I defy my hon. friend from West Durham to answer those questions satisfactorily. I would like my hon. friend to explain whether he and his colleagues in one single instance reduced, without injury to the country, one single item of the expenditure which they assert had been so reckless, so extravagant, and so corrupt. When those hon. gentlemen came into power, they found an overflowing Treasury. They found that there had been a large surplus year by year, notwithstanding

a heavy remission of taxes, in taking off the duty on tea and coffee, during the Administration that held power from the time of Confederation till 1873. During that time over \$10,000,000 out of the surplus Revenues had been spent in public works, properly chargeable to Capital Account; and there was no deficit impending when they took the keys of the public chest. There could not have been a deficit in that year or the next. Upon meeting, in the spring of 1873, the Parliament, which had been elected the previous summer, my hon. friend (Sir Samuel L. Tilley), then as now the Finance Minister, stated that engagements which had been and would be entered into would probably involve an ultimate necessity for increased taxation. He said that the Revenue for the coming year would be sufficient for all purposes and leave a moderate surplus, but that he would probably find it necessary to deal with the Tariff at the next Session, and that when he did so he should keep in view the protection of our home industries, and promote the interests of this country in that direction as far as practicable. He was succeeded by the hon. the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), who, it is well known, commenced his career by denouncing his predecessors in the most violent terms, by grossly overstating and misstating the extent and character of the obligations under which they had placed the country. He roundly asserted that the Pacific Railway they had undertaken to construct would cost the country more than \$150,000,000; that they left above \$131,000,000 to provide for; that it would create a greater public debt, in proportion to our resources and population, than the National Debt of England; and that they had left upon him \$131,000,000 of obligations which, poor man, he had to provide for—but he added that he was fully equal to the task. He painted everything in the blackest colours, he stated that the country had been ruined by the extravagance of the Ministry that had just then retired. The hon. gentleman then increased, or permitted the increase, of the public expenditure in every possible form. He piled deficit on deficit, he made no provision for those deficits, except a notable suggestion that the yearly contributions to Sinking Fund should not

be charged against the yearly expenditure on income account, and when he went out of office, the necessity devolved on my hon. friend of providing for them. I have not heard my hon. friend from West Durham, during the course of his long and exhaustive oration, touch at all upon any plan which he would have proposed to bring forward to relieve the country from the burdens which had been thrown upon it by the gentleman with whom he has been associated for five years. The hon. gentleman is a special pleader. He takes his pleas from his brief with great ingenuity, energy and eloquence, but after all it is nothing but special pleading. Every one who listened to the hon. gentleman during the whole of his oration, felt that he was endeavouring to present from his point of view, arguments, not as a statesman, not as [the rising hope of a great party, to whom the young men of Canada at one time looked for better things, but as a pleader of a special case, for a special purpose, which every man who listened to him felt was nothing more nor less than the word of a trained advocate, and an ingenious hair-splitting counsel. The speech of the hon. gentleman gives us the *raison d'être* of his again coming in the flesh among men, and claiming to take a part in the affairs which he affected to have done with forever. Less than a year ago he described himself as a ghost revising the earth whose interests he has ceased to interfere with. But the hon. gentleman soon tired of playing the rôle of a wandering spirit cut off from his familiar associations and ambitions, and he comes, like Banquo, with twenty mortal speeches in his mouth, to push his late leader from his stool and usurp his place. The hon. gentleman's temper is too excitable, and his nature is too imperious and arbitrary, and his organisation is too nervous to bear the brunt and stress which must be borne by a party leader, especially the leader of a forlorn hope, disorganised and demoralised like that which now confronts us and is not at unity with itself. The hon. gentleman could not refrain from a malignant attack upon the sister Provinces in his denunciation of the policy by which they have been misled into Confederation. According to him each one has been guilty of a lapse of virtue which is little better than

shameless prostitution. Nova Scotia was secretly bribed, and then, half reluctant, forced into consent. A disgraceful bargain seduced Quebec. New Brunswick sold her wares in the market and pocketed the price of her dishonour. Prince Edward Island yielded to the tempter and fell. Even weak Manitoba made some show of resistance, which was but coyness, and became an easy, if not a willing victim; but the crowning shame was the foul bargain with British Columbia, which was made, according to the hon. gentleman, "on the first day of April, 1871," "fitting day for fitting deed." Do we understand the hon. gentleman, that he considers the bargains, if such they are, of a nature that they should now be repudiated, or is he willing to abide by a wrong, provided he can rule the destinies of a Union which he so eloquently denounces. To go back to 1871 would be to cast off British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, and disfranchise Manitoba and the North-West. Is it part of the hon. gentleman's programme, one of the issues of his new departure, to untwine the bonds that unite the Provinces? The studied effort to sow discontent among them would seem like it, but it is impossible to measure the depth or height of the hon. gentleman's arguments. As he said at Aurora, he is always fond of making disturbing speeches, and he is also always "ill at ease," and "linguishes for the purple mists" of chimeras which every one but a vague political dreamer knows to be unsubstantial and unattainable. His gloomy utterances might have found some response when our community were bowed down by the disasters through which we were passing three or four years ago, and the bravest held his breath while the financial tornado and hurricane was at its height, but now he is as one born out of due time. There is a hopeful feeling, a spirit of enterprise abroad, and the instincts of a young, energetic country are entirely antagonistic to his sepulchral doctrines. The hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) has just told us that when he came into power, he found that the negotiations of Sir Hugh Allan and his co-directors, in respect to obtaining means for building the Pacific Railway under the charter that they held, had wholly failed, but that his Gov-

ernment, recognized that they were the trustees of the preceding Government and of the people, in so far as the agreement to construct the road was concerned. They were, however, free from the trammels of any previous legislation in respect to the manner of constructing the road, and they chose to undertake it as Government work. My hon. friend is never tired of repeating, both here and elsewhere, that when he brought down the Pacific Railway Resolutions in 1874, they were passed without an amendment having been proposed, without the change, as he said on one occasion, "of the dotting of an 'i' or the crossing of a 't.'" The hon. gentleman was then backed by an enormous, unreasoning, over-bearing, mechanical majority. When the hon. gentleman brought down his Resolutions, they were rushed through at a late hour. At three o'clock in the morning the debate was choked off ruthlessly, and there are gentlemen now present sitting in this House to-day who know that when the hon. gentleman stated that no amendment was offered to those Resolutions, either his memory was treacherous or he intentionally stated that which was not the case. The hon. gentleman, if he will look at the Votes and Proceedings of that day—I have them here—will find there were three amendments proposed, one by the hon. member for Frontenac and two by the hon. member for Vancouver. They were voted down, of course, by the large majority that sat behind the hon. gentleman, ready at all times to submit to his dictum. The hon. gentleman, in the course of the next Session—early in 1875—laid on the Table of the House two Pacific Railway contracts: One for No. 13, being for grading and bridging the then contemplated line from Fort William Town Plot to Shebandowan westward, forty-five miles, for \$406,904; one for section 14, from Selkirk, on Red River, to Cross Lake eastward, seventy-seven miles, for \$402,950. In the summer of 1876 he entered into Contract No. 25 for Section 25, from Sunshine Creek, where No. 13 was terminated, to English River, eighty miles, and for ballasting and track-laying from Fort William to English River, 112½ miles, for \$1,037,061; and in January, 1877, for No. 15, from Cross Lake to Keewatin, 38½ miles, including

ballasting and track-laying of No. 14 and No. 15, for \$1,594,486. When asking the House to sanction the contracts for Sections 13 and 14, he, at the same time, asked authority to let Section 15, from Cross Lake to Keewatin, and some discussion arose between the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) and the hon. the present Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) who said :

“The statement made by the Premier (Mr. Mackenzie) afforded one of the most apt and forcible illustrations of the un-wisdom of undertaking to let contracts without any such surveys as would put contractors in a position to know anything like the amount of work required to be performed.”

Mr. Mackenzie said in reply :

“It so happened that a most elaborate survey had been made of this section. It would be impossible to have a more careful survey, or closer examination, than had been made in these thirty-seven miles. There had been no such survey on the Intercolonial.”

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) now makes the disingenuous statement that he let the contracts upon the surveys which had been made by his predecessors, but he knows perfectly well that the line was not fixed upon to Kaministiquia in preference to the Nepigon, until after he came to power, therefore, there could have been no close survey previously of the line which he adopted. The Fort William Town Plot had not previously been a make-weight in determining the terminus. Mr. Fleming has stated, in his evidence before a Committee investigating the letting of the contracts, that, when the line from Fort William to Shebandowan was put under contract, they did not know where they were going, and it turned out, in fact, that they did not go to Shebandowan at all, and we have, in evidence taken before that Committee, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, that it was found impossible to get a practicable line to Shebandowan. When the contracts were let, Mr. Fleming, if he was a party to them at all, was acting under the direction of the hon. gentleman ; and I must say that I never heard anything on the floor of this House more unfair and ungenerous in its character than an attack the hon. gentleman made on his Chief Engineer to-day, in the desperate hope of screening himself. It was in evidence that the contracts were let without the

most elementary knowledge of the line ; that they were let upon bills of works containing specific quantities, which were merely guess work, not ascertained by actual survey, but made up here in Ottawa ; that no survey whatever had been made, not even a trial line, on Section 14 ; that Section 13 had been let when the engineers did not even know where the line was to run ; that the elaborate and exhaustive survey of Section 15 was a line run by eye and compass only, by Mr. Carre, who says that no mortal man—upon the data he had thus obtained, the only data that the quantities were based upon—could have given an idea of the cost. Mr. Fleming says that Section 13 was not thoroughly surveyed before letting ; that “it was done hurriedly,” and that he “represented to the Minister that the quantities given had no pretensions to accuracy as to the final cost of the line, and were simply a means of comparing tenders.” When the work was let, he says, “we did not know where we were going to.” The whole thing, he tells us, was done hurriedly in the office at headquarters, simply upon the rough profile furnished by the engineer in charge. The men who were taken up by the contractors to work on Section 13 were kept for some time idle, while the engineers were locating the line ; and the contractors were paid by the Government for the lost time. The engineers arrived on Section 14 to make the survey, when the contractors, who had taken the work, went up to commence operations. As to Section 15, we have seen that the survey was simply a trial line, and it turns out that the surveys of Section 25 were in no better state for letting contracts. The results are that the quantities in some cases are enormously increased, and in others suspiciously reduced ; that, in all cases, the cost of the four Sections, which was emphatically stated by the hon. gentleman to be \$24,500 a mile, or half that of the Intercolonial, is so enormously increased that it will reach \$40,000 a mile ; that that increase took place under the hon. gentleman’s Administration, and must have been, or ought to have been, known to him when he repeated his statement as to the cost ; and it must have been known to him that he had no authority from Mr. Fleming to make such a statement upon the

hypothetical amounts of the contracts. These remarks apply with directness to Sections 13, 14, and 25. As to Section 15, the hon. gentleman claimed that elaborate and exhaustive surveys had been made, but the hon. gentleman must have had, or ought to have had, some evidence of those surveys before he made the positive statements in the House in 1875. Where is the record? We have seen that nothing can be more fallacious. Important engagements, committing the country to termini at Fort William and at Selkirk, the former involving a flagrant job, and the latter, at least, a costly blunder that has cost the country, as we are told by Mr. Carre, the Division Engineer, \$360,000, from fault of location alone, and contracts hurriedly let on imaginary quantities, were made by the hon. member for Lambton, who was the responsible Minister; and no one who knows the hon. gentleman will believe for a moment that he was not wholly responsible for all those lettings, and that he was not, or ought not to have been fully cognisant of the state of the surveys upon a line that he had himself fixed upon. It is of no avail whatever for that hon. gentleman to attack his Chief Engineer for errors, or worse, for which I believe the country will justly hold him entirely responsible. In Contract 13, taken at \$406,494, but part of the work was done, but in that the ratio of cost was considerably exceeded. Contract 14 was for \$402,950; the work executed under it amounted to \$722,264. Contract 25 was for \$1,037,061; the work executed under it amounted to \$1,384,639. Contract 15 was for \$1,594,085; the estimated cost up to January, 1879, was \$2,525,000. In all these cases certain quantities stated on the contracts were enormously increased. In Contract 25, for instance, the earth excavation, at 33c. a yard, was increased from 1,000,000 to 1,950,000 cubic yards. In Contract 15 the earth excavation was increased from 80,000 yards, at 37c. a yard, to 1,657,000 yards, and it is said that there will be a further increase of 1,300,000 yards. There was a radical change in the plan of executing Section 15, dispensing with trestle-work and substituting rock and earth. This change took place in the summer of 1878. An attempt was made to lead the Committee to believe that the change was

not made upon Mr. Rowan's return from Ottawa at that time, but the evidence in the Committees of the House and Senate prove otherwise. There had been three sets of tenders prepared and advertised for on Section 15. The final advertisement was made for September, 1876. The plan was to construct the fillings of the hollows with trestle-work—to have no earth-work except the stripping of the rocks. Strange to say, this would involve the use upon the line of a stretch of nearly fifteen miles of timber of a size that the country could not furnish. When the lettings were made, and, in fact, when the tenders were advertised for, it will be found that Mr. Fleming was not in Canada. Mr. Marcus Smith, Acting Chief Engineer, was in the West, and he telegraphed the hon. member for Lambton from Winnipeg, after the bids were opened, if the contract had not been let, to wait till his return. This, however, did not suit the hon. gentleman. The tenders were received—twenty-one of them—that of A. P. Macdonald and Company, for \$1,443,175, was the lowest. They were notified to undertake the work, and arrangements were made by them for executing the contract and furnishing the security; but they heard while their arrangements were pending, that two years' extension of time for finishing Contract 14 had been given. Their contract included laying track over that section, and its completion within the time first agreed on was necessary in order to enable Macdonald and Company to get in supplies to Section 15. The contractors for Section 14 were Sifton, Ward and Company, of Petrolia—staunch friends of the hon. gentleman—and I have good reason to believe that the extension was made when it was found that the bid of A. P. Macdonald and Company was the successful one.

MR. MACKENZIE: No such thing.

MR. PLUMB: I do not accept the hon. gentleman's "no such thing," for I rather think that, if the matter came to the test, that I could prove it.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, prove it.

MR. PLUMB: Messrs. A. P. Macdonald and Company contracted under the impression that the Government would hold Sifton, Ward and Company to the completion of the contract within the

specified time. They wrote to the Department stating what they had heard, and said that the prices at which they had tendered were based upon the supposition that Sifton, Ward and Company's contract would be finished in time to enable Macdonald and Company to lay the track over Section 14 by August, 1877. They conclude by asking if such an extension had been granted, and say: "It would be imprudent for us to enter into the contract unless we were put in possession of the advantages which the specifications and forms of tender led us to believe and base our calculations upon." What was the answer to that reasonable request? We must bear in mind that this tender of A. P. Macdonald and Company was that of a perfectly responsible firm, whose contract anybody, acting in his own private interest or having the public interest solely at heart, would have been anxious to secure. The Government gave no satisfactory explanation whatever. Mr. Braun briefly requests them to execute the contract immediately. Messrs. A. P. Macdonald and Company reply:

"MONTREAL, 16th October, 1876.

"SIR,—In reply to your communication of the 14th instant, we beg to state that we cannot enter into contract for Sections 14 and 15 Canadian Pacific Railway, on account of reasons stated in our letter of the 13th instant.

"We therefore most respectfully decline to sign said contract, but beg to add that if the hon. the Minister of Public Works should see fit to change his decision we would most gladly enter into contract.

"We have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servants,

(Signed) "A. P. MACDONALD,

" "ROBERT KANE.

"F. BRAUN, Esq.,

"Secretary Public Works Department,

"Ottawa."

Martin, Charlton and Company were the next lowest bidders; the amount of their tender was \$1,540,000, nearly a hundred thousand dollars more, it must be noticed, than that of A. P. Macdonald and Company, whose bid was warned off. The next award was to them. Mr. Charlton seems to have been the negotiator, and he spent several weeks in offering securities of different kinds for the fulfilment. It would not be unfair to say, to obtain delay, that for some purpose or other, seemed

to be his chief object. While an active correspondence is going on between him and the Department, another actor suddenly appears, no other than Mr. Joseph Whitehead, whose characteristic letter to the hon. member for Lambton I will give in full:

"OTTAWA, November 28th, 1876.

"DEAR SIR,—It is the general impression outside that you are going to give the contract, Section 15, to Charlton and Company, and he is going to turn the contract over into the hands of some Americans from New York, and according to the feeling, you are going to make a great mistake if you allow such a thing to be done, as it is well known that Charlton says that he never intended to put a spade into the contract, Section 15; he only wants to make some money out of it, the same way he did out of the Grenville Canal, when he sold out to Cooke and Jones, and got six thousand dollars.

"Now, if you will give the contract, Section 15, to Sutton and Thompson's tender, I will guarantee that the grading, track-laying and ballasting shall be done and completed; the engine into Section 15 by the month of August next; and further, the whole of Section 15 shall be finished, completed, by the fall 1878, and for every day over and above, if any, you shall have the best of security that the Government shall be paid five hundred dollars per day for every day over and above the two dates named above, and this is the only way to put some life into the Pacific Railway, as there has been no life in it yet.

"Now, I hope you will pardon me for taking the liberty of writing you this note, as I have no other object in view than to let you know the feeling outside, as you must admit that Sutton and Thompson's tender is not an extravagant one, only I know what I have said in this note can be done.

"I remain,

"Your obedient servant,

"JOSEPH WHITEHEAD.

"Hon. ALEXANDER MACKENZIE."

The bidders next on the list were the firm recommended by Mr. Whitehead; Sutton and Thomson, of Bradford, Ontario, whose bid was \$1,594,085; or, as stated by Mr. Mackenzie, in a memorandum which I shall give, \$1,594,155, a trifle of \$150,980 over that of A. P. Macdonald and Company. Not long after Mr. Whitehead's letter was written, the unready Mr. Charlton seems to have become discouraged. He writes as follows:—

"I have met with so many unfortunate difficulties in procuring security for so large a sum, so as to satisfy the demands of the Government, and have been so worried and disheartened by the difficulties of the position in which I found myself, and consequent failing health, that I am reluctantly obliged to say that I

cannot now undertake so serious an enterprise, more especially as all the most experienced men whose advice and assistance I have asked, have convinced me and my friends that the work cannot satisfactorily be performed for the price tendered for.

"I beg, therefore, to ask that the hon. the Minister of Public Works will allow me to withdraw my tender, and will please to return to Mr. Beard, of Brooklyn, who proposed to join in the work, his deposit; and also return to me the papers which I deposited as given to make up the balance of the security required.

And in a final agony of despair, he soon afterwards sends the following telegram:—

"MONTREAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY,
27th December, 1876.

"(By Telegraph from Montreal.)

"F. BRAUN,

"Public Works Department—

"Dissension from within, added to extraordinary pressure from without, has left no alternative but withdrawal.

(Signed) E. J. CHARLTON."

Mr. Martin seems not to have been then aware of Mr. Charlton's dilemma and its unhappy consequences, but on learning that there had been a failure to furnish the security, on the part of Mr. Charlton, he writes as follows, two days after the date of the mournful but suggestive telegram:—

"OTTAWA, 29th December, 1876.

"SIR,—Re-Section 13, Canada Pacific Railway. I have just learned with much surprise, through your Department, that E. J. Charlton has withdrawn from our joint tender to build said Section 15, Canada Pacific Railway. His withdrawal was without my knowledge or consent.

"I am prepared to deposit the security required by the Government, and am prepared to perform the work mentioned in or contemplated by said tender.

"And I now offer to comply with the conditions and requirements of the Government, as specified in the advertisement calling for tenders for said work, and, in our said tender I protest against any and all acts depriving me of said contract.

"Trusting that justice will be done me in the premises,

I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Most respectfully yours,

(Signed) "PATRICK MARTIN,

"To the Honourable Minister of

"Public Works of Canada, Ottawa.

No reply seems to have been made to Mr. Martin's protest. And it may be noticed here that the ingenious Mr. Charlton seems to have had a wide connection, for on the 28th of

December Messrs. Baird and Company of New York, wrote to the Department complaining that he had used them shamefully; that they had gone to Montreal to meet him, and had stayed there three days, but had been unable to find him. They asked to be allowed to deposit cash security, and take the contract under Charlton's tender. The next lowest bidders were Messrs. Sutton and Thompson, the acceptance of whose tender we have seen was strongly recommended by Mr. Whitehead; a memorandum signed by Mr. Mackenzie, in the following words, recommends that their tender be accepted:—

30th December, 1876.

(Memorandum).

The undersigned reports that tenders having been invited for construction of Section No. 15, Canadian Pacific Railway, twenty-one have been received at schedule rates, which, when extended, are found to vary between \$1,443,175 and \$2,950,000.

"That the firms whose tenders are first and second lowest respectively Messrs. McDonald and Kane and Messrs. Martin and Charlton are, unable to furnish the necessary security.

"That the third lowest tender is from Messrs. Sutton and Thompson, of Brantford, amounting to \$1,594,155 (one million five hundred and ninety-four thousand one hundred and fifty-five dollars).

"That this firm are prepared to make the necessary five per cent. cash deposit, and proposes to associate with themselves Mr. Joseph Whitehead, contractor, of Clinton, Ontario.

"The undersigned, therefore, recommends that the tender of Messrs. Sutton and Thompson be accepted, and that they be allowed to associate Mr. Whitehead with themselves accordingly.

"Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) "A. MACKENZIE.

"Minister Public Works."

Thus it will be seen that on the day after Martin offered to put up the security, and three days after Charlton withdrew in such moving terms, the contract was awarded to Messrs. Sutton and Thompson, and, strange to say, the disinterested Mr. Whitehead consented to put a little more life into the Pacific Railway by becoming, first a partner nominally of that firm, and lastly by taking the whole work himself. It will be observed that the memorandum of Mr. Mackenzie, which I read a few moments ago, as a reason for giving the contract to Sutton and Thompson, states that A. P. Macdonald and Company, and Martin and Charlton, have been unable to furnish the necessary

security. As to P. A. Macdonald and Company, we have seen that there was no lack of ability, but that they were apparently forced off in another way. There was no good ground whatever for this assertion as respected Martin and Charlton, for Mr. Martin, in his letter just quoted, distinctly proposed to furnish ample security, and protested against the contract being taken away from him. Every contractor has a right to make as good a bargain as he can, of course, and I do not intend in anything I have said or shall say, to make any charge against Mr. Whitehead, or to blame him in any way. In the tender of Messrs. Sutton and Thompson, the timber was taken at prices so low, and the quantity required was so enormous, that it would have been absolutely impossible to deliver it. It could not be had in the country, nor was it to be found nearer than the head waters of the Mississippi, and I say that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, when he adopted a radical change in the plan of construction of the section, which he seems to have decided upon just before the tenders were advertised for, and in the absence of his Chief Engineers, should have ascertained that the timber could be found in the neighbourhood of the work, and I want the House and the country to understand that he was responsible for the letting, for the principle adopted in the plan of construction, and he does not pretend that it was decided upon when Mr. Fleming was in Canada, or that the letting was under his advice. Mr. Whitehead had not long been at work on his contract when Mr. Rowan, the resident engineer, recommended that the work should be radically changed by substituting rock and earth embankment for trestle work. His letter recommending the change stated that the trestle work was perishable and liable to take fire. I suppose most men could have known, without a professional opinion, that wood was a substance that would decay in process of time and might perhaps take fire if exposed to ignition; but Mr. Rowan was careful not to state that the trestle-work timber could not be obtained in the country. Anyone could see the trestle-work plan was a dangerous and imprudent one. But I believe it suited some purpose of the hon. gentleman to have the letting made at a comparatively low figure, and he seems to have acquiesced with commendable alacrity in the necessity of awarding the contract to bidders who were \$140,000 higher than the lowest, and he did not at all object to Mr. Whitehead. It would not be far out of the record to say that when he let the contract on the timber plan he had no real expectation to have it fulfilled upon that plan. The timber was taken at ruinously low prices, the earth and rock at extravagantly high prices, and consequently, when the timber was released, and earth and rock were substituted, the charge was enormously in favour of the contractor. The quantity of loose rock at \$1.75 a yard was exactly doubled. The solid rock at \$2.75 was increased from 300,000 to 525,646 yards. We have seen that the modest little quantity of 80,000 yards of earth at 37 cents a yard—not so modest a little price—was increased to 1,657,000 yards, and we hear that 1,300,000 yards more is to be done. Mr. Fleming approved of the proposed change, and wrote a letter recommending it to the late First Minister. The latter, in his evidence before the Committee, says that he himself approved of it, but he did not see fit to recommend it to the Council; but Mr. Rowan, the engineer, directing the work, left Ottawa under the full understanding—the full conviction, as he states in his own evidence—that that change was to be made. Mr. Fleming left for England the next day, after he had written an approval of Mr. Rowan's proposed change, and believed that his recommendation was approved of. Mr. Mackenzie states that he had constant communication with Mr. Marcus Smith, after Mr. Fleming's recommendation was made, prior to the departure of Mr. Smith for the North-West, and discussed railway matters exhaustively with him. Strange to say, he never thought it worth while to speak of the proposed change of Section 15, one of the most important matters connected with the whole subject. When Mr. Smith reached Winnipeg he found that the work was proceeding on the changed plan, for which he disclaims, and, I think, justly disclaims responsibility. Mr. Rowan's evidence was not quite satisfactory, but I will not refer further to that. Mr. Fleming certainly

I must say in all fairness, cannot be held culpable for the *laches* of his chief, the late Minister of Public Works. Mr. Fleming's leaning towards work of a character, perhaps too expensive for the road-bed required for the North-West, is well known. It is scarcely possible that he would have risked his reputation in recommending so flimsy, and, in fact, so impossible a plan as that on which Section 15 was let, and no one can doubt for a moment, not only that the change he recommended was a proper one, if it was not an imperatively necessary one, but that the present Government had no alternative but to accept it. The mischief was in the inception. The late First Minister cannot throw the responsibility of that upon any one else, and he ought not to attempt on the floor of this House to place it upon one who, from his peculiar position, is not able to reply or to defend himself. The fact is that no one seems to have been responsible. It seems intended that there should be some convenient method by which the responsibility should be evaded, and it is cowardly and shameful to say that the responsibility rests on Mr. Fleming. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Rowan's reports upon the progress of the work after the change, were not made as promptly and regularly as they ought to have been. The contract was taken in such a way as to increase the estimated expenditure more than one million dollars, and the end is not yet. It was the same with the Georgian Bay Branch. As to the reckless rushing into a contract in utter ignorance of the nature of the country to be traversed, we have heard the hon. gentleman on the floor of this House to-night accuse the Government of having neglected to build the Georgian Bay Branch, and of having been unfaithful to Quebec. The extraordinary contract with the late Mr. Foster has been condemned from time to time, and in regard to it we have received no satisfactory explanation. That contract, too, was made for work upon a line which no engineer had ever seen. Although the hon. member for Lambton has attempted to shirk all responsibility in respect to these contracts, I shall hold him responsible for them, and the country will also hold him responsible for them. I repeat that the hon. gentleman ought to have known, if he did

not know, that there were no surveys worthy of the name when those contracts were let. The hon. gentleman stoutly asserts in the face of these facts that he was perfectly justified in going before the country and saying that he was building the line embraced in the four contracts for one-half the cost of the Intercolonial Railway. I knew the hon. gentleman was inaccurate in his estimates when he made them. It is too late for the hon. gentleman to attempt to throw the responsibility on others; it rests with him. The responsibility also rests on him of the hybrid system of navigation, the mixture of mud and water which he attempted to "utilise," to use his favourite word, between Port Savanne and Keewatin. If the hon. gentleman had succeeded in carrying out his scheme, he would have been able to transport over his portage, according to first tender, exactly five car-loads of grain per day, or 1,665 bushels, and if he had done so steadily from the opening until the close of navigation, he would have carried 280,000 bushels, or about six vessel loads. If he had found for it employment from the end of the harvest till the close of navigation, about eighty thousand bushels would have been all that could have been carried, or a cargo and a-half would have been all the hon. gentleman would have been able to transport to market by his line. At one end of the line there were 112 miles of railway that were to cost, according to the latest estimate, about \$40,000 per mile, that is \$4,400,000; at the other end a line of the same length at the same figures, \$4,400,000 more—making a total of \$8,800,000. He was to spend on Fort Frances Locks, and the improvement of navigation by railway, river and tramway, say \$500,000 more, and all this expenditure would be incurred for the purpose of a line having, at the utmost, during the whole of its navigable season, a carrying capacity of 280,000 bushels. The mere interest on capital, therefore, would have been \$2 per bushel for every bushel that could possibly be carried over the line. The hon. gentleman rose in his place to-day and advocated that policy. If the hon. gentleman had thrown into the sea every dollar that was expended in the Fort Frances Locks he could not more effectually have wasted it. There is not one point of utility in con-

nection with that undertaking. The hon. gentleman quoted extensively from reports in relation to the North-West. I have no doubt he was at great pains to take out of those reports anything unfavourable to that country that he could find. I believe the hon. gentleman carefully passed over many a page that would have refuted his own argument. He seemed impelled by a mocking, imperious and cruel fate to follow in the wake of the hon. gentleman who preceded him (Mr. Blake), and to be forced to assist him in condemning the Great West, and the schemes which he has advocated everywhere himself, and which never till now failed to receive his strong support. The Opposition seem to have proceeded upon a settled plan in their tactics this Session, inspired, no doubt, by the new aspirant to the leadership. First, the whole chorus rang changes on the utter failure of the National Policy, and the utter and hopeless ruin of the country, with no prospect of its revival. Next the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), brought forward his Resolution condemning the Government land policy in the North-West, and it was his patriotic endeavour to show there was no possibility of utilising them, and that the country to the south had every possible advantage over ours, so that we could not compete with it in the advantages offered to settlers; but an overwhelming majority of the House negatived his proposals. He must have been surprised to find he was utterly at variance, in his ideas and policy, with the great organ of his party in Toronto. The next act in the dismal drama was the speech of the hon. member for West Durham—the logical sequence of all that had preceded. We have now had the strongest and darkest presentation of their unpatriotic course that could have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. We may congratulate ourselves we have heard the worst, and it is worse than anything that could possibly be urged by hon. gentlemen who wish well to the country. Even had they had some warrant for their contention, it was not patriotic to present the dark side of the shield; but more unwarranted, misleading statements never were made. I regret that the Opposition have been led into a course

which, I think, they will regret before a year has passed. The hon. member for Lambton, who is now apparently in most points at one with the hon. member for West Durham, ventured, however, to differ with him in respect to the entire prosperity of the United States. He tells us that its protective policy has ruined its shipping trade. The following extract from an authority that he will not venture to gainsay, refutes that assertion:—

“We have at our doors all the illustrations and experiences of Protection and its benefits required for our guidance. The United States have adopted a protective policy, under which their manufactures have been fostered and promoted, until, in 1870, their products reached the sum of \$4,253,000,000, giving employment to 2,000,000 operatives, and disbursing over \$775,000,000 in wages.

“It has been charged that protection has prevented the extension of foreign commerce in that country. That may be true; but it is estimated that the domestic commerce of the United States, last year, reached the enormous proportions of 200,000,000 tons, valued at \$10,000,000,000. What is the foreign commerce of that country compared with the vast domestic trade that goes on increasing, without the fluctuations or risks of foreign trade? Look at the progress of the cotton trade in that country. Previous to the import duties on foreign cottons, in 1824, British manufactures crushed out all efforts to establish factories in the Republic, but the imposition of 25 per cent. duty on foreign cottons had the effect, in a few years, not only of building manufactories, but led to the production of an article better in quality, and lower in price, than the Americans received from the British before their own industries were established.

“In 1860, the United States were exporters of nearly 10 per cent. of the whole cottons manufactured.

“When a protective duty was imposed, iron manufactories were established, and, in a short time, the price of iron was brought down several dollars a ton, and it is now sold cheaper than British iron was ever offered for in that market.

“The shipping interest of the United State was one of the most signal illustrations of the benefits of a protective policy that could be produced.”

That is the statement of a gentleman who has had a large commercial experience, and whose utterances are entitled to great consideration when dealing with statistics only—I mean the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That was a portion of his speech, delivered in this House four years ago, as I find it in the official record. Then, Sir, he ably and judiciously advocated Protection, upon

which he spoke with much force and sincerity. The right hon. the Premier has been greatly strengthened by the organ of the Liberal party in Toronto, in his late estimates of the value of our North-Western lands. That paper has given no uncertain sound with regard to the lands which we hope to sell to defray the cost of constructing the Railway, and with regard to the great promise and value of the country which it will develop. I believe that no statement of the hon. the First Minister exaggerated the value of our great domain, portions of which will be purchased by capitalists for profitable investment and cultivation, as well as by our own people and settlers generally seeking comfortable homes. I believe the menacing labour question in the United Kingdom will compel its statesmen to face it, and consider the best method of disposing of the enormous population depending on manufactures for support, that is increasing in a far greater ratio than the food supply can be increased. In that direction we offer to England a priceless boon, which no other country can offer, a region and soil best adapted to the development of the Anglo-Saxon race—a country possessing the laws, traditions and loyalty of that race, and practically as near to England as Land's End was to Glasgow forty years ago. We have a new world to place at the disposal of the over-crowded Mother Country, and British statesmen will soon be forced to turn their attention to some system of co-operation with this Dominion for the development of the soil of that new world. The hon. member for West Durham speaks of the preference of the Teutonic and Irish races for the United States, doubtless with some truth, but we have large and flourishing settlements of Irishmen, Scotchmen and Englishmen, and of races from the North of Europe, too, with every prospect of their extensive increase. Besides, the sentiment of loyalty, overlooked or excluded by hon. gentlemen opposite, will attract to our territory, through preference and sympathy, multitudes of the British people. In respect to our financial policy, so virulently attacked by the hon. member for West Durham, I do not believe the present Government desire to emulate the reckless expenditure of their predecessors, or continue building costly works

while incurring growing deficits. I believe they will take a different course, so different that the country will appreciate at its fullest value the contrasted policy of the late and present Administrations in this respect. I believe that this discussion was artfully contrived to alarm the timid and deceive the unwary and ignorant; but I venture to predict it will fail in its object, and that the hon. gentlemen, compelled from their position to sustain this Resolution, will find they meet with no sympathy elsewhere, and that they have plunged still deeper into that abyss from which I believe there is no political resurrection.

MR. CHARLTON: I have listened for some time to the remarks of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), who has travelled over a good deal of ground. He certainly came dangerously near the question, in one or two instances, but I think he did not touch it. I must do him the justice to say that he evidently struggled to reach the question, and he reminded me in his struggles of a stanza of John Hay, describing a steamboat stranded on a sandbar on the Missouri river, with her spur spars set upon the bottom, and her crew working at the pulleys in an attempt to heave her over:

“She hove and set, and hove and set,
And high her rudder flung,
And every time she hove and set
A wusser leak she sprung.”

The hon. gentleman had as poor success in his attempts to reach the question as the boat had—according to the description of John Hay—in getting off the sandbar. As usual, the hon. gentleman referred to the Fort Frances Locks, and read a quotation from the speech made by the hon. member for North Norfolk. What he would do without these two subjects for a speech I can scarcely imagine. I do not know that it is necessary to refer to that oft-quoted speech of mine. I may remind my hon. friends, however, on the opposite side, of certain circumstances which existed at the time that speech was made. It will be remembered that the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), then Finance Minister, proposed to increase the Tariff by 2½ per cent., and that the hon. the present Minister of Railways denounced that proposed increase as the thin end of the wedge of the hateful

policy of Protection, and if I made a qualified defence of Protection, it was that degree of Protection which existed under the 17½ per cent. Tariff. The ground I took in that speech was distinctly and explicitly to defend a 17½ per cent. Tariff as affording a sufficient degree of Protection, and I have never taken any position inconsistent with that speech since. I am ready, to-day, to defend the policy that was inaugurated then to defend a Tariff giving 17½ per cent. duties, and thereby affording that incidental degree of Protection which I believed then, and believe still, is all that this country requires. We are considering, to-night, a question of very grave importance. We are considering the question of the rapidity with which we should build the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the light of the experience of many years. We know better now, than at any previous period in our history, what are the difficulties we are likely to encounter in the prosecution of this great enterprise. We know better than at any previous period what are the public capabilities of this country as to bearing new burdens. We know now, better than at any previous period, that this is a question of great importance indeed, and the decision arrived at by this House upon this question is one fraught with serious consequences to this country, if the decision is, as I believe it will be, a vote in support of the policy of the Government. The step that I believe we are about to take is an irrevocable one, and it will bear disastrous fruits I predict here to-night. This question being one of so much importance should be approached in a dispassionate spirit. We should endeavour to examine it impartially, and free from partisan bias. But that is the very last thing, probably, that our friends on the other side will do. I do not suppose the arguments brought forward here will influence a single vote. I do not suppose, so far as the result of this question is concerned, that the magnificent speech made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the speech made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), or any other argument that may be advanced, will have the slightest effect whatever. But, nevertheless, it is the duty of this Oppo-

tion to lay all the facts bearing upon this question before the country, to protest against what they believe will be a step which will prove disastrous to this country; and in the discharge of that duty we rise here to protest against this policy. We rise here, not so much to address the gentlemen who sit on the Ministerial Benches, as to address this country, and to arraign this Government before the people of this country, for this policy, which we believe is conceived in a spirit that will prove disastrous to the country. Every speaker who rises in the opposite ranks rings changes upon a charge of a want of patriotism. Want of patriotism? Want of loyalty? In what respect are we to be charged with want of patriotism, because we warn the Government that the policy they are adopting will, as we believe, produce disastrous consequences? Why, Sir, no more absurd than this would be a charge brought against the watchman upon the deck of a ship, bearing down under full sail, at midnight, upon a rock-bound coast, who, for giving the warning cry of "Breakers ahead," should be upbraided by the crew and passengers for interfering with the pleasure and harmony of the voyage. Now it is evident from the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who support the policy of the Government, that there is no unanimity upon that side of the House as to the proper route of this Railway. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. De Cosmos) told us this afternoon that the best route was by the Pine River Pass, and he predicted that that would ultimately be the line. Now, one of the essential conditions that we should look at before locating this line of Railway, is an intimate knowledge of the country through which it would pass, such a knowledge as we do not in full measure possess. The very fact that that difference of opinion exists, which was developed by the hon. member for Vancouver, is, in my opinion, the best argument that has been produced on the floor of this House against the propriety of sinking millions of dollars in the canons of the Fraser River. I believe an expenditure of money there upon that Railway, or in any portion of British Columbia, is premature, until the road has reached the Mountains. Under such circumstances it is evident that caution in the prosecu-

tion of this work, caution in incurring the liabilities that it is proposed to incur is necessary—

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Did not the hon. gentleman refuse to vote, last winter, that the location was premature.

MR. CHARLTON: It was not in reference to the contract for expending money in the Valley of the Fraser River, it was in reference to the adoption of a route, without any reference to letting the contracts or the expenditure of money. I am not prepared to say, to-night, that after the road has reached the Rocky Mountains, if the proper time had come for the prosecution of that work in British Columbia, that upon the evidence we now possess, I should prefer the route to Burrard Inlet.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The case stood in this way: the late Government stood pledged; they had completed the surveys, and located the road and commenced construction, and we asked the hon. gentlemen to say if it was premature to commence construction and they refused to vote that it was premature.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is not the way to put it. It was premature to adopt that line. The hon. gentleman said the country had not been sufficiently examined to decide upon the line. The House was asked to declare upon that point, and my hon. friend joined in the refusal.

MR. CHARLTON: I was about to say that, in 1876, I made a speech in this House, taking strong grounds against the expenditure of money in British Columbia, before the Railway was built to the border of that Province from the east. These are the views I have always held. My views throughout upon this matter, as publicly expressed, have been the same. If, as I said a few moments ago, this road was built to the Rocky Mountains, if we had arrived at that point where it was to be determined which route to take, then I should be in favour, on the information we now have, of the Burrard Inlet route. But I hold now, that to expend money in British Columbia until we reach that Province from the east, is an act of folly. What object is to be gained by the rapid construction of that road. What objects are to be gained in the building of that road in British Columbia, previous to reaching that country, and in spending

millions there and opening a portion of the road in British Columbia, merely that you may have it ready when you reach the Rocky Mountains. Are the advantages so great to be obtained by building that road a few years earlier than otherwise would be the case? Are we to develop an overland trade with China and Japan, that will compensate for the premature outlay? The hon. member for Victoria, this afternoon, lamented that San Francisco was getting the start of Victoria in this respect: that they were establishing lines of communication with China, Japan, and Australia, and that before we completed this road the prize would have slipped from our grasp. Are we ready, to-day, if we had the road built to Victoria, to subsidise steamship lines? Are we ready to subsidise lines with China and Japan, and Australia? Are our burdens not already great enough without undertaking any enterprise of this kind? One of the advantages we have to gain by the construction of this road is a portion of that inconsiderable Asiatic trade that the American Pacific road now gets, and the trade with British Columbia; but both of these trades will be insufficient to pay the running expenses of that road. The cost of securing these two objects will be vastly disproportionate to the benefits we would derive from them. The hon. the Minister of Railways, the other day, in his speech on this subject, referred to the Pacific Railway. He told us that the Union Pacific Railway—I suppose he meant the Union and Central Pacific Railway—passed through 1,000 miles of desert. The Union Pacific is but 1,024 miles long, and passes through the fertile valley of the Platte River, but the Canada Pacific Railway was to pass the same distance through a garden, although this garden has not yet been brought under cultivation. I fear that it will prove but little more productive than the country that the Union and Central Pacific Railways pass through. He went on to tell us that the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be accomplished in the teeth of a factious opposition, as had been the case with the American Pacific Railway. Now, I was not aware that any factious opposition had ever been offered to the completion of the road. I was not aware that the Americans were

not one and all of them unanimous, and all the time anxious that the road should be constructed ; but they approached the undertaking of the great work of building that road with discretion, and I wish to draw the attention of this House to the difference between these two countries at the time these railway projects were started. In the first place, the American scheme was not even talked of, was not even thought of until the United States had a population of 20,000,000. In the next place, the American scheme, after being discussed, and after ample time had been expended in making elaborate surveys, after the utmost precaution was taken to secure the best route, the American road was not commenced until the United States had a population of 32,000,000. At that time the population of the Pacific slope—of Oregon and California—was 500,000 souls. At the time that road was commenced, the city of San Francisco had a population of 75,000 inhabitants. What is the comparison to be instituted between the two countries? The American Pacific slope had a population of 500,000 inhabitants, while British Columbia has a white population of, perhaps, 12,000. On the line of that road, in Utah and Colorado, were 50,000 inhabitants. If we compared California and Oregon with British Columbia, what do we find? The one country abounding in corn and wine, with vast fertile belts and plains extending for seven hundred miles. The State of California is one of the finest States in the American Union, possessing capacity for sustaining a population of four or five million inhabitants. Contrast this country with British Columbia, with less than 2,000,000 acres of arable land, and with Vancouver Island, having less than 400,000 acres of arable land, and it will be seen that we have nothing to induce us to commence or to carry forward to completion an overland railway compared with what the Americans had. I shall treat this question entirely apart from any consideration of treaty obligations. I wish to treat it upon this basis: what would be the common sense and prudent course to take in reference to this Railway, in the interest of the Dominion of Canada. We have a population flocking into a portion of the

North-West, into Manitoba and the Saskatchewan Valley. That population requires an outlet. The Pacific Railway is to pass through that valley. Now, the common sense course would be to build that Railway from the chain of great lakes to the Red River. That is being done ; that is perfectly proper. Having reached that point, the course would be to push that road westward, as the wants of the country required. The Government would be perfectly justified in doing that. Beyond that the Government are not warranted, in the interests of the public, in proceeding with the work. What is meant by exceeding the limited expenditure? I have indicated it means simply this: an unproductive investment, the putting of money into a railway that will, for the present, give no return. What is the character of our present railway investment? We have borrowed millions and millions of dollars, and have expended these millions in public works which are all unremunerative. They had a crisis in the United States some few years ago, and the cause of that crisis was unproductive railway investment. They had built thousands of miles of railway in advance of the wants of the country. Very few American lines were paying dividends on their costs. This system was carried on until the country succumbed beneath it. Jay Cooke and Company's failure precipitated the crisis. The cause of that crisis was the unproductive nature of those enterprises. An expenditure of thirty or forty millions of money among the rocks of British Columbia will make no return for years to come, and that section ought not to be built until it can be reached from the east. Many speculations have been entered into in regard to the arable land in the North-West. It was stated by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), eleven years ago, that the North-West contained 300,000 square miles of arable land, but the more accurate our knowledge of that country becomes, the smaller are our expectations. From the estimates, as to the extent of the arable land in that country, given by the hon. member for Lambton, it would appear that the total amount of arable land south of the north line of the Railway Belt really does not exceed seventy millions of acres. I have no doubt this

is a very liberal estimate. In addition to that, in the region north of that line, known as the Peace River country, we may have some arable lands. The arable lands of this region would all be contained in a section of country bounded on the south by the north line of the Railway Belt, on the east by a line projected north from the east end of Lesser Slave Lake, on the north by the line of 57° latitude, and on the west by the Rocky Mountains. This region would contain, by a rough estimate, 30,000,000 acres of land. The arable land contained in this region, and all the arable land to the north of it, would not make a total of more than 20,000,000 acres, so that we may safely conclude that the entire arable land of the entire Canadian North-West does not exceed 90,000,000 acres. It is barely possible that it may reach 95,000,000 acres. I believe this is a liberal estimate, and that, it will be found, when the country is better known, or that there will not be more than this amount. What was formerly known as the American North-West which included the States of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska, and the four Territories of Dakota, Wyoming, Montana and Colorado—in these eight States and four Territories are 634,000,000 acres of land, and it is supposed that of that amount 400,000,000 acres are arable land. The area of arable land in that region is, at least, four times greater than that which exists in our North-West. The hon. the Minister of Railways declared that our North-West was the granary of the world. The hon. gentleman has a fertile and poetic imagination. If that North-West ever is to be the granary of the world it is something which we will see developed in the future. We ought to have been in a better position to judge of the capability and character of that country. In 1873 a motion was made in this House for a thorough geographical and geological exploration of the North-West. That motion was never acted upon with energy. It would have been better if it had been. Now, I suppose I will be accused of being unpatriotic, because I do not indulge in the same flights of fancy, as to the prospective value of that country that have been indulged in by the hon. the Minister of Railways. I

ask is it unpatriotic to ascertain the value and to justly estimate the disadvantages and drawbacks under which our Dominion suffers. Is it not proper that we should estimate truly, the conditions and value of this country. Is there not a special necessity for our doing so since the hon. the Minister of Railways has informed us that on the value of these lands hinges the entire Railway policy of the Government. The hon. gentleman was pleased to refer to some predictions that I made, regarding this country, in a former debate. Well, Sir, I predicted that the country had a great future before it, and that a great number of people would settle in it; but, prophetic periods are often long periods, and I did not predict that the destiny I foretold for that country would be realised in ten years or twenty years, or in any given length of time. The hon. gentleman goes on to say that the North-West would make the most inviting field for emigrants in the world. While we are not sure as to the extent of arable land, can we be sure as to the character of the climate? How will it prove to be about summer frosts and winter blizzards in the north part of the Railway Belt? With regard to the climatic character of the country, I propose to read a few brief extracts. I will first refer to some remarks of Mr. Sandford Fleming, who says, with reference to the Peace River region:

“The explorers unite in the opinion that the fertile area is of great extent, and the whole region is certainly well adapted for stock-raising. But the explorations do not establish beyond question its adaptability for the systematic growth of the higher cereals. Cultivation has been attempted on a limited scale at the Hudson Bay Forts in sheltered spots in the valley of the Peace River, but no portion of the plateau has been placed under cultivation with the exception of very limited areas in the vicinity of Lesser Slave Lake and of Sturgeon Lake.”

Dr. G. M. Dawson, of the Geological Survey, says, as quoted by Mr. Fleming:

“Last year, summer frosts occurred at different times; they were severe in the latter part of August.”

At page 10, in his recent report, Mr. Fleming says:

“The wheat patches around the Hudson Bay Forts, at the bottom of the valley, at Hudson's Hope and Dunvegan, were injured by the frost. On the plateau there was frost on three occa-

sions, in August; on the 21st, at points a hundred miles apart, 12° and 14° of frost were recorded."

What does fourteen degrees of frost mean in August? It means death to all vegetation that can be injured by frost. At page 13 of this Report, Mr. Fleming says:

"The first step is to obtain general information respecting the principle features of the country, the character of the soil, the climate and its minerals. I pointed out last year, that although the prairie region had been seen by many travellers, and that the country east of the Rocky Mountains had been traversed on many trails, and a great deal of information collected, still the Territory is of such vast extent that comparatively little of it was known."

At page 54 I find the following extract from H. J. Cambie's Report:—

"Hudson's Hope, July 27-29. The soil in the garden is a good sandy loam, and onions were very fine; all other crops had been injured by a severe frost. About May 15th, beans were killed, so were the potatoe vines, but they had started afresh. A little patch of wheat had been frozen, but had grown up again and a few stalks were forming ears. * * * Returning then September 14—16 we found the potatoes had produced a very poor crop, and the wheat had again been frozen while the grain was in the milk stage, rendering it useless."

This is not very encouraging. Mr. H. A. G. McLeod, writing regarding the summer frosts, says:

"During our stay in the country (August), we experienced frost occasionally. On the 6th ice formed in the water bucket at night, and on the 21st there were 14° of frost four miles west of Mud River and about twenty miles south of Peace River."

Mr. Speaker, all these things show that we want to know more about this country before we can say it is fit for settlement. There is severe cold in the winter, and summer frosts to an extent that will certainly render it less attractive than we have been led to expect by the exaggerated accounts given us; and it is important when embarking in an enterprise of such magnitude that the Government should not be deluded as to the value of these lands. The North-West of our Dominion is not the only country for settlers. We have a rival in the South which still possesses a vast unoccupied extent of territory. They have 700,000,000 acres of land unsurveyed and in addition to this they have a great many million acres surveyed and ready for settlement; and these lands are in a

milder climate than our own. They have a variety of climate, from the tropical to one very little milder than our own. It is well known, from careful observation, that emigration substantially follows the line of latitude. Emigrants from Pennsylvania go to the Western States in the same latitude. The bulk of emigrants in Minnesota go there from the New England States. This tendency is very marked, and this being the tendency of emigration, you cannot expect to draw American emigration so far north as to the Canadian North-West. Moreover, American appliances for securing emigration are very superior. Their pamphlets and literature of a descriptive character, relating to their lands for settlement, are sent broadcast over the world. Almost every State has its Bureau of Emigration. The most powerful of all influences for securing the flow of European emigration into the United States, is the fact that up to July 1st, 1879, 10,150,000 foreigners have settled in that country, and the influence of this great element in attracting friends in the same direction is resistless. These foreigners are constantly corresponding with their friends in the Old World, and the latter naturally wish to go where their friends have settled. This fact would inevitably draw the great bulk of foreign emigration to the United States, if there was no other reason to be mentioned. There are also in round numbers 550,000 Canadians living, to-day, in the United States, and naturally a large proportion of the emigration from the older Provinces will drift to that country. I think, in view of the circumstances, that we must not expect that we will draw any considerable emigration from the American Union to our North-West. Apart from any climatic reason there is an aversion amongst American and naturalised foreigners to leave the United States Territory. We may expect, therefore, to draw almost entirely from our own population in order to people the North-West, as the foreign element will be exceedingly small, in fact, the only foreign element which will naturally go to that country will be the Scandinavian element; the Teutonic and Celtic races will not emigrate there to any considerable extent. The hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) tells us with poetical

fervour that the eye of the civilised world is concentrated on our North-West. I venture to say that nine-tenths of this civilised world have never heard of our North-West. I venture to say that nine-tenths of the people of the United States, even, do not know anything about that country. I hold in my hand a statement showing the population, at various periods, of what was formerly known as the American North-West—a region which formerly bore very much the same relation to the older States that our own North-West now does to the older Provinces. This region now comprises the eight States and four Territories which I referred to at an earlier stage of my remarks. The population of this region, in 1800, was 5,641; at that time the population of the United States was 5,308,000. In 1810 the population of the American North-West had risen to 41,564; in 1820 it was 211,000; and in 1830, 532,000. The population of the United States was 7,239,000 in 1810; 9,633,000 in 1820; and 12,866,000 in 1830. The foreign element of the population of the North-West was only estimated at 4 per cent. of the whole in 1810; 5 per cent. in 1820, and 6 per cent. in 1830; and it had only risen to a trifle less than 13 per cent. in 1850, at which time the first classification was made by the Census. These statistics show that the foreign element in the population of the American North-West was very small in the early period of its settlement, and that its population was mainly supplied from the older States, as will unquestionably be the case with our own North-West. They show, also, that it took more than thirty years to give that country a population of 532,000 souls, though it was a more attractive field than our own North-West, and easily accessible by means of the Great Lakes and the Mississippi; and at the commencement of the period the States from which emigration was to be drawn had a population more than 1,000,000 in excess of the present population of the Dominion. And yet, in the face of these suggestive facts, it is estimated that a population greater than that of the American North-West—at the expiration of thirty years from the time that an active emigration movement commenced—will be poured into the Canadian North-West in ten years.

MR. PLUMB: Between what period was that?

MR. CHARLTON: From 1800 to 1830.

MR. MCCALLUM: There were no railways or steamboats then.

MR. CHARLTON: But then, as now, the American people were a migratory people. I wish to refer again to the estimates of my right hon. friend the First Minister, with reference to the rapidity with which the public land in that country is likely to be purchased by settlers. I will now devote my attention, for a few moments, to the right hon. gentleman's estimate of the results likely to be derived from the land sales in that country. I desire to prove the utter absurdity of these estimates. The hon. the Minister of Railways tells us that, so far from involving the country in difficulties, his policy will lift him out of them, his project being based on calculations that we will realise, in the next ten years, from the sale of lands, \$38,000,000 in cash and \$32,000,000 in bonds and mortgages. I fear the Government will find mortgages rather poor security. Suppose the people of a district or township decline to pay, what is the Government going to do?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Going to sell the property to others.

MR. CHARLTON: Are you going to eject them and send up police to expel the defaulters?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That will not be necessary.

MR. CHARLTON: I know the case of the celebrated Holland Company, which bought the greater part of Western New York, at the close of the Revolutionary War, and sold to settlers on credit, with easy terms of payment. They found great difficulty in making collections, and were, in the majority of cases, glad to remit interest, and, sometimes, a portion of the principal. So I venture to predict it will be in the North-West, if the system of credit land sales is adhered to. The Government will find then mortgages poor security.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Why?

MR. CHARLTON: All history points to that result, in the case of extensive credit sales of land by Government. The hon. Minister of Railways bases his estimate on an average price of \$3 an acre for the

lands sold. The correct average, under present regulations, for homestead lands is \$1.75, and for Railway lands, \$2.13. The hon. gentleman has made a serious error. He estimates that, in the next ten years, 10,880,000 acres of Railway lands will be sold—the same number of acres of preemption lands sold, and the same number of acres taken up under the homestead law, making a total of 21,760,000 sold, and a total of 32,640,000 acres sold and settled upon under the homestead law. This calculation is based upon the estimate that 550,000 people will go into that country during that period. Now the American North-West has a useful and instructive experience for us with reference to the sale of such lands in a new country which is about to be settled. The statistics I am about to give will show the quantities of land sold and the amount of population that flowed into that country. As I have previously shown it took thirty years to place in that country the population that the hon. First Minister expects will flow into our own North-West in ten years. I find, by the United States Census returns, that, in 1850, when those States and Territories of the American North-West had 2,740,000 inhabitants, the amount of land held in farms was 34,956,327, or an average of 12⁷/₁₀ acres per head; in 1860, when the population was 5,609,000, the number of acres in farms was 67,442,639, or an average of 12²/₁₀ acres per head; and in 1870, when the population was 8,664,000 the number of acres in farms was 96,259,853 acres, or an average of 11¹/₁₀ acres per head. I propose to take the highest average and apply it to our estimated population at the end of ten years. On the basis then of an average of 12⁷/₁₀ acres of land per head, and a population of 550,000 ten years hence, the total number of acres in farms would be 6,930,000 acres, divided as follows, as per proportions of different classes of public lands given in Government estimate:—

	acres.
Homestead Grants.....	2,310,000
Preemption Lands, \$1 75	2,310,000
Railway Lands, \$2 13	2,310,000
Add for Speculators.....	1,000,000
Total Acres	7,000,000

Instead of 32,640,000 as per Government estimate. That would

represent, at present prices, under the land regulations, \$10,962,000 in cash and mortgages, in place of \$71,000,000. Has the hon. gentleman any reason to suppose that our settlers will hold any more land, on the average, than was held in the United States North-West in 1850? If so, experience will show he is mistaken. Now, Sir, if we make an estimate on the basis of 750,000 settlers in the next ten years, and on the basis of the land-holdings in the United States in 1850 as before, we have 9,410,000 as the number of acres that will be held in farms; one-third of the amount being in homestead, one-third in preemption, and one-third in Railway lands as before. If you add to this amount 1,200,000 for speculative purchases, you have disposed of 10,610,000 instead of 32,640,000. The amount from this that would be received in cash and mortgages is \$13,587,000 instead of \$71,000,000. But suppose the population would be less than 350,000 within the next ten years—if it reach that number, settlement will be much more rapid than in the United States North-West, under similar circumstances—he will find, taking the average holdings in that country, he will have disposed of 4,410,000 acres; in farms derived one-third each from homestead grants, and preemption, and railway land sales, 1,470,000. If we add, for sales to speculators, 750,000 acres, it will make a total of 5,160,000 acres, representing in money and mortgages \$6,670,000, instead of \$71,000,000. But I predict he will not see 350,000 in our North-West in ten years. I have not taken interest into account in these calculations, nor made any charge for the cost of surveys and sales. I think that these comparisons, based on the experience of the United States, must satisfy every hon. member that the hon. gentleman's calculations are likely to fall far short of realisation. His estimate, with reference to the expense of sales and surveys, is about 3½ per cent. of the receipts. The American Land Office statistics will give us some information, I think, which will demonstrate the fallacy of that calculation. The total sales of land, in the United States, up to the 30th June last, realised \$204,547,812. The expenses, from 1796 to 1857, only cover

the cost of surveys—not the expenses of the General Land Office at Washington, or those of the land offices in various parts of the States; with those omissions, the expenses reached \$34,718,000, or 17 per cent. of the amount of sales. I find that from 1852 to 1879, the receipts from sales were \$71,993,000. During the same period there were granted or certified to railways somewhere about 46,000,000 acres of land, after deducting lapsed, forfeited and reverted lands, during the same period, the homestead grants were 47,143,000. I find that the expenditure of the Land Office for that period, covering the expenditure of the General Land Office, at Washington, the various District Land Offices, the expenditures for the Surveyor-General in the different States, and the cost of explorations and surveys, was \$35,139,000, or averaging \$1,254,000 a year. So that while the cost of the United States Land Department was $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon all their sales from 1796, without counting General, Local and Surveyor-General Office expenses, which were much the heaviest items, for the first ten years, and were for the period, from 1852 to 1879, nearly one-half the total amount of sales. He expects to run his Land Department at a cost of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the sales. Well, it is about as near the truth as his other calculations, but it is absurdly wide of the mark. The hon. member for Niagara told us that the sales in the West, by the Government, amounted to about 10 per cent. of the total land sales.

MR. PLUMB: I said the Northern Railway sales.

MR. CHARLTON: I can scarcely comprehend how this can be, since the United States absolutely reserve within the Railway Belts one-half the lands, and as the Railway Belts do not cover one-tenth of the entire country, I think the hon. gentleman had better revise his calculation. If he reversed it and said the railways sold about 10 per cent. of all the land that was sold, he would be much nearer the mark. What does all this show as to the estimate of increased population? It think it shows conclusively that the calculations made by the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches are extravagant. What does all this show as to the question of

the arable land? It shows that the estimate made by the hon. the Minister of Railways, that we have 150,000,000 acres of arable land in the North-West, is exceedingly wide of the mark. He is deceiving himself and he is deceiving the country. He is guilty of a great wrong to the country if he involves it in a great expenditure, in the belief that the proceeds of land sales will repay the outlay. What does it show as to the prospective revenue from lands? It shows that in place of receiving an average of \$7,000,000 a year from land sales for the next ten years, he is not likely to realise a net return of one-seventh of that amount. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have shown that the various calculations made by the hon. gentlemen opposite are extravagant and visionary, and if this is the case, the fact, I think, should be held to cast much doubt upon the wisdom and the ability to manage great public concerns, of those gentlemen who made the calculation. Now, at the risk of being considered unpatriotic, I wish to place before the House some facts which have a very intimate bearing upon our own interests, and which are well worthy of our own consideration. I wish to make some comparison between the present condition of this country and the present condition of the United States. I wish to show to this House and to this country, that we are, at this moment, in a critical position. I wish to show that the burdens this country has incurred have already placed it in an unfavourable position as compared with the United States. I wish to show that it is high time, if we wish to keep going forward in the race of progress and to secure a permanent prosperity, to put on the brakes and to cease to add to the burdens already placed upon the people. In 1871 we had a total population of 3,601,000 souls, that is in all that is now comprised in the Dominion of Canada. If we estimate the increase of the present decade at 13 per cent., nine-tenths of this increase will give us at the present time 4,025,000 population, and I estimate that that number is very near the mark. Now, the gross public debt of this country, according to the Accounts last brought down, is \$183,974,000; the net public debt is \$147,481,000, but whether the assets, which are deducted from the gross amount

of the public debt, are all good or not, I cannot say. But I will assume they are, and I will treat this question of the liabilities of the country upon the basis of the net public debt. That amount is equal to \$36.64 per head of our present population. The interest charged upon the net amount of debt is \$6,660,000 a year, or \$1.66 per head of the population. Now, I wish to contrast our present condition with that of the United States, and I wish to say that it is a matter of the utmost importance that we should not allow the public burdens of this country to exceed those of the United States—that we should not allow this country to become more severely taxed than the United States, because if we do we shall be placed at a great disadvantage compared with that country. The public debt of the United States, last year, was \$1,996,000,000, which amounted to \$44.42 *per capita* of the population. The interest paid last year was \$83,773,000, which was a charge of \$1.69 *per capita*. Now, that public debt, since the last statement, has been reduced by \$46,814,000, and \$14,000,000 of that reduction was in the month of March, so that the net amount of the public debt is now \$1,950,000,000. It is expected that the reduction of the debt by the 30th June next will have amounted to \$60,000,000 for the year. The United States have reduced their debt since 1865 by \$806,821,000. A considerable proportion of this reduction has been made during a period of six years of great depression, from 1873 to 1879. But the country has passed out of that depression and the tax paying powers of the country are greater now than ever, the population is increasing, the interest charges are being reduced, and the reduction of the public debt will go on in a much greater ratio in the future, than it has in the past. That country has already paid off three national debts. It paid off the debt which was incurred in the Revolutionary War, the debt which was incurred in the War of 1812, and that which was incurred in the Mexican War, and it will, in my opinion, pay off its present national debt within the next thirty years. It is certainly reducing that public debt with great rapidity. Now, our expenditure was, in 1879, including expenditure chargeable to Capital Account, \$30,103,712, or \$7.47

per capita. The expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund, and including that upon Capital Account was \$24,455,381 or \$6.07 *per capita*. The expenditure of the United States for the same year, including all that class of expenditures that we charge to Capital Account, was \$245,393,712, or \$5.17 *per capita*. The Revenue statistics last year, for the two countries, were as follows:—

	U. S.	Canada.
Customs and Excise.....	\$250,811,000	\$18,291,000
<i>Per Capita</i>	5 08	4 54
Total Revenue.....	273,827,000	22,577,000
<i>Per Capita</i>	5 54	5 34

The revenue of the United States for the three-quarters of the present fiscal year that have expired, was \$248,766,000, equal to \$331,168,000 for the year. Our own Revenue during the same period shows no such increase. During the last year the United States have not only largely reduced their debt, but they have reduced to a still greater extent their interest charge through the funding of a large amount of their debt at a lower rate of interest. The amount of their debt on the 1st of June, 1880, may be assumed at \$38.34 *per capita*, and the interest charge at less than \$1.58 *per capita*. What does this mean to us? It means that, on June 30th next, our interest charge will be some 12c. or 13c. per head higher than the interest charge in the United States. It means that our debt per head will be fully equal to that of the United States, and that it will continue to increase rapidly. Our expenditure is relatively heavier than that of the United States, and the relative proportion will continue to increase. Our Revenue is smaller than theirs, and, while their revenue is swelling in amount, it will be with great difficulty that our Revenue can be increased. We are increasing our debt very rapidly, whilst they are reducing theirs. We are loaded down with unproductive investments. We have the Intercolonial Railway, and other Railways in the Maritime Provinces which are falling far short of paying running expenses, and we are building our Canadian Pacific Railway, which, I fear, will, for a long period, prove unproductive. We have Canals that are not paying a tithe of the interest on their cost. This means that we are placed at a dis-

advantage with the United States, which, as a Government, has no unproductive investments. It means that the great disparity which has hitherto existed between the growth of this country and the growth of that will be increased. It means that we are rapidly approaching a great crisis in the history of this country, and that it is high time that the hon. Ministers, who govern this country, who shape its policy, should take these facts into consideration, and put on the brakes. The policy announced by my hon. friend from West Durham is the only safe policy at this juncture. Who, Sir, is the patriotic man? He who warns the country of its dangers, or he who stands up and endeavours to choke off discussion, and attribute disloyal and unpatriotic motives to those who are warning the Government, and the people of this country, that the course pursued is fraught with mischief and danger. Under these circumstances are we justified in spending \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 on this British Columbia section. We will be warranted only in building this road as the imperative wants of the settlers in the North-West require. In doing more we shall be false to the interests of this country. I can sympathise with the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia; I know they are loyal to their Province; I know they desire communication with the Atlantic sea-board; but in objecting to the construction of this branch of the road, it is not that we love British Columbia less, but we love the whole country more. What is the record of the men who propose to rush into this extravagant expenditure. It is a record unrivalled for its blunders. Are not these the prudent, cautious men who threw 8,000,000 into the sea in building the Intercolonial Railway, as they did when it might have been made a paying investment by selecting a common sense route? Are not these the men who promoted rebellion in the North-West? Are not these the men who admitted British Columbia on these absurd terms which, periodically, come up to plague and vex us? Are not these the men who were guilty of scandalous misconduct in connection with this self-same Pacific Railway, which, when the disgraceful scandal became known, drove them from power? Are not these the men who made

the absurd estimates we are dealing with to night? Men capable of making such estimates are not fit to run a railway, much less to govern a country. The hon. the First Minister proves, by his astounding ignorance, in his estimates, in reference to the sale of lands, that he is unfit to grapple with these questions. The hon. the Minister of Railways, in his extravagant ideas in regard to the North-West, proves that he is unfit to counsel the country. The hon. the Finance Minister proves it by a senseless attempt to enrich the country through a process of depletion; and as a justification of his narrow, restrictive policy, pointing to the example of the United States, forgetting the radically different circumstances of the two countries; forgetting that that country is a miniature world, with every variety of soil, climate, and production; a *zollverein*, in fact, of thirty-nine independent nations, enjoying among themselves the benefits of Free-trade, and so vast in extent and diversity of productions and resources, that the evils of the restrictive system are neutralised by a semi-world-wide self-sustaining power. He draws a comparison between that country and Canada; and because that country, with its vast resources, has progressed, their policy, forsooth, is just the policy for Canada. The entire Cabinet prove by their past record that they are unfit for the position they hold. The propounding of such a policy as calling for an expenditure of 30,000,000 of dollars in British Columbia, while we have such heavy burdens weighing on the people, proves to me, and will prove to every reasonable man, that these gentlemen are unfit for the position they occupy, that they are unwise and unsafe counsellors, rushing us on to ruin.

House adjourned at

Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 20th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion (Sir S. L. Tilley): That Mr.

Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply, and on the proposed motion (*Mr. Blake*) in amendment thereto.

MR. WHITE (*Cardwell*): Mr. Speaker, —It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of the subject which has, for the last three or four days, been engaging the attention of this House. It is difficult to imagine any question more fraught with interest for, or more affecting the future well-being of, the Dominion than that presented to us for solution. It assumes two phases, to my mind, namely: that viewed from the standpoint of the national obligation, and that from the standpoint of the material interest of this Dominion. The hon. member for West Durham (*Mr. Blake*), in relation to the first view of the question, referred to what had been said by the hon. the Minister of Railways as a "delving into antiquities." That hon. gentleman, as a lawyer, knows this: that all our rights depend upon a delving into antiquities. If he has any legal question in dispute between man and man, he determines it by delving into antiquities; and we have to do the same thing in questions arising between communities, or individuals, or parts of communities. It seems to me that it did not come well from the hon. member for West Durham, to sneer at the hon. the Minister of Railways because he referred to the past history of this question, and to describe that reference as a "delving into antiquities." Notwithstanding that sneer, I shall, with the permission of the House, take the liberty of delving into the antiquities of this question, with regard to the relations between the Dominion and the Province of British Columbia, the duty we owe to the Province, and the obligation imposed upon us to perform the terms entered into with that Province. It is not necessary to refer to the earlier history of the Railway. It is well known to those gentlemen who have any knowledge of the circumstances in connection with the construction of the Pacific Railway, that it was originally by no means a party question, that both parties were in favour of its construction; and hon. members who are in the habit of studying what has taken place will remember that the strongest language was used by the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite

in denunciation of those who forgot that the construction of the Pacific Railway from ocean to ocean was a duty, to neglect which would be to inflict upon us the liability of being accused of want of patriotism, and as being hostile to British connection. It was not a question whether we should build the Pacific Railway, that was urged upon us by the leaders of both parties; but it was the manner in which it was to be built, the time it should take to build it. That became a question engaging the attention of Parliament, and upon that a division took place between the two political parties in this country. When British Columbia was incorporated in the Dominion we incurred the responsibility of building the Railway, to commence it within two years at each end, and undertake to complete it within ten years. The Government of that time, under the instructions of this House, let the contract in accordance with the determination arrived at, that the road should be built by a private company, aided by a subsidy of money and a subsidy of land; and if that company had succeeded, I think it would have been a great advantage to this Dominion. Who would not now gladly give 50,000,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000 to see that Railway built from ocean to ocean? But that scheme failed. I am not going to discuss the causes of that failure, which were many. Sir Hugh Allan, who obtained along with his associates, a charter for his company, was, as I think, unfortunately mixed up with other railway enterprises which brought against him the strong hostility of the most powerful Canadian railway corporation in London. He proposed not only to build a railway across the continent, but a railway from Quebec to Ottawa, to be continued to the Sault Ste. Marie, with a branch to Toronto, and then again by the Great Western to go further west, and thus secure competition with the Grand Trunk. As a consequence of that scheme, he met, in London, with the bitter hostility of the Grand Trunk directors and shareholders, who did everything they could to prevent his success. This strong corporation, with all the influence it had in London, was aided by circumstances on this side of the water. I am not going to say the hon. gentlemen opposite were not justified in endeavouring to turn out the

Conservative Government of that day ; but, I think, looking back to the past, that everyone will admit it would have been the more patriotic course, considering the interests the country had at stake, and that those hon. gentlemen had pressed strongly the construction of this Railway, had they held their hand, and not aided, by a political crisis at the moment, those on the other side of the Atlantic, who were doing their best to defeat the enterprise. I believe that, in spite of the opposition of the Grand Trunk in England, Sir Hugh Allan would have succeeded, and that we should have had enormous sums of British capital expended here for the construction of the road had that opposition not been aided by the political crisis here. The road would thus have been built by a powerful company, whose interest it would be to aid the settlement of the country, and which, through its President, controlled a magnificent line of steamships—and which had spread over the United Kingdom, 1,200 agents, passenger brokers, everyone of whom would have been an emigration agent for this country, and would have aided in filling up our North-West Territory. But the Allan Company failed ; the Government of that day was defeated, and hon. gentlemen opposite took office. If the statements we have heard since this debate commenced are to be accepted, I think we may fairly say it was open to the late Government, had they chosen to have said to British Columbia :—“ We cannot fulfil the bargain made, and, therefore, must ask you to release us, and we will build the Railway as rapidly as we can, consistently with our financial position.” They did not take that course. On the contrary, they recognised, by their first act, the obligation of the Dominion to construct the Railway, and that, in spite of the fact that they, according to their statements, made then and frequently since, were not bound to go on with the work except as the finances of the Dominion would permit. In a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, dated 8th July, 1874, on the mission of Mr. Walkem to England, and a cable message received from the Colonial Secretary—a report in which the Roman hand of the hon. member of Lambton is visible in every line—we find this statement as

to the position in which the bargain stood :

“ Mr. Trutch, the delegate of the British Columbia Government, present in Ottawa during the discussions on the Terms of Union, expressed himself as follows at a public meeting, in order to reassure those who were apprehensive of the conveyances of so rash an assumption of such serious obligations :—

“ When he came to Ottawa with his co-delegates last year, they entered into a computation with the Privy Council as to the cost and time it would take to build the line, and they came to the conclusion that it could be built on the terms proposed in ten years. If they had said twelve or eighteen years, that time would have been accepted with equal readiness, as all that was understood was that the line should be built as soon as possible. British Columbia had entered into a partnership with Canada, and they were united to construct certain Public Works. But before one would protest against anything by which it should be understood that the Government were to borrow one hundred millions of dollars, or to tax the people of Canada and British Columbia, to carry out those works within a certain time, he had been accused of having made a very Jewish bargain ; but not even Shylock would have demanded his pound of flesh if it had to be cut from his own body.”

“ These expressions show very clearly that the terms agreed to were directory rather than mandatory, and were to be interpreted by circumstances, the essence of the engagement being such diligence as was consistent with moderate expenditure, and no increase in the then rate of taxation.”

Then, again, in another report of the Council, dated 23rd of July, the hon. gentleman more tersely and more emphatically stated the same fact. He said :

“ It was distinctly understood by the British Columbia delegation, at the time the Terms of Union were agreed upon, that the taxation of the country was not to be increased on account of this work beyond the rate then existing.”

Now, it was with that understanding of the agreement that the late Premier entered into the negotiations with which we have now to deal. He might then have said to British Columbia : we cannot pretend to build this Railway, at present, but will do what we can to carry it across the continent and meet you at the earliest possible moment consistently with the proper expenditure of the public money, and you must depend on our good will and good faith. And he might the more readily have said this in view of the position of the finances at that time.

The hon. the Finance Minister had just imposed \$3,000,000 additional taxation, so that when he sent his delegate to British Columbia and entered into the Carnarvon Terms, he had actually increased the burdens of the country by upwards of \$3,000,000. He did not take that course. He sent a delegate, Mr. Edgar, to the British Columbia Government and made it an offer, without any pressure, in accordance with his own conception of the obligation of this country towards British Columbia. I do not propose to refer to the incidents of that mission, as I wish to detain the House not a moment longer than is possible. In the report of the Committee of the Privy Council, to which I have already referred, the proposals made by the hon. member for Lambton, of his own motion, are thus succinctly stated :

“The propositions made by Mr. Edger involved an immediate heavy expenditure in British Columbia not contemplated by the Terms of Union, namely, the construction of a Railway on Vancouver's Island from the port of Esquimault to Nanaimo, as compensation to the most populous part of the Province for the requirement of a longer time for completing the line on the mainland. The proposals also embraced an obligation to construct a road or trail and telegraph line across the continent at once, and an expenditure of not less than a million and a-half within the Province annually on the railway works on the mainland, irrespective of the amounts which might be spent east of the Rocky Mountains, being a half more than the entire sum British Columbia demanded in the first instance as the annual expenditure on the whole road.”

How Lord Carnarvon understood these propositions of the Government may be inferred from the despatch which he himself sent out, dated the 16th August, 1874 ; and as it is important to emphasize distinctly the voluntary offers which were made by those hon. gentlemen when they were responsible for the government of this country, it is well to have Lord Carnarvon's own words, as giving his understanding of those proposals :

“The proposals made by Mr. Edgar, on behalf of the Canadian Government, to the Provincial Government of British Columbia may be stated as follows :—

“1. To commence at once and finish as soon as possible, a Railway from Esquimault to Nanaimo.

“2. To spare no expense in settling as speedily as possible the line to be taken by the Railway on the mainland.

“3. To make at once a waggon-road and line of telegraph along the whole length of the Rail-

way in British Columbia, and to continue the telegraph across the continent.

“4. The moment the surveys and road on the mainland are completed, to spend a minimum amount of \$1,500,000 annually upon the construction of the Railway within the Province.”

Lord Carnarvon suggested two amendments to these terms. He suggested first that the annual expenditure should be two million dollars, instead of one million and a half ; and he suggested, secondly, that the road should be completed before 1890. The Government accepted the first of these propositions in these words, which I think I may fairly assume are the words of the hon. member for Lambton :

“In regard to the second proposal, the committee recommended that Lord Carnarvon be informed (if it be found impossible to obtain a settlement of the question by the acceptance of the former offer) that the Government will consent that, after the completion of the surveys, the average annual minimum expenditure on the mainland shall be two millions.”

Then, as to the second, or time limit, which Lord Carnarvon desired to impose, the hon. member for Lambton said :

“There can be no doubt that it would be an extremely difficult task to obtain the sanction of the Canadian Parliament to any specific bargain as to time, considering the consequences which have already resulted from the unwise adoption of a limited period in the Terms of Union for the completion of so vast an undertaking, the extent of which must necessarily be very imperfectly understood by people at a distance. The Committee advise that Lord Carnarvon be informed that, while in no case could the Government undertake the completion of the whole line in the time mentioned, an extreme unwillingness exists to another limitation of time ; but if it be found absolutely necessary to secure a present settlement of the controversy by further concessions, a pledge may be given that the portion west of Lake Superior will be completed so as to afford connection by rail with existing lines of Railway through a portion of the United States, and by Canadian waters during the season of navigation by the year 1890, as suggested.”

And finally, when we come to the agreement actually made, as stated by Lord Carnarvon in his despatch of the 17th September, and I read that with a view of completing this part of my statement. These were the agreements that were made by Lord Carnarvon and accepted by the Government of that day :

“1. That the Railway from Esquimault to Nanaimo shall be commenced as soon as possible and completed with all practicable despatch.

"2. That the surveys on the mainland shall be pushed on with the utmost vigour.—On this point after considering the representations of your Ministers, I feel that I have no alternative but to rely, as I do most fully and readily upon their assurances that no legitimate effort or expense will be spared first to determine the best route for the line and secondly to proceed with the details of the engineering work. It would be distasteful to me, if indeed, it were not impossible, to prescribe strictly any minimum of the time or expenditure with regard to work of so uncertain a nature, but happily, it is equally impossible for me to doubt that your Government will loyally do its best in every way to accelerate the completion of a duty left freely to its sense of honour and justice.

"3. That the waggon road and telegraph line shall be immediately constructed.—There seems here to be some little difference of opinion as to the special value to the Province of the undertaking to complete these two works; but after considering what has been said, I am of opinion that they should both be proceeded with at once, as indeed is suggested by your Ministers."

It is worth while remarking that these two works, the waggon road and the telegraph line, were not asked for by British Columbia, but, on the contrary, British Columbia intimated that they were useless, and that she did not desire them; but they were forced upon her and forced upon Lord Carnarvon by the hon. gentlemen opposite when they occupied seats on this side of the House:

"4. That \$2,000,000 a year and not \$1,500,000 shall be the minimum expenditure on Railway works within the Province from the date at which the surveys are sufficiently completed to enable that amount to be expended on construction.—In naming this amount I understand that, it being alike the interest and the wish of the Dominion Government to urge on with all speed the completion of the works now to be undertaken, the annual expenditure will be as much in excess of the minimum of \$2,000,000 as in any year may be found practicable.

"5. Lastly, That on or before the 31st of December 1890, the Railway shall be completed and open for traffic from the Pacific seaboard to a point at the western end of Lake Superior, at which it will fall into connection with existing lines of Railway through a portion of the United States, and also with the navigation on Canadian waters.—To proceed at present with the remainder of the Railway extending by the country northward of Lake Superior, to the existing Canadian lines ought not, in my opinion, to be required, and the time for undertaking that work must be determined by the development of settlement and the changing circumstances of the country. The day is, however, I hope not very distant when a continuous line of railway through Canadian territory will be practicable, and I therefore look upon this portion of the scheme as postponed rather than abandoned."

We had an appeal by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the other evening to the hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec, and we had a suggestion from him that this scheme of the Government, this disposition to expend money only on the western end to the exclusion of that portion north of Lake Superior, was in fact an attack upon the interests of the Province of Quebec. But here we find in this arrangement, which was made by the hon. gentlemen opposite when they occupied seats on this side of the House, a positive agreement to expend at least two millions, and as much more as they possibly could, every year in British Columbia upon the mainland; and that the line north of Lake Superior should be postponed indefinitely, abandoned, in fact, so far as any present indication to construct it was concerned. Now, here are the words in which the Privy Council accepted those terms. The report is dated 18th December, 1874:

"The Minute of Council of September 17th contained a statement of reason showing why some of these modifications should not be pressed, but the Government, actuated by an anxious desire to remove all difficulties, expressed a willingness to make these further concessions rather than forego an immediate settlement of so irritating a question, as the concessions suggested might be made without involving a violation of the spirit of any Parliamentary Resolution or the letter of any enactment."

So that the very reason for the offer to expend two millions a year at least in British Columbia, after the surveys were completed, in addition to the expenditures upon the eastern end of the line, was that that could be done without involving a violation of the spirit of any Parliamentary Resolution or the letter of any enactment. That was after \$3,000,000 of additional taxation had been added to the burdens of the people of this country, in excess of the rate of taxation existing when the Province was admitted to the Union, and the first Resolution limiting the obligation of the Dominion, so frequently referred to, was passed by Parliament. The report of Council proceeded:

"The Committee of Council respectfully request that Your Excellency will be pleased to convey to Lord Carnarvon their warm appreciation of the kindness which led his Lordship to tender his good offices to effect a settlement of

the matter in dispute, and also to assure his Lordship that every effort will be made to secure the realisation of what is expected."

When, Sir, Lord Carnarvon reads the debates which have taken place in this House; when he compares the different statements made at different times by the hon. gentleman then at the head of the Government, and of one of his supporters who had a short time before been a member of the Government, and who a short time afterwards was again a member of the Government, he will be shocked at the perfidy of Canadian public men. The comparison will certainly not be calculated to raise us in the estimation of British statesmen. Lord Carnarvon accepted in the spirit in which they were given the thanks awarded him, and said, on the 4th of January:

"It has been with great pleasure that I have received this expression of their opinion. I sincerely rejoice to have been the means of bringing to a satisfactory conclusion a question of so much difficulty, of removing, as I trust, all ground of future misunderstanding between the Province of British Columbia and the Dominion, and of thus contributing towards the ultimate completion of a public work in which they, and indeed the whole Empire, are interested."

The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) in his speech, stated that within a few months after this correspondence had taken place, after this interchange of compliments with Lord Carnarvon, he entered the Government upon the distinct understanding that these terms were to be abandoned. I think too much of him and of the hon. member for Lambton, to believe that any such compact could have been made. It is true that he contends that the defeat of the Esquimaux and Nanaimo Railway destroyed the Carnarvon Terms. And he contends that the offer of \$750,000 was to be regarded as a compensation for the abandonment of those terms. It was nothing of the kind. The Esquimaux and Nanaimo Railway was promised in excess of the Terms of Union, and as compensation for the non-fulfilment of the condition to build the main line by 1881. When the Bill providing for the building of this Railway was defeated in the Senate, the duty of the Government was to provide a substitute for the compensation for the delay on the mainland. They offered that compensation in the form of a money grant of \$750,000, that being

MR. WHITE.

in fact, as stated by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), the sum which he proposed to give as a subsidy to a private company to build the Island Railway. This offer, therefore, so far from being an abandonment of the Carnarvon Terms, was a confirmation of them, an admission of their binding character, a doing, in fact, in another form, precisely what was agreed to be done in those terms. But, Mr. Speaker, we are told that we ought not to go on with the road because there is an obligation on the Government not to go on if it will involve increased taxation. Whatever force there may be in that argument, members of the late Government have deprived themselves of the right to use it. The late First Minister when he entered into the Carnarvon Terms, when he made the contract with British Columbia, actually appropriated \$3,000,000 of additional taxation to enable him to carry out those terms. Here is the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) in the Minute of Council of the 23rd July, 1879, sent to England for the information of the Imperial Government on this question. He said:

"So anxious, however, were the present Government to remove any possible cause of complaint, that they did take means to increase the taxation very materially in order to place themselves in a position to make arrangements for the prosecution of the initial and difficult portions of the line as soon as it was possible to do so; and, at the same time, a special confidential agent was deputed to British Columbia for the express purpose of conferring with the Government of that Province, and to endeavour to arrive at some understanding as to a course to be pursued which could be satisfactory to British Columbia and meet the circumstances of the Dominion."

That was the statement made to the Imperial Government on the responsibility of hon. gentlemen opposite; that when they sent their agent to British Columbia they sent him armed with the fact that \$3,000,000 had been appropriated to the carrying out of terms to be agreed upon in reference to this Railway; and yet hon. gentlemen now say that we must dishonour ourselves, because the carrying out of the terms, which they made a show of carrying out by the infliction of \$3,000,000 increased taxation, would involve a very much smaller increased burden on the people. But we

have another report. In order to enable the Government to fulfil the terms, and so that no excuse might be allowed for supposing that they were unwilling to carry them out, we find them stating, in another report of the Privy Council on the 8th of July, that they had raised the average rate of taxation 15 per cent. The actual statement thus made is as follows:—

“In order to enable the Government to carry out the proposals, which it was hoped the British Columbia Government would have accepted, the average rate of taxation was raised at the last Session about 15 per cent. The Customs duties being raised from 15 per cent. to 17½ per cent., and the Excise duties on spirits and tobacco a corresponding rate, both involving additional taxation exceeding \$3,000,000 on the transaction of the year.”

That is a statement made by the authority of the Government that this increased taxation was made expressly to enable them to carry out these Carnarvon Terms, and yet we have from these very gentlemen now, an appeal to the country to oppose the policy of the present Government in the direction of carrying out those terms, on the ground that it may increase the taxation of the country, and that in spite of the fact that the proposals of the Government will not involve anything like so large a burden. The hon. gentleman, as I shall be able to establish, has never, until this year, gone back upon that record. Session after Session we have had the statement of the hon. member for Lambton that he recognised the obligation resting upon him to carry out these Carnarvon Terms. Every Session we have had his assurance to that effect. Let me read two or three such assurances given by him, when submitting his yearly statements to the House. In his speech, in submitting the Pacific Railway policy in 1876, he said—and at this time the hon. member for West Durham was a member of the Government, and is, therefore, responsible for every word uttered:

“We have felt from the first that while it was utterly impossible to implement to the letter the engagements entered into by our predecessors, the good faith of the country demanded that the Administration should do everything that was reasonable and in their power to carry out the pledges made to British Columbia, if not the entire obligation, at least such parts of it as seemed to be within their power and most conducive to the welfare of the whole Dominion, as well as to

satisfy all reasonable men in British Columbia, which Province had fancied itself entitled to complain of apparent want of good faith in carrying out these obligations. * * * Let me say, so far as the work itself is concerned, that I have always been an advocate of the construction of a railway across the continent, but I have never believed that it was within our means to do it in anything like the period of time within which the hon. gentleman bound Parliament and the country.”

That is by 1881. After an elaborate statement of surveys, and a suggestion of the advantages of the Pine River Pass, he said:

“But this route is open to the objection that if we were to decide upon surveying that country, it would be practically putting off the construction for some time longer than would be necessary by adopting the line we have already surveyed. If British Columbia were to act with consideration for national interests with regard to the obligations assumed by the Dominion at the time of the Union, it undoubtedly would be the policy any Administration would seek to carry out to examine the country more thoroughly before action. With the irritation that is felt by many in British Columbia, and the constant complaints made, it is doubtful whether the country would be justified, even for a permanent advantage, unless that one of so decided and conclusive a character as to be apparent at sight, in pursuing such a policy. Assuming, therefore, for a moment—and assuming what I may call almost a certainty—that the Jasper House Pass will be the crossing place in the Rocky Mountains, we have the line tolerably clearly defined from east to west.”

Thus, Sir, at that time we had a statement that further explorations must not be undertaken lest delay might occur in the work of actual construction. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) at that time sat beside the then First Minister. And speaking of taxation, the late Finance Minister, that very same Session, the Session in which this statement was made by the hon. member for Lambton, came down and announced that there was a deficit of \$1,900,000, and amended the Tariff with the view to still further taxation. Yet, in spite of that deficit, and of that increased taxation, we had the statement of the hon. member for Lambton that so important was it that this arrangement should be carried out and the terms fulfilled by an immediate commencement of the work of construction, that he was actually prepared to forego further explorations unless the advantages of such explorations were apparent

at first sight. The hon. gentleman in the same speech said :

“Our policy was this : It is utterly impossible to commence the construction in British Columbia until we have overcome the initiatory difficulties by carefully surveying the country and ascertaining the line which would have ultimately to be adopted. From the statements I have made it will be seen that an enormous force has been engaged and a large amount expended in that Province, and it is unjust in the people of British Columbia to complain that we have not prosecuted this work with all due diligence. Directions were given by the Government to the Chief Engineer, and by him to his staff, that anything that could be done was to be done in order to push the work forward as rapidly as possible.”

In the same speech, in order to give additional proof of his sincerity and of his determination to carry out this work, he referred to the steel rails which had been sent to British Columbia. He said :

“It has been assumed that as this road is not to be constructed, the rails shipped to British Columbia are therefore utterly useless. That is a great mistake. If we are able to commence the work of construction this coming year in British Columbia, these rails would be required. It may be said to be impossible to commence the construction of the road in British Columbia without having the rails on the spot.

“There are five thousand tons in British Columbia, and if we have erred in sending them there we have simply erred in our earnest desire to show to the people of British Columbia that we are desirous of keeping faith with them, that our speeches were not mere empty promises, and that we are resolved to place ourselves in a position they could not misunderstand.”

That was the statement in 1876, made by the hon. gentleman from his place on the Treasury Benches. The hon. member for West Durham sat beside him at the time, and was responsible for every word he uttered. And yet the hon. gentleman comes here and tells this House, and he tells this country, that he had before this made an arrangement that this work was to be postponed. Let me read another extract from the same debate. The hon. member for Cumberland said :

“He had followed the hon. gentleman closely, and failed to learn what was proposed to be done in regard to the great question of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The British Columbia papers merely showed that the Government had succeeded in bringing matters to a deadlock, and the Premier was bound to tell the House before asking it to vote this large amount what he intended to do.

“Hon. Mr. BLAKE—The last paragraph in the papers will show.

Mr. WHITE.

“Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—I said our policy from the first was to do everything in our power to keep the bargain the hon. gentleman and his friends made, and nothing will be lacking on our own part to bring it to a successful conclusion in British Columbia. I have shown pretty conclusively that nothing I am aware of has been left undone that could be done. I do not know what the hon. gentleman wants.”

That is to be taken as the interpretation of the arrangement made by the hon. member for West Durham when he entered that Cabinet. But we have another authority as to what the late Government intended to do, which, to my mind, seems utterly to negative the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Durham, that he entered the Cabinet upon conditions which would have dishonoured the Government that accepted him on such terms. Lord Dufferin, then Governor-General of Canada, was sent to British Columbia in 1876. I should, perhaps, not use the word “sent,” but he went to British Columbia, though judging by his speech, perhaps I am right in saying that he was sent there. He went there at any rate. He went through the country. Hon. gentlemen who have been endeavouring to decry British Columbia will do well to read Lord Dufferin’s speech on that occasion, wherein he described what he calls “this glorious country.” But, Sir, the then Governor-General of this Dominion, after his return from his tour through the interior of British Columbia, and just before he embarked for San Francisco, made a speech in Victoria. How serious he felt that speech to be may be gathered from one expression, which I will read, and which was an extraordinary expression for a nobleman in his position to use :

“I would sooner cut my right hand off than utter a single word that I do not know to be an absolute truth.”

This statement was made in order to convince British Columbians that what he said, he said from a knowledge of the facts, with a resolution to say nothing but what he knew to be absolutely true. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), as a good constitutionalist, knows that being a Minister at the time, he was responsible for every word Lord Dufferin then uttered. Here is an extract from the speech :

“Let me then assure you, on the part of the Canadian Government and on the part of the Canadian people at large, that there is nothing they desire more earnestly or more fervently than to know and feel that you are one with them in heart, thought and feeling. Canada would indeed be dead to the most self-evident considerations of self-interest, and to the first instincts of national pride, if she did not regard with satisfaction her connection with a Province so richly endowed by nature, inhabited by a community so replete with British loyalty and pluck, while it afforded her the means of extending her confines and the outlets of her commerce to the wide Pacific and to the countries beyond.”

Well, Sir, at that time there was a suspicion prevailing that the hon. member for Lambton had not acted in good faith in connection with the Carnarvon Terms. There was a suspicion prevailing, because two hon. gentlemen of the Senate, prominent friends of that gentleman, who were known to be so good party men that one could hardly conceive their voting against any measure which the Government sincerely decided to see passed—yet voted against this Bill—there was a suspicion that he had procured the defeat of the measure for the construction of the Esquimault and Nanaimo Railway in the Senate; and referring to that suspicion Lord Dufferin said:

“Had Mr. Mackenzie dealt so treacherously by Lord Carnarvon, by the representative of his sovereign in this country, or by you, he would have been guilty of a most atrocious act, of which I trust no public man in Canada or in any other British colony could be capable. I tell you in the most emphatic terms, and I pledge my honour on the point, that Mr. Mackenzie was not guilty of any such base and deceitful conduct; had I thought him guilty of it, either he would have ceased to be Prime Minister, or I should have left the country.”

I ask you where is the difference between conspiring to secure the defeat of the measure in the Senate which had passed the Commons, and which the Ministry pretended to be in favour of, and conspiring to arouse public sentiment as those hon. gentlemen are doing to-day, in order to prevent the carrying out of the Carnarvon Terms. Lord Dufferin proceeded:

“I saw Mr. Mackenzie the next day, and I have seldom seen a man more annoyed or disconcerted than he was; indeed, he was driven at that interview to protest with more warmth than he has ever used against the decision of the English Government, which had refused, on the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, to allow him to add to the members of the

Senate, after Prince Edward Island had entered the Confederation.”

And yet these hon. gentlemen come here now and ask us to postpone the construction of this Railway, to postpone the carrying out of these terms which have been entered into, this solemn bargain which has been made, and in order to carry which they, at that time, four or five years ago, actually tried to violate the Constitution by creating additional members of the Senate. Well, Sir, after discussing the question of the action of the Senate, Lord Dufferin said:

“But there is one thing I admit the Senate has done, it has revived in their integrity those original treaty obligations on the strength of which you were induced to enter Confederation, and it has reimposed upon Mr. Mackenzie and his Government the obligation of offering you an equivalent for that stipulation in the Carnarvon Terms, which he has not been able to make good.”

Then he refers to the offer of \$750,000 as compensation for the failure of that part of the Carnarvon Terms which the Senate had made it impossible to make good:

“My only object in touching upon them at all is to disabuse your minds of the idea that there has been any intention on the part of Mr. Mackenzie, his Government, or of Canada to break faith with you. Every single item of the Carnarvon Terms is at this moment in course of fulfilment.”

The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is responsible for that statement. Lord Dufferin pointed out how this was the case, and then he went on to say—and I beg the hon. member for West Durham to listen attentively to what he did say in relation to the conduct of those who, being strong in numerical majority, would try to oppress a small Province because it had not sufficient members to compete with them:

“Your numerical weakness as a community is your real strength, for it is a consideration that appeals to every generous heart. Far be the day when on any acre of soil above which floats the flag of England, mere material power, brute political preponderance, should be permitted to decide such a controversy as that which we are now discussing. It is to men like yourselves, who, with unquailing fortitude, and heroic energy, have planted the laws and liberties, and the blessed influence of English homes amidst the wilds, and rocks, and desert plains of savage lands, that England owes the enhancement of her prestige, the diffusion of her tongue, the increase of her commerce, and her ever-widening renown, and woe betide the Government or the statesman who, because its inhabitants are few in num-

ber, and politically of small account, should disregard the wishes or carelessly dismiss the representations, however bluff, boisterous, or downright, of the feeblest of our distant colonies."

I draw to those words the special attention of the hon. member for West Durham, who, for the moment, has permitted himself to sink the statesman who can think of the next generation, into the parish politician who thinks only of the next General Election. That was the position in 1876, and I think I may say that I have established beyond controversy, beyond the possibility of controversy, the fact that the hon. gentlemen were at least committed, the hon. member for West Durham amongst the rest, at that time, to the honest fulfilment of the bargain which they had made. In 1877, it was reported—I do not know what truth there was in the report—that it was in consequence of Lord Dufferin's visit to British Columbia, the question of the selection of the Burrard Inlet route came up for the first time. Up to that time that route had hardly been heard of, and the hon. member for Lambton was known to be in favour of the Bute Inlet route.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have no objection to tell the hon. gentleman that Lord Dufferin had nothing personally to do with it. It was adopted purely upon practical engineering reasons. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying I was in favour of the Bute Inlet route for a considerable time. In fact I was in favour of it until I got something better.

MR. WHITE: Who suggested the change is not a matter of any consequence to my argument. I simply give the report as it was current at the time, and the hon. member knowing the facts contradicts it. In 1877 the Burrard Inlet route came up for the first time, so far as Parliament was concerned, and so far as the suggestion of it as a serious route was concerned. The hon. member for Lambton, in reply to the hon. member for Cumberland, who asked whether, in connection with some other statements which he made, he proposed to settle that question and put the line under contract without the consent of Parliament, that being apparently the intention of the Government, from the speech of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Mackenzie replied: "Certainly not; I think I stated we hoped

to have the tender submitted to Parliament next Session." So that in 1877, as in 1876, there never was a thought of abandoning the line in British Columbia, or violating the Carnarvon Terms; but on the contrary the Government of the day were acting in good faith in their desire to carry out those terms. Well, Sir, in 1878, the hon. gentleman, the last time he had the privilege of making a statement from the Ministerial Benches, referred to the great surveys which had taken place in connection with the proposed road through British Columbia. Throughout all his speeches on the subject, from first to last, there runs a line of argument showing how sincerely he was devoted to carrying out the scheme of beginning the work on the mainland. He pointed out that 47,000 miles of country had been traversed by the various parties who were sent out to explore the country, and that there had been "actual instrumental surveys laboriously measured, yard by yard, of not less than 12,000 miles or nearly five times the length of the road when completed from Lake Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean." Then he gave his reasons for desiring to go on at once as follows:—

"If there were no political considerations governing the action of the Government, and these political reasons referred to our obligations with the British Columbian Government and people to proceed as fast as possible—or as the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster) says two or three times every day, 'proceed immediately'—if there were no considerations of that kind to govern our action, it might be, I have no doubt it would be, desirable to spend another two years exploring the country which is yet comparatively unknown. The governing considerations then, Sir, are all in favour, as it appears to me, of adopting the views of the Chief Engineer in respect to this line. The Government have not at the moment formally resolved upon the adoption of this line, but it is the opinion of the Government that the considerations to which I have alluded in these remarks are such as must govern their action if they are to attend to this matter purely in the public interest."

That was the statement made by the hon. member the last time he addressed this House from the Ministerial Benches. What occurred afterwards? Parliament was prorogued the General Elections were coming on, and the hon. gentleman advertised for tenders for the construction of that very portion of the Railway which we are now asked to postpone. Now,

MR. WHITE.

what are we to infer from that? Governments do not do those things, on the eve of General Elections, which are likely to be unpopular with the country. He advertised for those tenders simply because the public mind of this country had been thoroughly imbued with the fact that the honour of the country was pledged to the carrying out of this arrangement. He had been going on through four Sessions, making the only condition of commencement, the completion of surveys, not the question of taxation, but the fact of the completion of the surveys, and as soon as the surveys were completed he advertised for tenders. It is true he has suggested, and I am bound to say I was astonished at the suggestion, and I am sure this House will be astonished when I offer them the proof I am going to offer—it is true he suggested he did not intend to build the road, although he advertised for tenders, intimating that he advertised for tenders simply in order that he might find out how much it was likely to cost. After all the surveys made and all the reports obtained, we are actually asked to believe that he had advertised simply with the view of obtaining an idea of the cost. The only object he had in view in sending this advertisement from one end of the Dominion to the other, inducing contractors to make enquiries about them and to go to the expense and incur the loss of time in getting up their tenders, was simply to ascertain the probable cost without any idea of practical work. All I can say about it is this: he deceived his own friends most wonderfully, if that was his intention. Here is a statement in the *Toronto Globe* of the 20th September last. I do not quote it because it is in the *Globe*, but because it is an evidence of what was the popular impression as to his intention in advertising for tenders:

“Sir Charles Tupper's Pacific Railway Resolutions proposed to construct 125 miles of road in British Columbia during the present season. By that promise the British Columbian members were induced to vote for the Tariff, so injurious to itself and to their Province. They have been amused ever since by tales of explorations, surveys, guarantees, purchases of steel rails, and announcements that operations would soon begin. It is now late in the year, nothing has yet been done, and very little could be done before winter if the work were now begun. Had Mr. Mackenzie remained in

office, a large portion of the line would now have been constructed, and access to the interior have been given. The people of British Columbia may well wonder at their folly in parting with the ‘bird in hand.’”

That was the impression the hon. gentleman made. Well, Sir, a short time afterwards it was announced that the Burrard Inlet route had been agreed upon, and that the Government were advertising for tenders for the construction of a road in accordance with that decision. And here is what the *Globe* said on the 27th October in reference to this question:

“Just a year ago Mr. Mackenzie, as Minister of Public Works, was making preparations for the letting of contracts to build a line from Yale to Kamloops, about 120 miles, and the work of transporting the rails from Esquimaux to the mainland was actually begun. As soon as the present Government came into power, the order for the transportation of the rails was countermanded, and the project of building the Yale Kamloops line was abandoned. * * * In other words, they are shut up to a choice between acknowledging that they have by their incompetence lost a whole year to the construction of the line, and confessing that they never meant to give it up at all, and sought only to temporise in the face of difficulty at the expense of feelings and hopes of the unfortunate Islanders.”

That was the opinion of the *Toronto Globe* in relation to the action of the hon. gentleman. There was then no suggestion that the road should be postponed, but a suggestion that time had been lost in not having gone on with it earlier. I have evidence still stronger than that—the evidence of the hon. member for Lambton himself—which hon. gentlemen opposite will perhaps accept. Last year the hon. member delivered a speech on the floor of this House. He had no responsibility of office upon him; he was in a position, if he had chosen to do so, to have done then what he has humiliated himself by doing on this occasion. But he did not do so. Here is the assurance that he gave to hon. gentlemen on this side:

“They will always find that gentlemen on this side will be prepared to consider all such questions from a truly national point of view. We recognise the obligation resting upon us as Canadians, and while I assert, in the most positive manner, that nothing could have been done by any Administration during our term of office that we did not do or try to do, in order to accomplish or realise those expectations which were generated by the Government of hon.

gentlemen opposite in their admission of British Columbia into the Confederacy. I say, at the same time, we endeavoured, not merely to keep the national obligations, but we ventured to a great extent our own political existence as administrators; we risked our political position for the sake of carrying out to completion, in the best way possible, the course which hon. gentlemen opposite had promised should be taken."

They are evidently not going any longer to risk their political position for the sake of carrying to completion, and in the best way possible, the obligations which hon. gentlemen opposite had so emphatically rivetted upon the Dominion. Then he gave to this country from the Opposition Benches, as he had before from the Ministerial Benches, a declaration of his policy:

"Our proposal was this: We endeavoured in the first place to obtain some modification of the terms. We despatched an agent to British Columbia, and Lord Carnarvon ultimately offered his good services in order to arrive at some understanding with that Province, and we reached the understanding that we would endeavour to build a Railway from Lake Superior to the Pacific Ocean by 1890, that we should expend a certain sum per annum in British Columbia after the surveys were completed and the line adopted. The line never was surveyed sufficiently to enable us to reach that conclusion till last year, and as soon as we had information to guide us we adopted the Burrard Inlet route and immediately advertised for tenders for the construction of that line."

That is the statement of the hon. gentleman; but I have another passage from his speech stronger than that. It will be remembered that the policy of the hon. the Minister of Railways was this: He asked this House to declare that the selection of the Burrard Inlet route was premature, to give him permission to make further and other explorations, and further to allow him to let 125 miles of railway where he might determine after these explorations were made. What did the hon. member for Lambton say to this proposition? Here is an extract from his speech, and I beg hon. members to note it well:

"I do not see how it is possible that this House can authorise the Government first to select a line, and, at the same time, when that line is not made known to Parliament, that we should authorise the Government to enter into a contract for building 125 miles of the Railway. If the Government ask for power to let out contracts on lines that have been already thoroughly surveyed and are located, I would not blame those who approved of the policy of the Government, for giving them that power,

and if they ask for the power to build 125 miles on the line which I believe to be best, I will be prepared to support that proposition, but I am not prepared to support any proposition to place power in the hands of any Government to expend money in building a portion of a railway without, at least, communicating the place where that money is to be expended."

Now it comes to this, that had the hon. member for Cumberland been less anxious to select the best possible route for British Columbia, had he been willing to come down here last year and ask permission to let 125 miles of railway on the Burrard Inlet route, the hon. member for Lambton would have supported him, and, I need not say, the whole party at his back would have supported him as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, what has brought about this change? Certainly the financial position last year was not better than the financial position this year. Certainly the business outlook was not better last year than this year. Certainly the prospect in this country in relation to the filling up of the North-West was not better last year than this year. Why then was he prepared last year to give his support to the precise expenditure asked for to-day, while this year he advocates a postponement of the work. There is a reason for it. An hon. gentleman who was not here last year, has returned to public life. We have the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) again in this House. That is why this opposition is put forward. Those who have watched his political career since 1867 knows that he never brooked leadership, and that he does not brook it now. He is to-day aspiring to the leadership of his party; but I will tell him, if he will permit me to do so, that a man who does not know how honestly to follow will never successfully lead. Well, what is the result? Not satisfied with placing his party upon a new platform, not satisfied with subjecting his leader to the deeply humiliating position of turning his back upon himself, he has done more than that. Those who have watched Parliament, as I have watched it from that gallery, know that the incorporation of the North-West Territories has always received the support of the hon. member for Lambton. He has always been in favour of filling up the North-West, and never until last night has he ever uttered a single sentence of discredit against that North-West Terri-

tory. But those who have, as I have said, watched the course of events in this Parliament, will remember the almost open rupture that took place between the then hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for Lambton, because the latter supported the policy of the Government in regard to bringing in this North-West Territory; and they will also remember that the then hon. member for South Bruce ultimately left the House in a pet and did not vote at all. Not satisfied, I say, with placing his leader in the humiliating position in which he has placed the hon. member for Lambton by inducing him to turn his back on his political record, he compelled him to devote two hours last evening in that triangular speech of the hon. members for West Durham, North Norfolk and Lambton, the details of which were announced in advance by that hon. gentleman, to reading extracts from reports and books calculated to discredit the country, and to prove, if the statements were true, that the then hon. member for South Bruce was right in his refusal to incorporate the North-West with the Dominion, and that the hon. member for Lambton was wrong in supporting the Government on that question. The hon. member for West Durham referred to the question of Western development, and he stated that that Western development had been most marvellous. There is one thing that will strike every hon. member in this House that according to the hon. members on the other side everything American has been marvellous and everything Canadian has been the reverse. He selected two States—Kansas and Nebraska—as illustrations of progress, and in order to prove that we had no reason to look for any such progress, he gave reasons showing the great advantages enjoyed by the Western States as compared with the Canadian North-West. The hon. gentleman dwelt strongly upon what he called the vast recruiting ground which the Western States possessed in the United States, and as an illustration of this, he pointed out that of the increase in the population of the states and territories, west of the lakes, between 1850 and 1860, 81 per cent. was native and 19 per cent. was foreign; and that between 1860 and 1870, the proportions were 79 per cent. native and 21 per cent.

foreign. Then he went on to show that there was no possibility of our copying that wonderful development in our North-West; that we had no such native recruiting ground as the Western States. It will be perceived that while the hon. gentleman is pleased to build up a Chinese wall as against emigrants coming into this country, he pulls it down when Canadians are to go into that country. Mention has been made two or three times of the large number of Canadians going into the United States. There is no doubt that such an emigration has been going on. But it is worth while to point out that by the Census of 1870, it appears that of the population of the United States there were 1.26 per cent. of the whole population Canadians, and that in British North America 1.85 per cent. was of American birth. That rather pulls down the Chinese wall on both sides, and shows that the people do come and go from and to both sides. But after proving to his own satisfaction that we could get comparatively no population into our North-West, the hon. member for West Durham went on to ask of what value the population going there will be to the older Provinces; and referring to the suggestion that the manufacturers of the east will find a market in the west, the hon. gentleman asked, with one of his most cynical sneers, whether the National Policy was to have no effect there. Well, Sir, it is well known that in the United States, where Protection prevails in the west as well as the east, western development has resulted in home markets for eastern manufacturers. So much is this the case, that the group of manufacturing States has increased in population in an equal ratio with the whole United States. I think it will be admitted by everyone who knows anything of the progress of emigration, notwithstanding the suggestions of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that emigration has always gone on lines of latitude, that the tendency in the United States is for the emigrant to go into new territory. Places that were the centres of emigration only ten years ago are now the recruiting ground for emigrants going still further westward; and as we have, at this moment, in our North-West, the newest regions—almost the only

places remaining on the North American continent entirely new—we shall have the same process or movement from east to west, into our territory, in the future, in addition to the large emigration from the Old World. Then the hon. member for West Durham told us, as another reason why we could not hope for much emigration to that country, that the people of Ireland were not likely to come into Canada; and we had an appeal to Irish sympathies as a means of signalling, perhaps, the advent of Irish leadership, and the downfall of Scotch ascendancy in the Liberal party. If he had been disposed to deal fairly with his own country, he might have referred to the fact that there is no part of the North American continent where the Irish race occupies a better position than in Canada. What is the fact in the United States to-day? The governing party are bitterly opposed to the Irish race; and the most effective cartoons of the great Republican caricaturist Nast, are those in which he appeals to Irish antipathies among native Americans. Do we find anything of that kind here? On no other part of this continent have the national and religious feelings of the Irish Roman Catholics been recognised as in Canada. Even in the Act for opening up our new territory, there is a constitutional provision made for supplying the Irish Catholics with schools in accordance with their own religious convictions. The hon. gentleman might, when making that appeal to Irish sympathies, and endeavouring to secure a new alliance, with a view to the building up of his party, have said this much in relation to the Irish race in Canada. Nowhere, whether in politics, commerce, or the professions, has the Irish race achieved greater renown or a more preeminent position than in the British North American Provinces. But I am glad he admits that the railways in the United States have been the secret of their development. There is no doubt of it. In the Republic in 1860, only eighteen years ago, there were only 36,635 miles of railway; in 1878 there were 81,841; the average mileage built every year for the last eighteen years was 2,845, equal to the entire length of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Though he admits that it is to those railways is due the rapid peopling of the American North-West, giving an

example of a movement of population and of settlement of a scale never before seen, yet he seeks to place his party on the platform of building no more railways in Canada. The hon. member for North Norfolk, referring last night to the impossibility—for that seems to be the theme on the opposite side—of building up our North-West country at all, alluded to the small progress made in the Western States from 1800 to 1830. When he had to go back that far he was hard pressed for an argument. At that time it is quite true the Western States were not peopled at all. Their population was, I think, about 760,000, the whole population of the country being 12,866,020. But since, and in exact proportion to railway development, the Western States have been developed. Up to that time there was scarcely any emigration from the Old World to the United States. It is rather a curious fact that from 1815 to 1840, the emigration from the British Isles to the British North American Provinces, actually exceeded the whole emigration from them to the United States by 82,000. Down to 1847, the year of the Irish famine, and the terrible ship fever, the emigration from the British Isles to Canada was 746,163, and to the United States, 780,048, the difference being only about 24,000 in favour of the United States. But since that year emigration has been on a large scale to the United States, in consequence of those very western territories, attracting the people from the Eastern States, who left room for the people from the Old World. By the Census Returns, while 645,608 people came from the United Kingdom to Canada, from 1847 to 1870, 3,692,624 went to the United States. We have in our Mother Land an important recruiting ground for emigrants to this country. In spite of the enormous emigration from the Mother Country, the population still increases. From 1860 to 1870 its emigrants to all parts, including Australia, Canada, and the United States reached 1,571,729, despite which its increase of population was over two and a half millions. That shows how important a recruiting ground the British Isles furnish for this Dominion. We are told we are not going to get much money from our lands in the North-West. The hon.

member for West Durham stated that 11,770,000 acres were sold in the United States from 1860 to 1869, and from 1869 to 1879, 47,170,000 acres.

MR. BLAKE: Not sold, but granted and sold to settlers.

MR. WHITE: I understand—located, or taken up. But he did not refer to the railway lands disposed of.

MR. BLAKE: I mentioned that that number did not include the railway lands.

MR. WHITE: I so understood you. But what do we find? That the United States Government granted to its railway companies 192,308,311 acres, and that the companies sold to June 30th, 1879, 43,698,068 acres. Thirteen railway companies in the United States sold in 1877, 1,006,266 acres, and in 1878, 2,570,744. Sixteen companies sold their lands at an average of \$5.70 an acre. So there is proof that the railway companies in the United States have succeeded in outdoing the Government, and that people have actually gone west and paid large prices for railway lands, when they could have got homesteads and preemptions for little or nothing, showing the advantages and good results that have flown from a perfectly organised system in inducing these companies to cooperate in the settlement of those lands. The total receipts from the sale of lands in the United States for this century are \$204,447,473. Those figures show that the lands of that country have been yearly growing in attractiveness; that there has been a greater demand, a larger number of sales, and more competition for the land year by year. We may fairly assume, then, in connection with our North-West, the settlement of a large population in it at no distant day. Another reason urged by the hon. member for West Durham why we could not hope for success in selling the North West, was that we have a large debt in Canada. We have. I very much regret it is so large. But we are incurring obligations, perhaps in the hour of our greatest weakness, that will suffice for years. We are building up large enterprises, such as those connected with the Canals; deepening our rivers, erecting lighthouses on our coasts, in the interest of that great commerce that must come to the country in the future. These expenditures make additions to our debt.

But those improvements go on adding, not by way of direct return—which the hon. gentleman seems to think is the only possible return a nation can have for its expenditures—but in the development of our industries, of our trade and commerce, and in the promotion of that prosperity which is very much more valuable than any question of so many dollars as tolls from those works. Take the Welland Canal; it does not yield us a great deal in direct returns. And yet who is there in the country who would oppose the expenditure on its improvement? Who would even dream of looking for a return from that work from the tolls on the vessels passing through it? It is simply a means of bringing the largest vessels from the western lakes into Lake Ontario, to enable Canada to compete with the United States for the shipment of grain to Europe. Nothing could be more unfair than to refer to the debts for such Public Works as if they had to be repaid from year to year. They are sources of development which the people have voluntarily undertaken in view of the great advantages to result from them. The hon. gentleman should have dealt honestly with our debt, which he told us had increased from \$77,706,000 net debt in 1871, to \$147,485,070 in 1879, or about 89 per cent.; and he went on to compare that increase with the increase in European States, whose large debts have been incurred, not for the purpose of development, but for destructive objects and great armaments. But with all this great increase, it will be admitted that the measure of the burden of the debt is the annual interest paid upon it. Now, what is the fact? That while the net debt has increased about 89 per cent., the actual interest on the debt has increased rather under 40 per cent.

MR. BLAKE: I stated that.

MR. WHITE: Yes; but the hon. gentleman so emphasised his statement as to cause the fact to be overlooked. That is the real position of affairs as to the increase of debt upon which the hon. gentleman dwelt. There was no object, I think, speaking in the interest of his own country, in throwing into the face of those who might desire to take advantage of the fact, that a large increase has taken place; no object in giving an opportunity

to those who are opposed to Canada, and who are watching this debate, ready to use the expressions of the hon. gentleman to the detriment of this country in England and Europe generally; no necessity to refer to an increase of the debt in a way to cause an erroneous impression in regard to it. In that increase about \$14,000,000 are debts of the Provinces which have been assumed by the Dominion; that is no real increase but a transference of debt.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: That is a mistake.

MR. WHITE: Does the hon. gentleman deny that view?

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Certainly.

MR. WHITE: I think I am right; and I do not think the hon. member for West Durham will venture to say that the assumption by the Dominion of the debts which had to be paid by the Provinces, is any addition to the burdens of the people; it is a mere transference of the obligation from the Provinces to the Dominion, the taxes coming from the same people all the while. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the annual expenditure in Canada, which was, if I remember aright, \$6.69 per head, while in the United States it was \$6.13 per head. Well, what is the fact with regard to our expenditure? It is well that our condition, as compared with the United States, should be understood when the whole policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to show how much more desirable a country from every standpoint is the United States to settle in than Canada. The hon. gentleman referred to the large decrease of debt which is taking place there, and happily taking place, because it is well that all free governing communities should be as lightly taxed as possible. But the hon. gentleman in taking that ground, ought to have pointed out that the expenditures of the Dominion of Canada practically include the expenditures of the Provinces, and that there is one item, the subsidies to the Provinces, which, it seems to me, ought always to be considered in presenting the expenditures of the Dominion of Canada. What are the state debts in the United States? What are the debts outside altogether of the debts of the Federal Government? The

last official Census of 1870 shows that there were state debts, county, town and city debts, independent altogether of the Federal debt, amounting to \$868,676,758. The amount raised by direct taxation in the United States in connection with the state, county, town and city debts, amounted to no less than \$280,591,521. In 1860 those direct taxes, outside the Federal taxes altogether, outside the Revenues of the Federal Government, amounted to \$94,186,746 for that year, and in 1870 they had increased to \$280,591,521, or an increase during that period of \$196,404,775. The hon. gentleman referred to another point. He says: Look at the enormous taxes involved in the Customs' duties. Under the Customs' Tariff we have the large sum of 19.62 per cent. of everything that is imported into the country going into the Dominion Treasury, and he urged that, I presume, as a reason why people should go to the United States rather than come to Canada. Well, he might also have stated that in the United States, of the total imports, free and dutiable, no less than 29.44 per cent. goes into the Federal Treasury. Or if he came to dutiable goods alone he might have pointed out that, while in Canada it is somewhere about 24 per cent., in the United States it is 45.28 per cent. of everything that is imported that goes into the Federal Treasury. That is a specimen of the kind of argument with which this House has been treated, in order to prove that this country is hardly a fit country to live in, that we have neither present nor future to hope for, and that all sensible men should feel that the proper place to go to, if they want to change their homes at all, is into the United States and not into Canada. And now, Sir, I come, for a moment, to the question of British Columbia itself. It seems to me that in relation to British Columbia there is a determination from one end of the country to the other to belittle that Province. We have heard about the 12,000 people there; we have heard about the enormous injustice done to this country by the representation given to those 12,000 people; we have heard about British Columbia being a source of large expenditure and as practically returning nothing to the Treasury; we have heard of it as a country utterly useless; we have

MR. WHITE.

heard hon. gentlemen say, wish a flippancy which I am sure every one must regret when you come to remember the position they occupy, that if it is a question between building this Railway and letting British Columbia go, they say: Let her go—they almost say, let her go whether the Railway is built or not. What are the facts with regard to this Province? I do not repeat the remarkable figures given by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos), in the speech he has addressed to this House. He gave us figures which, I think, will have a very considerable influence in educating the public sentiment in this country in relation to British Columbia. What was the revenue, last year, of that Province, which we are asked to regard as being utterly valueless, which has not yet commenced to be developed, but which, I think, will be found to contain natural riches—I was going to say hidden riches—which, in the near future, will make it, if not the richest, one of the richest Provinces of this Dominion? The revenues last year, from Customs, Seizures, Excise, Mariners' Fees, Stamps, etc., amounted to \$572,955.29. Sir, what was the Expenditure? I do not admit that the Expenditure on surveys can fairly be chargeable to British Columbia. British Columbians would have been glad, I have no doubt, if the Dominion of Canada had consented to begin the road without a survey at all. The expenditure for surveys in British Columbia have been made for the exclusive benefit of Canada as a whole. They have been made with the object of finding the cheapest and best route for the Railway with a view to future saving and future advantage, and therefore they are in no way chargeable to that Province solely. But taking the expenditures on Subsidy, Collection of Customs, Excise, Lighthouses, Coast Surveys, Fisheries, Salaries of Lieutenant Governor and Receiver-General, Penitentiary, Hospital, Indians, Administration of Justice, Public Works, Post-office,—taking all these, we find the expenditures were \$462,172, so that there was an annual balance in favour of the Dominion last year of \$110,782. That was the position of British Columbia in connection with the Dominion of Canada.

MR. BLAKE: Have you included

the interest on the debt and the subsidy?

MR. WHITE: I have included the subsidy only.

MR. BLAKE: And the interest on their share of the debt?

MR. WHITE: How much is it? Will the hon. ex-Finance Minister kindly say how much it was?

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: According to the statement of the Deputy Finance Minister it was \$97,000.

MR. WHITE: Then we have still a balance in favour of the Dominion. But what I want to point out is this: that the Revenues have been progressing in that Province. In 1874, the revenue from Customs, which I take as a fair test, not having had time to examine the others in detail, was \$306,436; in 1875, \$337,451; in 1876, \$490,226; in 1877, \$405,650; in 1878, \$426,607; in 1879, \$517,261, showing a steady progress every year, with the exception of 1876, when the revenues increased by nearly \$90,000, by some means which I have not been able to learn. With the exception of that year there has been a steady progress from \$306,436 in 1874 to \$517,261 in 1879. Then there is another point which I think indicates that the people of British Columbia are somewhat progressive. There is no better test of the progress of a people than the post-office. I find that the collections in the post-office of British Columbia amounted last year to \$18,438, while in Prince Edward Island, with its one hundred thousand inhabitants, a Province which we all admire, the garden Province of the Dominion, the receipts were \$20,840, or a difference of only about \$2,400 between British Columbia with its 12,000 inhabitants and Prince Edward Island. This indicates an activity on the part of the people of British Columbia, an enterprise and intelligence which augur well for the future of that Province. Sir, why should we not expect that this piece of Railway in British Columbia will return something to this Dominion in the form of regular tolls, and by the development of the Province itself? If anyone will take the trouble to look over the Library, they will find that in 1860, 1861 and 1862, almost everybody seemed to be engaged in writing books about British Columbia, showing that that Province contains

within itself sources of wealth which are certainly equal to those which are to be found in any other part of the Dominion. There is nothing more unfortunate than the disposition to measure all national wealth by the grain-producing power of the country. We have our prairies where wheat can be raised; we have in Nova Scotia our magnificent mines of coal and iron, which are going to make that Province very wealthy in the future; we have in New Brunswick forests of timber and the shipbuilding industry which are the distinctive features of that Province; and we have in British Columbia great resources of riches, and particularly of coal, iron and other minerals, which have always been the basis of powerful states, and which, I venture to believe, will make British Columbia one of the wealthiest Provinces in this Dominion. Apart altogether, therefore, from the considerations of national honour, which seem to me to be strong, and which have been presented with so much force by hon. gentlemen opposite when they occupied a position on this side of the House, that they cannot now escape from them. I say that on mere grounds of material development and national well-being, we ought to do something towards the development of that Province. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) talked last night of an expenditure of \$30,000,000 in British Columbia. There is no such expenditure demanded from the House at this time. As I understand the policy the Government has announced, it is this: Hon. gentlemen opposite admit that we must complete the portion of the road we have already under contract from Thunder Bay to Red River, and the 200 miles west of Red River. I understand the policy of the Government is to build the 125 miles of Railway which open up the best section of British Columbia, and which gives entrance to a great length of navigation, and will open up such portions of that Province as are capable of development and improvement; and that the work of the Pacific Railway shall go on in accordance with the wants of settlement in the prairie regions. There is no necessity in British Columbia for the continuance of that road to the Rocky Mountains until the Railway across the plains is ready to meet it. But as the road

MR. WHITE.

goes on over the plains in advance of settlement, the intermediate country will become filled with people, and when we get to that point where we shall be receiving advantages, which I venture to believe will be considerable, then the question of the connection of the line on the prairies with the line which is now proposed to be constructed, will become an important question for this Dominion to decide. That does not become an important question at present, and it is not right, therefore, for the hon. member for North Norfolk to talk of an expenditure of \$30,000,000 in connection with British Columbia. I venture to believe that if the policy which is announced to us here is fairly carried out, if the policy is determined upon to build these Railways with the least possible expenditure of money consistent with the safe working of the Railway, if everything is done that can be done to put people into these western prairies, if we devote ourselves to the development of these enormous sources of wealth which are to be found in British Columbia itself, I think we may fairly look forward as a result of that policy, to such resources in the future as will enable us to carry on to completion the great works which we have undertaken. Hon. gentlemen opposite have chosen a different course; they have determined to cry halt; their disposition is to ignore altogether the obligations which they have entered into; but I mistake the people of this country if any party can hope to build up success upon national repudiation and national dishonour.

MR. ANGLIN: If there is any part of the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite which has more than another proved a failure, if there is any part of their policy which, more than another, has proved injurious to this whole country, it is their policy with respect to the great North-West. Years ago, when the time seemed to have arrived for receiving the North-West Territories into this Dominion, they then, going to England, in my opinion, rather as the agents of the Colonial Office than as Ministers of this Dominion, made a bargain respecting that country into which they never should have entered. The responsibilities for opening up and settling that country then rested entirely upon the Imperial Govern-

ment. The people of Canada were willing to accept the charge of that territory, but they had a right to expect that the Imperial Government would hand it over to them free of any embarrassment. The British Government chose to sustain the claims of the Hudson's Bay Company to the sovereignty of that whole region, and to compensation for the rights and privileges which it was assumed that they possessed. Our Government, instead of demanding, as I believe they should have done, that the Imperial Government should transfer the territory to them free of encumbrance and contribute largely to the cost of opening up and settling that territory, agreed to pay the Company \$1,500,000, leaving them, moreover, the right to select 5 per cent. of the land, where they please, in each section set off for settlement. This is entirely ignored by hon. gentlemen on the other side who have agreed as if all the proceeds of all the land in the North-West must go into the Treasury, whereas 20 per cent. of the most valuable of these lands, and the choicest, are the property of the Hudson's Bay Company. Well, having blundered so seriously in the acquisition of that territory, they blunder still more seriously in their legislation with regard to it. They involve this country in a war with the people of that region, which fortunately did not lead to much bloodshed, though much heart-burning and ill-feeling resulted and lasted for some years after. Even then their blundering did not cease. It was resolved to annex British Columbia to this Dominion. We were told that, unless we made terms with British Columbia, the 10,000 or 12,000 people of that Province would annex themselves and their territory to the United States. Hon. gentlemen spoke as wildly and as unreasonably on that matter as they do with regard to the subject now under consideration. Hon. gentlemen again showed themselves very desirous of carrying out the policy and wishes of the Colonial Secretary for the time being. British Columbia, prompted no doubt by the Colonial Office to seek admission into the Union, came forward with certain demands. The hon. gentlemen not only consented to that demand, but pledged the country to this enormous undertaking to commencing the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway within two years,

and completing it within ten years from the time of the admission of British Columbia into the Union. Now, I quite agree with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) that it was not within the competence of this Parliament, after having deliberately adopted that address, to alter very materially the terms of the agreement by its own action, and, therefore, although that cannot bind us as to anything absolutely impossible, or anything that might seem ruinous to this country, nevertheless, I have always felt that this Dominion was bound to carry out the terms of that arrangement, strictly in the letter, and in the spirit, were that possible. But hon. gentlemen on the other other side of the House, who had entered into this extraordinary agreement, which any man of common sense would have known it would be impossible to carry out, deliberately proposed and passed a Resolution declaring that the burden of the country and the rate of taxation must not be increased in carrying out that agreement. They next proposed to get the road built through a company, offering them a bonus of \$30,000,000 in money and 50,000,000 acres of land. This plan failed months before the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite fell, and they never prepared another. We opposed the Union with British Columbia, on the terms submitted to Parliament, as strongly and as persistently as we could, because these terms were unreasonable. We were not opposed to the Union with British Columbia on unreasonable terms. We opposed their having six members in this House to represent a number of white people not equal in number to any one of the constituencies of the hon. gentlemen who are sitting around me. We were opposed to having three members representing them in the Senate while their population was so small. We were opposed to the obligation that the road should be commenced within two years and completed within ten years, as we felt that to do this would tax the resources of the whole British Empire. We opposed it because, as we stated then, and as we say now, the Terms were of unreasonable and impossible fulfilment, but we did not oppose it because we were opposed to the amalgamation of the Provinces of British North America into the

whole, call it Dominion or nation. Even those of us who proposed the original scheme of Confederation, did not oppose the carrying out of the grand scheme of uniting British North America to which we then found ourselves committed. But we were opposed to a scheme which we believed then to be perfectly wild and impossible, and which everyone now believes to be what we then described it. We were opposed also to the mode in which the Government of that day proposed that the obligations incurred should be fulfilled, because many of us felt that if that Company, created by the Government of that day, commenced actual operations, \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land would not be all that we would be compelled to contribute towards that work. We know what was revealed in the famous correspondence that was submitted to this Parliament and the country. We know that the hon. gentleman, who was at the head of that Company, boasted in that correspondence that he had a number of gentlemen in this House under his control, who were bound to vote as he pleased; and recent events have shown that hon. gentlemen on the other side were willing to play into the hands of Sir Hugh Allan and his associates. Although the Act of Parliament required that \$1,000,000 should be deposited as security for carrying on the work—and it was stated that the \$1,000,000 was deposited—the deposit we have known was the merest sham. Accepted cheques were given by some banks on the express stipulation that the payment of the money they were supposed to represent, should never be demanded. Well, that whole speculation broke down. Sir Hugh Allan went home and tried to put bonds for \$180,000,000 in the money market, but entirely failed. The capitalists in Europe could not see sufficient security for the vast sum required for this gigantic undertaking. They looked for something substantial, and found nothing but the \$30,000,000. They did not attach the value, attached by hon. gentlemen opposite, to the 50,000,000 acres of land. Hon. gentlemen opposite were very fond of charging hon. gentlemen on this side with having caused the entire failure of Sir Hugh Allan's negotiations in Eng-

land; but that charge is unfounded. What hon. gentlemen would have done had they continued in power, we can only conjecture. They have never ventured to say what they would have done on the failure of their grand scheme. They pretend, indeed, now, to say that the country was never bound to do more than they actually did towards carrying out the engagement to build that great work; and they allege that the Government of the hon. member for Lambton went further than they should have gone, and imposed upon the country obligations which they never would have imposed. The actual obligation, however, upon this country is contained in the Royal Proclamation, and incorporated in our Constitution. It is the undertaking to commence the road within two years of the admission of British Columbia, and to complete it within ten years from that date. The hon. member for Cardwell laboured successfully, in his very elaborate speech, to show that the hon. member for Lambton felt the great weight of the obligations which rested upon him when his predecessors went out of office and he formed a Government, and that he went earnestly to work to fulfil those obligations in their entirety. But British Columbia was not satisfied. British Columbia was discontented even before hon. gentlemen opposite left office. They insisted upon the letters of the bond. Nothing would satisfy them but the pouring of the largest measure of the public money of Canada into their coffers. The hon. member for Lambton sent out a staff of surveyors to explore the country, and he was accused, over and over again, with wasting the public money on surveys. It was important that the best line should be discovered and adopted. It is not necessary at this time to say whether any money was or was not wasted on those surveys. The hon. gentleman did exactly what it was his duty to do, but British Columbia was not satisfied. An appeal was taken to the Colonial Office. That appeal was not wholly improper. The Imperial authorities were, to some extent, parties to the arrangement made between that Province and the Dominion, and might have had a right to do something towards enforcing the fulfilment of the Terms of that agreement. But the Government, led by the

hon. member for Lambton, did not, as has been alleged, join in that appeal or consent to accept the arbitration of Lord Carnarvon, or to be bound by any decision he might give, nor when he made suggestions, did they bind themselves in any way to carry out those suggestions. They gave to those suggestions the weight to which they were entitled; but they prudently and properly declared that the Resolutions and the Acts of Parliament, which provided that the rate of taxation must not be increased, would be duly observed. The Minutes of Council states the whole case plainly. Now that, Sir, was what they assented to in these suggestions of Lord Carnarvon. They never did assent, or agree in any way, that Lord Carnarvon should have the right to direct what Canada and the Government of Canada should do, but they were willing to leave it to him as one of Her Majesty's Ministers (Secretary of State), as a man of high character, to say whether they had or had not done all that was incumbent upon them to do under the circumstances. The negotiations proceeded, and Lord Carnarvon undertook to state what he believed Canada ought to do, and those Terms, as they have been called, have been much commented on. Hon. gentlemen opposite stated, over and over again, that in accepting those Terms, the Liberal Government laid new obligations on Canada; and the hon. Minister of Railways in particular spoke as if Canada, up to that time, never was bound to do anything, but that this was absolutely the first time any positive obligation was laid upon the country, although, in reality, this was a modification of the Terms of Union entirely in favour of Canada, giving us nineteen years to do part of the work, the whole of which hon. gentlemen intended to complete in ten years—a vast modification of the Terms of Union. But even that modification the Government of the day did not absolutely accept; they did not absolutely bind Canada to carry out these conditions. It is well that the words used in the Minutes of Council, respecting those Carnarvon Terms, should be again put on record, and be known and understood by the people of this whole Dominion, whom hon. gentlemen opposite have so persistently endeavoured to mislead as to the character of

these Terms. The Resolution was the original Resolution, that this road should be built, but in such a way as not to add to the burdens of the people of Canada. The enactment there referred to is plainly the Act introduced by the hon. member for Lambton, providing for the construction of the road, and making that Resolution part of an Act of Parliament. So they plainly indicated in their answer to Lord Carnarvon, in this Minute of Council, that they would only carry out his suggestions so far as it could be done without violating any Resolution or enactment of Parliament relating to an increase of taxation. Here we find the whole matter put upon an intelligible and satisfactory footing; and then, Sir, to follow the history of this matter, which has been so misunderstood, let us see what followed. The hon. member for Lambton, in the following Session of Parliament, introduced a Bill to give effect to one portion of the suggestions—I will not call them terms at all, as that is a word not applicable to the Carnarvon suggestions—to introduce a Bill authorising the Government to construct a Railway from Nanaimo to Esquimalt. Hon. gentlemen talked of that as if it was an addition to the original undertaking, and spoke of all the mischief thus wrought by the hon. member for Lambton and his colleagues. The hon. the Minister of Railways asserted that they had by this means added four millions of money to the cost of the Pacific Railway, as projected by himself and colleagues. Why, as the hon. gentleman has been already reminded, one of the very first things done by hon. gentlemen opposite after the Union, was to pass a Minute in Council fixing Esquimalt as the Pacific terminus of the Railway. The hon. the Minister of Public Works in the previous Conservative Government (Mr. Langevin), visited the Western Province and was, no doubt, heartily received by the people of Vancouver Island. He came back and it was upon his report, I believe, that the Order in Council was passed, making Esquimalt the terminus of the Railway. So that, even if this Railway had been gone on with by the late Government, they would only have been carrying out the expressed intention of hon. gentlemen opposite, of carrying out what was a pledge made by them to the people of

Vancouver Island, and there would have been no increase to the cost of building the Pacific Railway as originally intended by those hon. gentlemen. Further, had their own grand original idea been carried out, it would have been necessary to bridge the Straits, at an expense estimated by Mr. Fleming, of some 20,000,000, in order merely to get down from the head of Bute Inlet to the coast, and thence cross to Vancouver Island, one of the most stupendous works ever conceived in the history of railways; and yet this hon. gentleman, the hon. the Minister of Railways, who really committed himself to that extravagant project, who really was one of the Council that deliberately resolved that it should be done, had the coolness to charge the hon. member for Lambton with having added \$4,000,000 unnecessarily and unprofitably to the cost of the Railway on the side of the Pacific. We know that the Bill passed through this House; we know that the majority of the members of this House, although many did not approve of the Carnarvon suggestions, passed that Bill. It went to another House, and there it was defeated; and now the hon. member for Lambton is charged with having, somehow or other, caused the defeat of that measure, at all events of being responsible for its defeat. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, talking on that point some evenings ago, calmly asserted that if the hon. member for Lambton had chosen to exert his influence in the other House, that Bill might have passed, and therefore he was responsible for the failure, and guilty of a breach of good faith in this matter. All the gentlemen in the other House who voted against that measure were, with two or three exceptions, then, as the survivors of them are to-day, in thorough and entire sympathy with hon. gentlemen opposite. We know, from the history of that House, that the majority of its members sympathise with hon. gentlemen opposite, and rarely do anything to run counter to their wishes, thwart their projects, or cause them any embarrassment. Had hon. gentlemen opposite chosen that the Bill should pass it would have passed, but Liberals, either of this House or of that are not made of such metal as hon. gentlemen opposite hammer into any shape they please. We generally

think and judge for ourselves. We are willing, sometimes, to give up our opinions because of expediency, or because the general interests of the country seem to require that we should consent to measures which we regard as somewhat questionable in their character; but to do that which they believe to be absolutely wrong, and in violation of principle, is what Liberals are seldom found capable of; and, therefore, it is that we are taunted so often by hon. gentlemen opposite, and their admirers throughout the country, with that want of unity and compactness which distinguish those who prefer party to principle.

MR. PLUMB: Hear, hear.

MR. ANGLIN: I hear the cheer of the hon. member for Niagara. It would be unparliamentary to say that he sometimes votes against his convictions, although sometimes it appears to me he votes very strangely. Well, Sir, the Bill was defeated, and, soon after, the hon. member for West Durham joined the Government, and that was held to be another proof that there was some deception with regard to the defeat of that Bill in the Senate. The hon. member for Lambton, no doubt, found out that the country at large did not quite approve of the Carnarvon suggestions, that his friends on the other side were not willing to cooperate with him in carrying out these suggestions, and, no doubt, he felt relieved by the action of Parliament which released him from that particular part, of what has been called an obligation; but when the hon. member for West Durham joined the Government a proposal, followed, almost immediately, that the 10,000 or 15,000 people in British Columbia should be paid \$750,000 by the Dominion of Canada as compensation, not merely for the disappointment they had experienced in not getting this Railway built, but for the disappointment they would have to experience throughout, because the Terms originally entered into with them by this Parliament, led by hon. gentlemen opposite, were terms which could not be carried out to the letter, and they had some reason to complain they had been deceived. It was fair, perhaps, that Canada which, with eyes open, entered into the bargain, should compensate the weaker power for the

MR. ANGLIN.

violation of the Terms of agreement even though these terms were impossible of fulfilment. British Columbia, fortunately for the Dominion, refused that offer, and I hope it will be a long time before such another offer will be made. I was certainly much surprised that such an offer was made. Following up the history of this undertaking, we find that the hon. member for Lambton, and his colleagues, proceeded with the work with a degree of rapidity which was the best possible proof of their entire earnestness. We find them going to work between Lake Superior and Red River as rapidly as was possible, with due regard to the public interest. To-day they are charged with having proceeded too rapidly with that work, with having made contracts in that district without having had a single survey made, and without having had any idea of the character and extent of the work to be done. The hon. the Minister of Railways, whose intellectual power is so great, as compared with that of the pigmies who preceded him, boasted that he had pursued a very different course, that he would not let a single mile of the road until it had been thoroughly surveyed and the most careful calculations had been made, and until he had reduced the cost to an almost absolute certainty, binding himself, in every instance, by a declaration of what the maximum quantities should be—a declaration which, although so grandiloquent, means, under the circumstances, nothing at all. The hon. member for West Durham, referring to this particular branch of the subject some evenings ago, cruelly, if not maliciously, quoted from these very contracts of which the hon. Minister so boasted. What did he quote? He quoted a little foot-note in this contract, which stated that, in some cases, the quantities were roughly approximate, and in others were absolutely conjectural. Such is the accurate information, the careful survey, the precise knowledge of which the hon. Minister boasted, and which resulted in roughly-approximated estimates and merely conjectural quantities. Well, it was not an unusual occurrence for the hon. the Minister of Railways to wake up, after such boastings, to the consciousness of the fact that their real value had been discovered. We all know that he is apt to indulge in superlatives,

and that he loves to describe everything he performs as done in the best possible way, and all that has been done, by his opponents, is of the worst possible character. He charged the late hon. Minister of Public Works with gross neglect in the letting of those contracts. We know that the estimates for one of the sections—Section 15—have been greatly exceeded by the amount of work done. The hon. member for Niagara devoted a whole hour to prove that the excess resulted in a very great waste of money, and that, to a very great extent, it was attributable to the very gross neglect of the hon. member for Lambton, to his extraordinary want of capacity, or to his want of knowledge of what was being done out there. Let me tell the hon. member that, although he was a member of the Committee appointed to enquire into this matter, and took a very active part in the proceedings, he proved himself, last evening, to be ignorant on a very material point, a point so material that his blunder spoils the whole of his argument. He alleged, last evening, that the excessive expenditure, up to the time when the investigation was held last Session, was caused by the substitution of embankments for trestle-work, whereas the evidence before the Committee shows that it was nothing of the kind. No embankments had been so substituted.

MR. PLUMB: Let the hon. gentleman read the Report.

MR. ANGLIN: I have read the Report of both Houses, and have heard some of the witnesses. The engineer in charge of the work—Mr. Rowan—stated that he had not, up to that date, made any such change; that he recommended a change; that Mr. Fleming approved of the change, and, perhaps, that the Prime Minister himself expressed his approval of it, but that he never received any instructions on that point, and that he did not, as he ought not, make the change at all. I think he stated also before the Committee of this House, or the other House, that the time had come when further delay should not be permitted, and he ought to have positive instructions.

MR. PLUMB: I would like the hon. gentleman to show this in the Report.

MR. ANGLIN: I believe the

hon. gentlemen opposite received their information, in addition, from Mr. Marcus Smith, the engineer. Mr. Marcus Smith was sent out there by the late Government to enquire into the cause of the excessive expenditure. He examined the whole place. He saw Mr. Rowan, and he relates, in his evidence before the Committee, what Mr. Rowan told him, with regard to this trestle-work. He stated, also, that the increase was caused by the substitution of embankments for trestle-work, but it was found afterwards that he was entirely mistaken; that, although he was sent there to make enquiry as to the extraordinary causes of expenditure, he came back ignorant of what he should have known. He told some of the gentlemen opposite that he had ascertained that this substitution of embankments for trestle-work was the cause of the additional expenditure up there, but Mr. Rowan, when he was summoned before the Committee, contradicted that, stating that up to that time no embankment had been substituted for trestle-work. The result was that the majority of the Committee of the Senate, mostly composed of hon. gentlemen in entire sympathy with the present Government, condemned Mr. Marcus Smith very emphatically for his conduct. While this mode of building this particular portion of the road is of very great importance, while the manner of letting contracts is of great importance, they are not of such immediate importance as the question raised by the amendment which now calls for our attention. But as charges have been made against hon. gentlemen on this side, not only against the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), but against his supporters, of having blundered egregiously while endeavouring to carry out this great undertaking, let me briefly refer to this extraordinary charge as made by the hon. the Minister of Railways. He said that in these sections, between Lake Superior and Red River, the surveys made under the Liberal Government were little more than explorations, and that the quantities of work stated, when the contracts were let, were only guess work: that the hon. member for Lambton had no such grand idea as his own of maximum quantities. I have here the Sessional Papers, and I find the specifications for these particular sections, covering several pages.

MR. ANGLIN.

These are the official papers, signed by Mr. Sandford Fleming, who had been in the service of hon. gentlemen opposite for years, and whom the hon. member for Lambton had no right to distrust. He received, from that gentleman, what he had a right to believe a carefully prepared and close approximate estimate of quantities. This was signed by Mr. Fleming, and he, the hon. member for Lambton, was bound to receive it and act upon it, unless he had reason to believe that that engineer was deceiving him, and that he would be justified in calling in some one else to revise what had been done. Leaving No. 14, we come to 15, and here Mr. Fleming says—

MR. PLUMB: Mr. Fleming was not in the country at the time.

MR. ANGLIN: This is signed by him as Chief Engineer. I want the most thorough investigation, and would like to hear every objection the hon. gentleman has to make, in order that all such objections may be dealt with at once.

MR. PLUMB: Section 15 was let in October, 1876, in Mr. Fleming's absence, and a communication was sent to that effect by Mr. Marcus Smith.

MR. ANGLIN: I am not aware that what the hon. member for Niagara says is not the case, but that is not very material. Mr. Marcus Smith is, no doubt, a man of ability; but any one who was a member of that Committee, knows that he is exceedingly fond of finding fault.

MR. PLUMB: I only say he was absent.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. ANGLIN: I was endeavouring to show how utterly without foundation are some of the charges respecting the mode of letting the Railway sections between Lake Superior and Red River, which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I showed, with regard to Sections 14 and 15, about the management of which the greatest number of complaints were made, that there was a bill of quantities in minute detail. It has been said that No. 15 was let without sufficient preparatory surveys, and without what, at that time, seemed to be a

reasonable amount of precaution. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) admitted that he did not assert, or, I think, believe, that money had been wasted on those sections.

MR. PLUMB: I did not say so. I said I believed; I did not assert. There is a great deal of difference, as the hon. gentleman knows, between an assertion and a belief.

MR. ANGLIN: I admit that; and I am aware, further, that between the assertions and beliefs of the hon. gentleman, there is a remarkable distinction to be drawn, when attacking hon. gentlemen on this side.

MR. PLUMB: They are always based upon belief.

MR. ANGLIN: I am aware that hon. gentlemen opposite are able to build a very large structure on a very small basis. They have a knack of inverting the pyramid. They can weave extraordinary fictions founded on fact.

MR. PLUMB: I recognise the voice of Jacob, but the hands are Esau's.

MR. ANGLIN: Well, Sir, what I am endeavouring to show is that the charges of mal-administration, of incapacity and so on, with regard to this particular section, are unfounded. The bill of quantities was as minute as is any such bill with relation to any section let by the Public Works Department. The estimates were more than roughly approximate estimates. It was stated that there were 600,000 cubic yards of solid rock, 40,000 cubic yards of loose rock, 900,000 cubic yards of earth excavation.

MR. PLUMB: That is not the contract. That is number one.

MR. ANGLIN: It is here so reported. I am reading from the official documents; and I must prefer to accept them rather than the statement of the hon. gentleman, however much respect I have for his assertions.

MR. PLUMB: I merely wish to keep the hon. gentleman from getting into a false position. How much rock did the hon. gentleman say?

MR. ANGLIN: 600,000 cubic yards of solid rock; 40,000 cubic yards of loose rock, and 900,000 yards of earth excavation.

MR. PLUMB: There was no contract taken until October, 1876.

MR. ANGLIN: It has been stated

that Mr. Fleming was not in Ottawa at the time, but that he was in England. The hon. gentleman has stated further that Mr. Marcus Smith telegraphed that the contracts should not be let because he had discovered some blunder.

MR. PLUMB: I did not say that.

MR. ANGLIN: Well, that some error had been committed.

MR. PLUMB: No; I did not say that.

MR. ANGLIN: Then we will drop Mr. Marcus Smith's share in that particular connection; one or other of them, I suppose it is meant, should have been in Ottawa when the contract was let.

MR. PLUMB: I did not say that.

MR. ANGLIN: But the plain inference was to that effect.

MR. PLUMB: I led to no such inference.

MR. ANGLIN: The hon. gentleman may deny that he said so in exact terms, but he cannot refuse me the right to draw an inference from what he did say.

MR. PLUMB: It was not essential that either of these gentlemen should be in Ottawa when the contracts were let.

MR. ANGLIN: It was made under the authority of the Chief Engineer. The preparatory work was unquestionably done in such a manner as satisfied him of its sufficiency; and within a few days. I presume we have all received a copy of a letter, addressed by the Chief Engineer to the head of his Department, in which he endeavours to justify himself against charges made, that, through his incapacity, or negligence, those extraordinary expenditures have been incurred on Section 15, and particularly at Cross Lake, in connection with the embankment through it. He does not attempt to take the ground that he is not responsible for the original letting, and the statements upon which it was based; but he alleges that this increase occurred in some way entirely incomprehensible to him; that immediately after his return from his last visit to England he took means to have some check put upon that expenditure, and caused an additional survey to be made, because he was not satisfied with the returns made by the engineer in charge of the work.

But, in his whole defence, the Chief Engineer never even hints that the slightest blame or responsibility, other than a mere official responsibility, with regard to this additional expenditure, rested upon the gentleman who was Minister of Public Works when that contract was let.

MR. PLUMB: May I ask my hon. friend a question: Will he tell me, on looking over those tenders, to whom that one was awarded? He has got the schedule before him.

MR. ANGLIN: I am not prepared to answer on that point.

MR. PLUMB: I think he ought to be prepared.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. ANGLIN: Inasmuch as it is a matter of no moment in relation to the subject to which I address my argument, I took no trouble to ascertain who received the contract; nor did I consider whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Plumb) had any grounds for the statement, last evening, that Mr. Whitehead was improperly admitted into the contract. I do not think that has any bearing on the point now under consideration.

MR. PLUMB: The hon. gentleman is discussing the matter of a contract made upon a tender and bill of works which he has not got before him. Messrs. Salter and Thompson, who got the contract, were not bidders for the \$600,000. He is quite misled, and has made a statement utterly incorrect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. PLUMB again rose, when—

MR. SPEAKER said the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) was allowed to put a question, but could not enter into a discussion while the hon. member for Gloucester had the floor.

MR. ANGLIN: I must leave the hon. gentleman to prove me incorrect if he can. I quoted from the Sessional Papers, No. 43, vol. 8, 1879; and if he chooses to enter into the matter, he can see whether these are or are not the bills of quantities, on which the contract was originally let. I am not prepared to say whether they are or are not. If those are the bills of quantities and notices upon which those works were let, as I have no doubt they are, then the charge that those sections were improperly and carelessly let falls altogether to the ground.

MR. ANGLIN.

The hon. member for Lambton has been much and often sneered at for endeavouring to make use—temporarily only, for the purpose of opening up the North-West and connecting with British Columbia more speedily—of the water-stretches. The line of Railway first fixed upon, west from Lake Superior and east from Red River, approached certain lakes and rivers closely on both the eastern and western sides. I believe it was, on the authority of the Engineer-in-Chief, and as a result of careful location surveys, thought those were the best lines that could be found, and it was thought desirable to utilise those waters to connect the two terminal sections of that portion of the Railway, and open up more speedily connection with the great North-West, and facilitate operations on the sections of the road first to be put under contract, and cheapen their cost. A great deal has been said about the Fort Frances Locks; and it has afforded hon. gentlemen opposite boundless satisfaction to be able to declare that the money expended on that work was wasted. But if the original views, with regard to the best mode of constructing that part of the Railway, had proved correct—if subsequent surveys had not shown that a better route could be had—unquestionably the building of that Lock would be regarded by fair-minded men of all parties, as a work the Government ought to have undertaken and executed as rapidly as possible. It seemed, then, to be a work which would not only be of great local use, but would cheapen the cost of the intervening portions of the road to such an extent as to prove the means of saving money to the people. The work was properly undertaken at the time, but that line was properly abandoned when a better and cheaper line was discovered. The late Minister of Public Works, as he often declared, was determined to build this road so as to make it a real, true, grand trans continental highway. If we look at the amount of work done on it, we shall see that there is no reason for the clamorous complaints of the hon. members from British Columbia. Considering the difficult and little known character of the country between Thunder Bay and Red River, we are forced to the conclusion that, in getting those surveys thoroughly made, in discovering the best possible line, from

Kaministiquia to the Red River—the line as it stands to-day, being, with a few trifling modifications, that selected under the management and control of the hon. member for Lambton—the late Government accomplished much useful work. The work on these sections is in magnitude quite equal to the work of building the Intercolonial from Rivière de Loup to Truro. On that road a survey was made by Major Robinson, twenty-five years before Confederation, and another by Mr. Sandford Fleming before Confederation, he surveying no less than thirteen or fifteen different lines for the Intercolonial. Notwithstanding all that preparatory work, and the important fact that, for a great many miles, the route lies through an inhabited country, and for many more through a country presenting no great difficulty for location or construction; notwithstanding the fact that there were old established highways along the whole line, and rivers connecting with the ocean, penetrating the country all along the line, affording facilities for carrying in supplies—that road commenced in 1867, was not completed till nearly ten years after its commencement. If ordinary diligence be used by the present Government, the road from Fort William to Red River will be completed in much less than ten years. So the progress made on this road appears to have been very much greater than that made by the hon. gentlemen opposite on the Intercolonial, when all the difficulties are fairly estimated. The hon. member for Lambton, and his colleagues, did not stop there, but prosecuted with the utmost diligence, and at extraordinary expense, extensive surveys in the western part of the country, and through the sea of mountains, in every direction, seeking the best route. I think the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) as much as admitted that the survey was prosecuted with very great diligence; and that when it was completed, and the hon. member for Lambton was able to determine where the terminus on the Pacific should be, and by what route it should be approached, tenders were at once invited for the construction of some sections in that quarter. But advertisements, previously published, invited tenders for the work as a whole on the condition that the portions then completed should be accepted, and that credit should be given for the moneys

expended on those sections and on the surveys; and those notices and advertisements were still, I think, in the newspapers while the other notice invited tenders for the portion of the road through the Rocky Mountains. It is admitted by some hon. gentlemen on the other side, including the hon. member for Cardwell, that up to this point the hon. member for Lambton, and his colleagues, seemed very much in earnest in the prosecution of this work. We say they did all in their power to fulfil the obligation of the Dominion to British Columbia, and to open up that North-West country to actual settlement—all possible towards constructing this vast trans-continental road in a proper way and by the best route. The hon. the Minister of Railways, a few evenings ago, took ground which astonished me exceedingly. The hon. member for Lambton did not adopt that course, nor did he believe it open to him. He felt, with many of his supporters, that the solemn obligations of the Dominion were not to be lightly set aside; that they were bound to construct this Railway as soon as possible. They did not believe that Parliament had only bound the Government to construct the road by a company, and that when the attempt, so to construct it failed, they were relieved from the obligation. They held the bargain to be a solemn national obligation which they were bound to carry out, if the means of the country permitted; and they set to work to fulfil that obligation, not dreaming of repudiation. When the hon. member for Lambton issued his address to the electors, and stated that he felt it impossible to carry out this work within the time named, the right hon. leader of the Government of to-day, in a speech delivered, I believe at Kingston, declared that even that was repudiation, and that it would justify the people of British Columbia in seceding from the Confederation. Other speeches were made in the same direction, and more than once the hon. members from British Columbia were told that they had ample justification for seceding from Canada altogether. Well, there are some in this country who would not have regretted very much if they had seceded. There are some who believe that British Columbia is unreasonable in its demands, and in exact-

ing the absolute fulfilment of the Terms originally imposed upon the people of Canada. It has been asked why hon. gentlemen now in Opposition, if they at one time regarded this obligation as so solemn and binding in its character, now ask that the work of construction in the Rocky Mountains should be suspended. The hon. member for West Durham, in moving his amendment, fully stated the reasons which actuated him. It may, perhaps, be well to summarise briefly the arguments advanced by that hon. gentleman in support of his Resolution. He stated, in the first place, and I think he proved, that even if the lands in the North-West are as extensive and as fertile as is alleged, even if as large an emigration as the hon. gentlemen opposite say they expect will flow into that country, even if the land can be sold in as large quantities and for the prices expected, nevertheless the net proceeds of the sales of these lands will not be sufficient to pay the cost of this Railway, or anything like it. The hon. gentleman pointed out the fact that two or three serious mistakes were made in the calculations submitted to the House by the right hon. the leader of the Government. In the first place, he made the mistake of merely adding together the price of one acre in each belt of land, assuming that that furnished a basis for calculating an average, and that average he calculated was \$3 per acre on the whole. The hon. member for West Durham pointed out that these belts are all of different widths, and that the belt near the Railway is narrower than the belt immediately beyond, and, therefore, that the hon. Premier's mode of striking an average was erroneous. He pointed out also the fact that the purchasers of the preemption lots, even in the first belt, will pay but \$2.50 per acre. He showed also that in the hon. Premier's calculation, the amount taken was of no interest in the cost of the construction of the Railway—an error of 18,000,000, as the hon. Finance Minister afterwards admitted. The hon. member clearly proved that the nett proceeds of all the lands to be sold in that country would be entirely insufficient to pay the cost of this Railway. He showed that if the road is to be such a one as we were led to ex-

pect, if, even on the prairie lands, we were not to have the construction slighted, and the road made a mere colonisation road, it must cost much more than the amount the hon. gentleman stated.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to make an explanation. The estimates first made were for a first-class road. The Government have changed that determination with the exception of building a road from Lake Superior to Red River, which will be a first-class road. It is proposed, to use the language of the hon. member for Lambton, to "degrade" the road and to build as cheap a road as will serve for colonisation purposes, and at the same time obtain the means of crossing the continent. Not only will the road from Red River to the Rocky Mountains be of the very cheapest description that will enable communication to be carried on with safety, but through the Rocky Mountains, in the canons of the Fraser, everything is to be done to reduce the cost of construction to the lowest possible point.

MR. ANGLIN: It seems rather remarkable that the estimates of the cost of this road have varied so much amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. The estimate of the hon. Premier, on which he based his elaborate calculation, was \$75,000,000, if I remember rightly. Since that the hon. the Minister of Railways has submitted another estimate of \$64,500,000. Then there was another estimate which appeared to have been furnished in writing, to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, which put the cost at \$60,000,000 or \$62,000,000. This would seem to indicate that hon. gentlemen on the other side have not yet quite made up their minds as to what kind of a road they intend to build; and I think it indicates also that they find it necessary to satisfy many hon. gentlemen who sit behind them, that this road will not cost as much money as Mr. Fleming formerly said it would cost. Somehow, if they are now to be believed, this land in the North-West is to yield more money than anybody ever imagined, and the road is to cost much less than anybody ever imagined it would cost. The cost of the road may be reduced in various ways. The road-bed may be made

as narrow as possible and the gradients as steep as possible, and the curves as sharp as possible. Now, what a pleasant prospect it is for those wishing hereafter to travel over that road, to find themselves amongst the Rocky Mountains creeping round on the top of these canons 400 or 500 feet above a gorge, and find the railway-carriage grazing the rocks as they passed, the vast mountains frowning down upon them, the vast chasms yawning on the other side of the narrow, steep and crooked road-bed, and the train describing a letter S as it winds around the mountains. The hon. member for West Durham denied that the emigration into the North-West would be as great as hon. gentlemen opposite chose to calculate, or the quantity of land taken up as large. In order to prove that he pointed to two of the states of the neighbouring Union, in which the increase of population was larger than in any others, and taking all things into account he showed that the ratio of increase which hon. gentlemen expected in the North-West would surpass the ratio of increase in those states where it has been most rapid. He pointed out why we should not expect it to be as rapid. We have not the great home nursery of emigration which was furnished for many years by the Eastern States of the Union, nor have we, whatever the reason may be, the attraction for emigration that the United States have always possessed. There is no use in blinking the fact that the oppressed thousands of Europe, when forced to leave their homes, do not choose, as a rule, to come to what they consider a monarchical country. They do not know this country as we know it. They do not know that in this country, even when the hon. gentlemen opposite are in power, they may enjoy all the rights and liberties compatible with good Government and order. They have an idea that we are ruled from Downing Street to this day—a mistaken idea, but one which many hold. Germans, we find, do not care to come here, although they formerly came in large numbers. The Irish do not seem to care to come here in such large numbers as they formerly came. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) chose not only to say that the Irish hold as high a position here as they do in any part of the United States, that they are received

more cordially here, and that they become more thoroughly identified with the other people of the country than in the United States—but he chose to go a little out of his way to say that for all that, they need not thank the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House very much; and then he proceeded to point out one as the strongest and most remarkable attractions that, in the North-West to-day, the Irish Catholics have in the constitutional clause respecting schools, a guarantee that their rights and privileges would be respected in that part of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman must have forgotten altogether who were the authors of that clause in the Constitution of the North-West, which he thought ought to be so acceptable to the Irish Catholics. It offers no peculiar advantages to Irish Catholics. It offers the same to French Catholics, and to all who prefer religious to secular education. But we are indebted for this, not to the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but to hon. gentlemen who now sit on this side, and who were formerly members of the Government of this country. The hon. member for West Durham spoke of our trade, and pointed out that our import and export trade is, to-day, relatively smaller than it was many years ago, that our revenues are smaller, and that our expenditures have enormously increased of late years. For all these reasons he asks, not that the Railway project should be abandoned, not that faith should be broken with British Columbia, not that anything should be done to drive British Columbia out of the Confederation, but simply that, under the extraordinary circumstances in which we find ourselves placed to-day, we should pause a little, estimating exactly our financial condition and difficulties, and should refuse to plunge ourselves into liabilities that may prove too weighty for us, and which, instead of hastening the construction of the Pacific Railway as a whole, may tend to delay its completion for many years. Some hon. gentlemen have chosen to speak of this Resolution as a repudiation of our obligations; but it is not that. The hon. member for West Durham, and all the hon. members on this side of the House, feel the full weight of the burden imposed upon them, and are quite willing to see the

Railway from Lake Superior to Red River proceeded with as rapidly as possible. We do not want to adopt a cheese-paring policy. We want simply to proceed cautiously, and the circumstances of the country demand that we should proceed cautiously. The hon. the Minister of Public Works followed, but he did not attempt to grapple with a single statement made by the hon. member for West Durham. As no one has ventured to impugn the statements of the hon. gentleman, we may take it for granted that these statements are thoroughly accurate, and that the calculations submitted by the right hon. leader of the Government are inaccurate. The hon. the Minister of Public Works chose to charge the hon. member for West Durham with a grave dereliction of duty, because when he was not a member of this House or a public man—except so far as his character and reputation must always make him a public man—and even while he was in Europe, he did not take any steps to find out what the Government were doing or to protest against what they had done. How he was to be held responsible, in any way, for the proceedings of that Government, the hon. gentleman did not choose to state. Instead of disproving his statements or refuting his arguments, he resorted to the pitiable expedient of telling us that the hon. member for West Durham once abstained from voting, when, as he alleged, the interests of Quebec were at stake. The hon. member for Niagara spoke afterwards, but he did not successfully challenge one of the statements, or attempt to refute one of the arguments of the hon. member for West Durham. He said the hon. member was mistaken in what he said, with regard to the growth of Western States, and he chose to assert that our North-West would fill up quite as rapidly. The hon. member for Cardwell did make a faint attempt to prove that some of the conclusions of the hon. member for West Durham were erroneous. He contended that though we have not a large domestic nursery for emigration, we have in the Mother Land a magnificent nursery. The majority of emigrants, even from Great Britain, however, prefer the United States. The hon. gentleman stated, and no doubt correctly, that up to a certain time, I think prior to

1840, the emigration from Great Britain to Canada was larger than the emigration from Great Britain to the United States. The reason of this was the cheap passages furnished in those days by lumber vessels fitted up for the carrying of passengers, and many emigrants who intended going to the United States took passage to Quebec. But we know that, at the present time, all that is changed. But few emigrants arrive on these shores who do not come out in steamers. I do not want to argue that we shall not have a large number of people go to the North-West next year, but let me say, without intending any depreciation of the North-West, that I do not, for one, believe there is there anything like the amount of fertile land hon. gentlemen on the other side say there is. Even if this were established beyond doubt, it will not deter a single emigrant from settling in the North-West, where, I believe, there is abundant room for millions of people in the fertile lands that really exist; but, when we come to calculate on the land as a means of paying for the construction of the Railway, we ought to know, beyond doubt, whether we have as much land to sell as hon. gentlemen say. At \$1.50 per acre, or thereabouts, which will be the average price, according to the calculation made by the hon. member for West Durham, it would take a very great quantity of land merely to pay the increasing interest on the cost of construction. Since the discussion commenced, I have looked very carefully into the pamphlet published in 1870, by Archbishop Taché, with a view of directing public attention to that country as a desirable place for settlement. The general terms of his description are these: Within our boundary, from the dividing line northward and westward, there are no less than 6,000 square miles of land unfit for settlement to any considerable extent. A large portion of it, he admits, to be slightly covered with what he describes as exceedingly nutritious, but unfit for agricultural purposes. All that district is nearly worthless. Of what he calls prairie lands, he says there are only 60,000 square miles all told, a large portion of which is comparatively inferior in quality. More than that he told us that a large portion must be regarded as uninhabitable to the average settler, and incapable of settlement on a large

scale, because of the intensely cold winters, because of the absolute impossibility of obtaining lumber for constructing dwelling houses, and of obtaining wood for fuel, or in fact any kind of fuel. Large portions of the prairie can for these reasons only be used for pasturage purposes. He says that the portions most fit for settlement are those contiguous to the timber belts near the Rocky Mountains in the west, and towards what is now Manitoba in the east. Altogether, it must be concluded there are not more than 25,000,000 acres of land absolutely fit for settlement. That is a vast extent of country, but it is not the quantity of land hon. gentlemen choose to say we have wherewith to pay for the construction of this Railway. The hon. member for Cardwell took objection to one portion of a statement made by the hon. member for West Durham, and he asserted that last year British Columbia paid into the Revenue more than she received indirectly. Let me, in the first instance, refer to the assertion made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos), that the people of British Columbia paid a very large amount into our Treasury, and that if we could increase the population, it would continue to pay in a similar portion. The present population of that Province, like the people of Newfoundland, pay a large sum into the Revenue because engaged chiefly in one industry, and exporting what they produce they buy larger of the imported dutiable goods, but we cannot expect that if we were to put a large population into British Columbia, they would contribute very much towards the cost of this Railway. The hon. member for Cardwell was mistaken in his figures. During Recess, I took the pains to ascertain how the matter stands, and I find that in his statement he has omitted many items that ought to have been included. I am not charging the hon. gentleman with doing this intentionally, but he has made a very egregious mistake in his figures. The hon. member for West Durham was dealing with a series of years with regard to all the Provinces, and in doing this he stated that the receipts for British Columbia were \$2,557,675, and that the expenditure was \$3,441,461, leaving on that whole period a deficit of \$883,786.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That must include Railway Service.

MR. ANGLIN: No. I will give the hon. gentleman, in a moment, all the items for the past year, so as to show that the hon. member for Cardwell must have made several omissions. That amount does not include at all the cost of the surveys, or anything relating to Dominion expenditure for Civil Government and the like. Let me take the year ending the 30th June last, and we will see exactly how the matter stood. The receipts of that year were unprecedentedly large, those from Customs amounting to \$577,262, as compared with \$426,682 the previous year, or about \$90,000 of an increase. For Excise, the receipts were \$32,097, as compared with \$35,000 the previous year. The receipts from Post-offices were \$18,612; Sick and Disabled Seamen's Fund, \$62,866; Inspection Fees, \$621. Weights and Measures, for no doubt there was some attempt to put that law in operation, gave \$40. Then there were various seizures, for it seems that in that remarkably high-toned Province there is some smuggling going on, and the good share of the seizures amount to \$674, making a total revenue received last year of \$572,192, as compared with \$478,857 for the year before, or very nearly \$100,000 more. So that last year was the most favourable that could have been selected for making a comparison between the expenditure and the receipts. Now, I will give the details of expenditure for that year—there is interest on the debt, which the hon. member for Cardwell first forgot and afterwards recollected, \$97,314; Subsidy, \$208,093; Governor's salary, \$9,000; Administration of Justice, \$35,604—a very expensive luxury in that part of the Dominion; Penitentiaries, \$23,312; Marine Hospital, \$4,167; Pensions, \$4,346; Militia and Defence, \$7,801; on one class of Public Works, \$6,973; Ocean and River Service, which I think the hon. gentleman for Cardwell omitted, \$54,000; Light house, \$15,153; on account of Fisheries, \$1,424; Steamboat inspection, \$12,165; Indian grants, \$48,532; Collection of Customs duties, \$21,056—I think the hon. member for Cardwell omitted that; collections in Excise, \$5,766; Weights and Measures expenditure, \$561; Post Office,

\$77,265 ; Public Works of another class, but entirely of a local character, not connected at all with the Railway, \$57,014 ; and then some minor expenditures, \$358, making altogether, \$672,913 expended last year, as against \$572,192 received from all sources. If this is correct, and I think it is exactly accurate, the hon. member for Cardwell will see that he must have omitted much that he ought to have charged, if he did not take credit for something he is not entitled to.

MR. WHITE : Was all this expenditure on account of Consolidated Revenue ?

MR. ANGLIN : There is one item of Public Works to which I have drawn attention already, which may be charged to Capital Expenditure, but all the rest come out of the Consolidated Fund, and that also I am just now assured.

MR. WHITE : There is undoubtedly a great deal of difficulty in selecting items from Public Accounts, but I select them with a great deal of care, and they are substantially the same as those of the hon. gentleman. I think he will find some of his figures are on account of Capital.

MR. ANGLIN : I have no doubt that the hon. member believed his statement to be accurate, but he was mistaken, and I thought it would be well to point out the fact that he was mistaken, and I give him the exact account, so that he may be satisfied, and others may be satisfied he was mistaken. With regard to the Province from which I come, I might have said also that the statement of the hon. member for West Durham was calculated in one sense to mislead. It was perfectly accurate, inasmuch as it was taken from the Accounts. But in the Province of New Brunswick the amount of goods entered at our local Custom-houses was not last year quite \$5,500,000, whereas, fourteen years ago, it was over \$10,000,000, and for some years before that it ranged from \$8,500,000 to \$9,000,000. It would be impossible to suppose, much as our people are impoverished down there, that in that time the consumption of imported goods has not considerably increased ; but the fact is, that in late years, as the hon. gentleman from Cardwell stated, our position has changed, and we have been buying more and more in the markets of the Upper Provinces, so that a great deal of the duties for which we ought to get credit is

paid in the Customs-houses of the Upper Provinces. Now-a-days also we import more largely the manufactures of those Provinces, and if no part of the money of our people paid for these goes into the Treasury, it goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. Nevertheless, that does not at all affect the accuracy of the statement made by the hon. member for West Durham. On the whole he showed very conclusively indeed, that unless we have some reasonable grounds for expecting that our revenues will largely increase in a year or two, we ought to hesitate before plunging very much further than we are already involved into obligations and debt. Our debt was, on the 30th June last, \$147,000,000. The hon. member for Cardwell very properly said that the rate of interest has been very considerably diminished of late years. It has been ; but, Mr. Speaker, I must remark here that it is not quite fair to judge of the rate of interest we pay now-a-days by looking merely at the amount, as calculated upon the basis of a stated debt, because in former years we sold 6 per cent. debentures—I think at one time we paid a higher rate than 6 per cent.—at a premium as high as 9 or 10 per cent. in some cases. Let me remark *en passant*, as an interesting little item, in the accounts of the surplus rolled up during these years, that the amounts received as premiums on the sales of those debentures was taken into account as part of our Revenue, and I think, altogether, that amount reached about \$1,500,000.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : No ; it was on the first loan made by the Hon. John Rose, of 5 per cent. guarantee, and the amount then undisputed was \$500,000, the question being whether it should be taken as Revenue or not.

MR. ANGLIN : I think we realised a premium on bonds sold subsequently.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : A very slight premium.

MR. ANGLIN : It went with the Revenue Account ; and I remember myself having objected to this, and in the Committee of Public Accounts asking why it was not, as premium on the loans, credited to the work for which the money was borrowed. I was told accounts could not be kept in that fashion. Of late years we have been selling at a discount, pro-

MR. ANGLIN.

missing to pay a £100, after a certain lapse of years, for the £93 or £94, which is the average price of our Four per cents; so that we calculate interest on the £100 we have not received, and we are, in reality, paying a higher rate of interest than appears on the face of the accounts now published. There is another little point. Last year the discount on the last loan effected by the hon. the Finance Minister was some \$607,000, and I do not know that that was put to the debit of the Revenue Account at all. I think it was found quite possible when the balance was on the wrong side to keep accounts in a different manner than when we sold bonds at a premium.

MR. PLUMB: Does the hon. gentleman think that it ought to be charged otherwise?

MR. ANGLIN: I say the other ought not to have been put to Revenue, but if the other was properly put to Revenue Account, this should now be properly charged against Revenue. I think that no man can very well entertain the hope on the other side of the House, even the most sanguine, that we will realise, from the sale of lands in that far west country, enough money to pay for the construction of the road, even if the cost be reduced to \$62,000,000. There is no possibility of raising so large an amount within a few years from the sale of these lands. Hon. gentlemen have talked of the sale of lands in the United States, but the average amount received during the whole century by the United States would not equal the amount hon. gentlemen expect to derive from the sale of lands in the North-West. They calculated on receiving much more than the \$2,000,000 a year, which is the average received by the United States for sale of land in that period. If that is true where are we to look for this money? We are asked why the hon. member for Lambton, his colleagues and supporters although who, hitherto, have shown such zeal in attempting to fulfil the Terms of Union with British Columbia, now wish to postpone the construction of that portion of the road which it is proposed to build in British Columbia. Our reason is this: We have no money. In 1876 we had a deficit. In 1877 we had a deficit, and we were obliged to borrow money to pay a part of the interest on the debt. In 1878 we had a deficit,

and we were obliged to borrow money to pay the interest on our debt. During these years all who wished this country well hoped that the time of depression would soon cease, and that we would have a revival of trade and business; that our revenues would increase and the necessity of borrowing money to pay interest on our debt would cease, and that no necessity for imposing additional taxation would arise. But in the year past, in 1879, the year for which I say hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible as far as the expenditure is concerned, we had an enormous deficit of nearly \$2,000,000, and we were obliged to borrow money to pay nearly \$2,000,000 on the interest of our debt. This year again we have a deficit of \$500,000 more, to which amount be added \$1,300,000 of the Revenue of last year, as stated by the hon. the Finance Minister, we will, therefore, this year, be obliged to borrow \$1,800,000 to pay the interest on our debt, or take this amount from the proceeds of loans already effected. Under these circumstances, and with little hope of an increased Revenue next year, should we not pause? Hon. gentlemen on this side are quite willing to see the works in which we are already engaged pressed speedily to completion, we have other obligations also which must be met. We must complete as soon as we can the work of enlarging our Canals. The Welland Canal will require a loan of \$2,250,000 at least to complete it, and that money ought to be expended within a year, if possible. The Lachine Canal ought to be finished at once, and that would require \$1,120,000 more. There is an expenditure of \$3,407,000 absolutely necessary on these two works, which we must raise by borrowing and the interest on which we must endeavour to provide—let us hope not by borrowing, but by taxation. I do not know what the expenditure for the Carillon and Grenville Canals ought to be for next year, but I have heard it estimated on the whole as large as \$2,000,000. Besides that, there is the work of enlarging all the other Canals, to which we are constitutionally as much obliged as we are to the building of the Pacific Railway. The Constitution expressly declares—there are some strange provisions in that Constitution—that

these Canals should be enlarged as soon as the state of our finances would permit.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No, it does not.

MR. MACKENZIE: The Resolutions adopted by the Delegates from the Province do so, and it has been upon these Resolutions that the fabric of Confederation is formed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is no portion of the Constitution.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, it is something.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No, it is not.

MR. ANGLIN: I do not quite say it is the same thing. I speak from recollection of the Quebec Scheme, and from that day to this, the impression on my mind was that this was a constitutional obligation.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is no provision of the kind in the British North America Act affecting any works whatever.

MR. ANGLIN: I do not hesitate to say, under the circumstances, that this objection is not as binding as the constitutional obligation to build the Pacific Railway. However, it is not a constitutional obligation, but we are clearly bound to provide that \$3,500,000, and the amount necessary to proceed with the Grenville and the Carillon Canals. If we take these latter works out, and accept the statement of the hon. gentleman that they have managed to reduce the cost of the Railway from Lake Superior to Red River to \$17,000,000—an estimate which, as we shall find, will be far below the actual cost—and add the cost of the 200 miles to be built west from Winnipeg, which he estimates at \$2,000,000—although my impression is that it will be \$3,000,000—add to these sums the cost of the surveys, which is about \$4,000,000, altogether we have \$23,000,000. On the 30th of June last, as the Public Accounts show, \$12,500,000 were paid to that date on Railway Account. This left \$10,500,000 to be provided by some means or other. There is the \$3,000,000 to be provided for Canals, making \$14,000,000 to be provided this year, or within fifteen or eighteen months. We have already a large amount of

interest to pay, but we will have to add largely to that. We are paying for interest nearly one-half of our whole Revenue from Customs. Hon. gentlemen, not in the habit of looking into the Public Accounts, do not always understand what these vast expenditures, when they are asked to vote, really mean. After taking \$1,300,000 from last year's receipts, and adding that to the receipts of this year, we have still, admittedly, a deficit of half a million dollars. We have to provide that additional half million, and we are asked, under such circumstances as these, to undertake the work of constructing a Railway in the Rocky Mountains, which, at the estimate of the hon. gentleman, will cost \$9,000,000, but which, I estimate, as the hon. member for West Durham put it, will exceed that, and reach some \$12,000,000, everything being provided; and, when that road is opened, we cannot expect a Revenue which will pay working expenses. That road, when built, cannot pay running expenses, and in the country through which these 125 miles of rail are to be laid, at a cost of so much money, there are but a few small tracts of fertile land, or land fit for settlement. As has been said, all those lands taken together are only about the size of an average Ontario county, and only about large enough to support a population of some 30,000, when all the little nooks and valleys from the mouth of the Fraser to Kamloops are filled up. We cannot expect from such a population any such amount of trade as would pay the working expenses of the Railway, for the expense of such a railway will be higher than on a railway of an ordinary character running through a country of the ordinary description. So that, in addition to our existing debt, and the vast and additional expenditure of about \$14,500,000, we are asked to incur this large additional liability for the construction of a portion of the road which, while it remained without connection, would be of very little value. How are we to raise the money? Are we to go on in this way, blindly heaping up our burdens? While hon. gentlemen, members of the late Government, were preparing for proceeding with the work there were some little grounds for hope, there was some little

MR. ANGLIN.

reason to expect that the dawn of better days was near, that prosperity was at hand, that the Revenue would soon mount up so as to exceed expenditure. They say that the Liberal Government imposed an additional \$3,000,000 of taxation on the country. In one sense—in the ordinary mode of speaking of the imposition of taxation—that is correct. There can be no doubt, mystify matters as we may, confuse them by any amount of verbiage, that that large increase of taxation was owing to the fact that we had this North-West country and this said road project on our hands. If we had not to pay the interest on the price we paid for the North-West, and on the cost of our little war in the North-West, and on the cost of opening up and governing that country, and had not to subsidise the Indians, paying them rents for those lands; if we had not to support an armed police to prevent the Indians from being troublesome; if we had not taken in British Columbia on such terms, and had not to pay the expenses of Government in Manitoba, we would have had no deficit, and there would have been no necessity for imposing additional taxation. There is no use of us passing Resolutions that we will not increase the rate of taxation, while we incur liabilities which render such increase inevitable. It is because we have the Pacific Railway to build and the North-West on our hands that we find ourselves in the financial difficulties in which we are now placed. Then, Sir, we have a Tariff, one of the most cruel, grinding and oppressive that the world ever saw, since the pirates, Moors and Algerians swarming out of Tarifa and the other ports on the Barbary coast, levied their Tariff on the merchant vessels which they plundered and destroyed. We have a Tariff which may be well called Algerian, for it is cruel and oppressive beyond description. It is well-named a Tariff. And still with such a Tariff the hon. Minister has a deficit that can be fairly counted up to \$2,000,000. We have this deficit staring us in the face, and another most probable deficit looming in the near distance of the coming year. Should we next year be prosperous beyond the expectations of the most sanguine; should we have abundant crops and a plentiful harvest, as I trust we may; should that

thin, grey streak now glimmering in the eastern horizon, brighten into the roseate hues of morn, and should we enjoy a revival in the lumber trade—that waning industry so despised by the hon. the Finance Minister—and of our shipping business, and of all our other important trades, notwithstanding this Tariff and the load of its oppressive influence on the industries of our country; and if prosperity do return to those industries, it will be through the operation of duties over which we have no control; it will be almost miraculous. We may be able to avoid the great financial disasters which threaten us if, without a decided improvement in our Revenue and our resources, we are now compelled to spend for a work nearly useless in itself—this \$12,000,000, in addition to the \$15,000,000 which we must necessarily spend at once. It is because this is the position of Canada to-day, because for five successive years we have been forced to borrow money to pay the interest on our debt, because even with our present grinding Tariff we have a deficit, because there is little prospect of any material improvement in our condition this year or next, and because the present load of our debt and liabilities is greater than the country in its present condition can bear, that we ask the Government, that we ask Parliament, that we ask the people of British Columbia, if they have sense of justice and fairplay, to pause and to forbear. We do not ask Parliament to abandon this project, as some have alleged, or to repudiate any obligation into which it has entered, but to wait until we have ascertained how much we may reasonably calculate upon receiving towards the cost of this vast undertaking from the sale of these lands which the road now in course of construction, and the proposed extensions into the prairie, will fully open up for settlement. Wait until we recover from the exhausting effects of the great expenditures we have already made and of those to which we are absolutely committed; wait until this business depression shall have passed away, and settling prosperity shall enable us to raise a revenue equal to our expenditure, and give us not only courage to undertake, but strength to bear further liabilities and additional burdens. We but ask the Government and Parliament to give due weight to the facts and cir-

cumstances which should mould our policy, to proceed cautiously and carefully, so that the country may not be involved in the difficulties and disasters which may bring pain to the people of the older Provinces, and retard the completion of the Pacific Railway for many and many a year.

MR. MACDOUGALL: I rise with some reluctance, and—I may as well confess it—with some trepidation, to offer a few observations upon the Resolution or question before the House. We have been debating the Pacific Railway, and its relations with British Columbia, for three days and for three nights, and the question is still before us. My impression is that the speeches we have had from the other side of the House, and the arguments employed to induce this House not to go into Committee, but to adopt a Resolution not to proceed with the Railway in British Columbia, would carry us—if we listened to them, if they had weight with us—a great deal further. For my part, if I viewed this question as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) views it. if I believed the country to be in a condition of hopeless poverty, as he declares it to be; if I believed its financial resources were as limited, as unproductive as he represents them to be; if I thought our hopes of the future would not justify further expenditure on Capital Account, for any purpose whatever in the North-West, because the competition of the United States for the emigrant populations of the Old World will prevent us from selling, or settling, our waste lands in that part of the Dominion, instead of asking this House to declare that the further prosecution of the work of building the Pacific Railway should be postponed, I would take the ground that it ought to be abandoned. I should say, at least, that we ought not to proceed further than the Red River, and allow the settlement of the country beyond that point to provide for itself. The hon. member for West Durham, and some of his colleagues, on that side of the House, have presented to us certain alleged facts—I prefer to call them statements—and they have reasoned at great length upon them; but, admitting the premises, his conclusion, as I have said, is a very lame and impotent

one. I will ask the indulgence of the House, while I go back to an earlier chapter in the history of this question, than that which the hon. gentleman detailed to us. I do so for the purpose of showing that there are reasons why members of this House ought not to concur in the doctrine set up, in some quarters, as to the obligations of Canada towards British Columbia, respecting the Pacific Railway. I deny that there is any evidence to support the statement that we are under a Treaty obligation with British Columbia to expend millions and millions of money, whether we can afford it or not, to build this Railway. In the first place it may be well to glance at the history of British Columbia, prior to 1867. In 1858, gold discoveries were made in that country. Prior to 1866, there were two Governments in existence, one for the Island of Vancouver, and another for the main land; but they were not popular or representative Governments. The population was very small, mostly miners and traders. It was composed of Americans as well as Canadians, and foreigners from various countries, who had gone into that country in search of gold to better their fortunes. In 1866, a single Government was established. It was that of a Crown colony, and was directly under the control of the Colonial Secretary; but when Canada and the Maritime Provinces had agreed to form a Confederation, and while the Act of Union was under discussion, a number of persons in British Columbia desired to bring about the Union of that Colony with the old Provinces of Canada. An agitation took place, public meetings were held, speeches were made, and Resolutions passed, declaring that such a Union was expedient in the highest degree. Canada had not then sought to induce British Columbia in favour of the Union, though it was no doubt a part of the great scheme of 1864, for uniting all the Provinces of British America under one Government. It was then contemplated that British Columbia would, at some time, become a part of the Confederacy, and provision was made that Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia might come into the Union upon such terms as might be agreed upon between Canada and them, subject to the approval of the Imperial Government. But up to 1868, British Columbia was a

MR. ANGLIN.

Crown colony; it was a Government controlled and directed from the Colonial Office, and it so continued until it became a Province of Canada. In 1868, a memorial, based on resolutions passed at public meetings, was sent to Canada. That memorial expressed the strong desire of the people to join the new Confederacy, and it was in consequence of these popular movements in British Columbia, that action was taken in Canada, an Order in Council passed, and negotiations begun with the Imperial Government. It might be as well to refer to the statements made at that time, by the citizens of British Columbia. In the Sessional Papers of 1867-8, we find the Resolutions as they were passed, and the Order-in-Council adopted by the Canadian Government thereupon. The following passages from that Order, under date of 6th March, 1868, will explain the position, at that time, of the Canadian Government:—

“The Committee have had under consideration, a Memorandum, dated 5th March, 1868, from the hon. the Minister of Public Works, stating that certain Resolutions, on the subject of Union with Canada, adopted at a public meeting of the inhabitants of Victoria, British Columbia, on the 29th January last, transmitted through the Hon. Samuel L. Tilley, to the Secretary of State for Canada, were on the 3rd instant, referred to a Committee of the honourable the Privy Council, and by the Council referred to him, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, for immediate report. That he has read and duly considered the purport of these Resolutions, the circumstances under which they were passed and the action which ought to be taken by the Government of Canada thereupon.

“That it appears from these Resolutions and the Memorial of the Committee appointed at the public meeting, which accompanies them, that the Legislative Council of British Columbia, on the 18th March, 1867, unanimously adopted a Resolution, requesting His Excellency Governor Seymour to take measures without delay to secure the admission of British Columbia into the Canadian Confederacy on fair and equitable Terms.”

It appears further:

“That neither the people of British Columbia, nor the Government of Canada have been apprised of any measures that may have been taken by the Government of British Columbia in pursuance of the Resolution of the Legislative Council.”

Then, after referring to the fact that this action of the people and the Legislative Council took place before the British North America Act came into force, and

that farther action would, therefore, be necessary on the part of British Columbia under the 146th section of that Act, the hon. the Minister of Public Works—which office I then had the honour to hold—made a recommendation which the Order-in-Council recites in these words:

“The hon. Minister submits, that considering the peculiar constitution of the Legislature and Government of British Columbia, and that notwithstanding the Resolution of the Legislative Council, in March of last year, and the Resolutions of the public meetings, and the expression of public opinion through the Press of the Colony, before and since the Act of Confederation, in favour of Union with Canada, no official communication on the subject from British Columbia has reached this Government, he would recommend that Your Excellency communicate to His Grace the Duke of Buckingham a copy of the Memorial and Resolutions referred to, and request His Grace to instruct Governor Seymour to take such steps as may be deemed proper to move the Legislative Council of British Columbia to further action in terms of the Imperial Act. He further recommends that His Grace be informed that the Government of Canada will be prepared to submit to Parliament a proposal for the admission of British Columbia into the Union, in the expectation that the Imperial Government will lose no time in transferring the intervening North-Western Territory to the jurisdiction of the Canadian Government.”

The Privy Council concurred in these recommendations, and transmitted them to the Colonial Minister. But it may be interesting to the House to hear two or three passages from the memorial of the citizens of Victoria, and certain members of the Legislative Council, on which our Orders-in-Council was based. It informed us that:

“The people of Cariboo, the next most populous and influential portion of the Colony, held in December a highly enthusiastic meeting, and unanimously passed Resolutions in favour of immediately joining the Dominion of Canada.”

It informed us that all the newspapers except one, five in number, supported Confederation. The hostile paper was in favour of annexation to the United States. It informed us that:

“The Legislative Council, the only Legislative body in the Colony, is made up of a majority consisting of Heads of Departments, Gold Commissioners, Magistrates and others subject to Government influence, and cannot be relied upon to urge Confederation, as it ought to be at the present juncture,” and, therefore, they appealed to Canada to help them.

The Memorialists said :

“ We feel that without the help and support of the Government of the Dominion, the time will be remote when this Colony will be admitted into the Dominion, but with the aid which we solicit we believe that there is no obstacle to prevent our admission by the 1st of July next.”

And to allay all apprehension as to terms, they specified them as follows:—

“ 1. Canada to become liable for the Public Debt of the Colony, estimated at \$1,500,000.

“ 2. Canada to provide for Federal officers and services.

“ 3. To grant a fixed subsidy and *per capita* subsidy sufficient to ensure the support of the Local Government, in addition to the powers of taxation reserved to Provincial Governments in the British North America Act.

“ 4. Representation in the Senate and Commons of Canada.

“ 5. The construction of a trans-continental waggon road from Lake Superior to the head of navigation on the Lower Fraser, within two years after the time of admission. This is regarded as an essential condition.

“ 6. Popular representative institutions, insuring responsible control over the Government.”

It will be seen that the British Columbians were very reasonable in their demands when soliciting our help to escape from an arbitrary and irresponsible Government. They did not even hint at a Pacific Railway then. And who were the influential signers of this memorial? The first is James Trimble, Mayor of Victoria; A. DeCosmos, member of the Legislative Council; J. H. Powell, M.D., member for Victoria in the late Assembly for Vancouver Island. The others I need not mention. Now, that was the initiatory proceeding for the admission of British Columbia into the Union. I think, Sir, that, recalling those circumstances, the statement of the hon. member for West Durham, that Canada applied any coercion, or was guilty of any improper solicitation for the purpose of inducing British Columbia to join Canada, is not borne out by the facts. The negotiations went on, and in the meantime, the late Sir George Cartier and myself were deputed to proceed to England for the purpose of arranging with the Hudson's Bay Company and the British Government for the acquisition of the intervening territory. In 1869, we completed an arrangement by which the great North-West became the property of Canada, at a cost of £300,000 sterling.

MR. MACDOUGALL.

Then the admission of British Columbia became a matter of serious consultation and interest with the Imperial authorities; and it was again pressed upon the Secretary of State for the Colonies that there was objection and hesitation on the part of the officials of British Columbia to come into the Union, except upon terms that would prove onerous to the Dominion, and he was urged to use his influence and authority—the policy of uniting all the Provinces and Colonies in British America having been affirmed in an Imperial Act—to induce the local authorities of British Columbia to agree to practicable and reasonable Terms of Union with Canada. That effort was made by the Colonial Minister, whose despatch to the then Governor of British Columbia, urging a speedy and amicable union with Canada is on record. Mr. Musgrave, who had previously been Governor of Newfoundland, and had taken a very warm interest in the subject of Confederation, was appointed Governor of British Columbia for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of the people as expressed in their memorial. The then Secretary for the Colonies, Lord Granville, in writing to Governor Musgrave, makes use of some expressions which have an important bearing on the view of the question I am endeavouring to present :

“ The question,” says Lord Granville, “ presents itself whether this single Colony should be excluded from the great body politic which is thus forming itself. On this question the Colony itself does not appear to be unanimous. But as far as I can judge from the despatches which have reached me, I should conjecture that the prevailing opinion was in favour of Union. I have no hesitation in stating that such is also the opinion of Her Majesty's Government.”

That definite instruction and command was communicated to the Queen's representative in British Columbia on the 14th August, 1869. As to the dependant and subordinate position of the Colony at that time, His Lordship observed :

“ The Constitutional connection of Her Majesty's Government with the Colony of British Columbia is as yet closer than with any other part of North America, and they are bound, on an occasion like the present, to give, for the consideration of the community and the guidance of Her Majesty's servants, a more unreserved expression of their wishes and judgment than might be elsewhere fitting.”

In consequence of that pressure from the

Imperial authorities, upon the reluctant authorities of British Columbia—for, as I have shown, the people had already appealed to Canada for help—the negotiations for a Union proceeded. I will now read the “Terms” proposed by the Governor in Council of the Colony in more detail, and in official form, under those instructions and this pressure. I would call the particular attention of the House to those Terms as they were presented at Ottawa, especially the clause relating to internal transit, or “a trans-Continental road.” I find it expressed in the official and formal propositions of the delegates sent to Ottawa in these words :

“8. Inasmuch as no real Unions can subsist between this Colony and Canada without the speedy establishment of communication across the Rocky Mountains by coach road and Railway, the Dominion shall, within three years from the date of Union, construct and open for traffic such coach road from some point on the line of the Main Trunk Road of this Colony to Fort Garry, of similar character to the said Main Trunk Road, and shall further engage to use all means in her power to complete such Railway communication at the earliest practicable date, and that the surveys to determine the proper line for such Railway, shall be at once commenced, and that a sum of not less than \$1,000,000 shall be expended in every year from and after three years from the date of Union, in actually constructing the initial sections of such Railway from the seaboard of British Columbia to connect with the Railway system of Canada.”

On presenting those Terms at Ottawa, and discussing them with the Canadian Government, an alteration of this clause was proposed to the British Columbia delegates, with respect to the Railway, as follows :—

“The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously within two years from the date of Union, of the construction of a Railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocky Mountains, towards the Pacific, to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the Railway system of Canada; and further, to secure the completion of such Railway within ten years from the date of Union.”

That condition or term in the Act of Union was a voluntary proposal of the Government of Canada. The Government of British Columbia proposed that we should undertake the construction of a Railway at the rate of \$1,000,000 a year, which, if the estimate of the Chief Engineer that it would cost \$100,000,000 be correct, would require 100 years

instead of ten to complete the Pacific Railway. My contention is, that, so far as this Parliament is concerned, we are not bound by the Terms of Union respecting the Railway in the absolute sense or to the extent which some hon. gentlemen even on this side of the House contend. It was a voluntary proposal of our own; a *nudum pactum* as lawyers would say, because we received no consideration for it. It is true the British Columbia delegates did not object to it. They were very glad to find that the people of Canada were so anxious to establish rapid transit across the continent. But that, like any other decision of Parliament, was subject to modification. The condition that the resources of the country would enable the Government to “secure the completion” of the work in ten years was always understood. Nay, more, it was expressly stipulated. We promised British Columbia, and we promised everybody, that we would build the Railway if we could. But Parliament did not deprive itself of its legal, natural, constitutional right to modify or repeal any law in the Statute-book, or any schemes or undertakings which might be found impracticable. British Columbia, being a part of the Dominion, can have no right to complain, unless it can show that we have the means, or that they are within our reach, and that it is to the interest of the country to proceed with the construction of the Railway in their Province. As members of this House, and representatives of a portion of the people of the Dominion, hon. gentlemen from British Columbia have the right to present their case in the best way they can. But to say that the transactions of 1871 are in the nature of a Treaty, that this Dominion consists of separate parts which have Treaty obligations one with another, and that we are bound at all hazards, and under all circumstances, whether we have the means or not, to carry out everything that a previous Parliament may have proposed in reference to public works in any Province—that proposition, Mr. Speaker, cannot be maintained; I, at all events, am not able to accept it. I come now to consider the position we are in to-day. We have undertaken the construction of this Railway. We have yielded to the demands of the members from British Co-

lumbia, on the ground that we undertook to perform a contract which happens to be advantageous to them, though it threatens ruin, or great embarrassment to the older Provinces. I find that we are actually engaged in the construction of the Pacific Railway from the head of Lake Superior to the waters of the Pacific. It has been surveyed, different lines have been proposed, and, at last, the leaders of the two great political parties in this country have concurred in the selection of a particular line in British Columbia, and the contracts have been given out for the purpose of constructing that initial section. We are now called upon by the hon. member for West Durham and the hon. member for Lambton, the First Minister of the late Government, to halt. The grounds upon which we are urged to adopt that course are, that the country is in a depressed condition; that we have neither money nor credit, or, if we have credit, we ought not to use it in borrowing the money to proceed with that work; that there is no country to be developed by this particular portion of the line in British Columbia; that the country through which the line is to pass on this side of the mountains, is not what it is represented to be; that it is, in fact, a poor country, and here, Sir, let me say I was much surprised and pained last night, to hear the hon. member for Lambton reading old volumes by the hour, for the purpose of showing that there was a great deal of swamp, a great deal of alkaline and sandy country, vast reaches of uncultivable land, between Red River and the foot of the Rocky Mountains. He told us there were only about 80,000,000 acres of good land in the whole country, which he seemed to think an insignificant amount, but if he will look at the area of some European countries, which make a considerable figure in the world, he will find they have less than 80,000,000 acres of arable land. Yet they maintain armies and fleets, and support very costly Governments. I regard that hon. gentleman as more blameable, more deserving of censure, than any hon. member of this House, for decrying the financial and material resources of our country, because he was lately at the head of a Reform Government, a Government that appealed to and was supported by the

people, on the ground that they represented the party of Progress, that they would exercise economy in public affairs, that they would be careful of the public purse, which they said their opponents had dealt with extravagantly. Hon. gentlemen opposite were supported because of these pledges, and how did they redeem them? We find that soon after their accession to power, the public expenditure increased beyond all former example. We find that they had a succession of deficits during their entire existence as a Government. The previous Government had undertaken to complete this public work within ten years. That improvident bargain was the great point of objection. It was something terrible. The hon. gentleman, eloquent as we know him to be, especially on the stump, pointed out to the astonished electors that the previous Government were unworthy of confidence, because they had undertaken this enormous project to construct the Pacific Railway within ten years. Why, he said, all the money that could be raised by the Imperial Government would fail to carry out such a work in that time! It was of no consequence to tell the hon. gentleman that the "ten years" was mentioned in these terms merely for the purpose of indicating that the Government of the day would proceed earnestly and continuously with the construction of this work. He persisted in the assertion that time was of the essence of the contract with British Columbia, though neither the people of that Province nor their representatives had ever so understood it. They never contended that it was an essential condition, the non-performance of which would void the agreement, that the Pacific Railway should be completed in that particular period of time. Why, Sir, neither the Government nor their engineers knew at that time that it was possible to construct the Railway at all. It was not known as a matter of engineering that we could pass the canyons of the Fraser or penetrate the Cascade Mountains and thus reach the waters of the Pacific. I do not think it has been made quite clear yet, that we can do it without enormous expenditure. Under these circumstances, before there had been a survey, before we knew the character of the country beyond

Lake Superior, before we knew what difficulties would be encountered in passing the Rocky Mountains and the Cascade Range, the hon. gentleman endeavoured to persuade the people that the previous Government had bound the Dominion to construct that work within ten years *coute que coute*. Sir, there was no such condition. It was never contemplated that that work should be completed within that time, unless an easy line could be found, and unless the circumstances and revenues of the country would permit it. It was so understood in this House. I was sitting on the Opposition side of the House at the time, and associated with Sir Alexander T. Galt and other independent members, insisted, in order to make the point clear, upon a Resolution of Parliament that this work should be proceeded with, provided it could be done without increasing the then rate of taxation. The right hon. gentleman, then leader of the Government, being absent in Washington, Sir George E. Cartier, who, in his absence led the House, found so many of his own supporters concurring with us, that he consented to adopt that Resolution, and it was passed while the delegates from British Columbia were sitting beside the Speaker's Chair. Now, with these facts in view, what course did the hon. gentleman opposite take when he came into office? He complained of this ten years' limit, yet he assumed the responsibility of constructing the Railway as a public or Government work, and he sent to England and invoked the interference of Lord Carnarvon, then Secretary of State for the Colonies.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. MACDOUGALL: What did you do?

MR. MACKENZIE: I invoked the assistance of no one.

MR. MACDOUGALL: Who invoked the interference of Lord Carnarvon?

MR. MACKENZIE: The British Columbia people.

MR. MACDOUGALL: Then the British Columbia people proceeded to England. I happened to be there myself at the time. Mr. Walkem came to London to complain of bad faith on the part of the Canadian Government, and the result was that Lord Carnarvon was invited to offer his services, and the hon. gentle-

men opposite consented to accept his services, and agreed to abide by his arbitration as to the millions which were to be expended yearly by Canada up to 1890. Mr. Walkem talked over the matter with me, and I endeavoured to persuade him that he would not be serving the interests of British Columbia in taking any such ground as he proposed; that Canada would proceed, under any Administration, to open up the great North-West, and then the necessity of crossing the mountains to a Pacific terminus in British Columbia would be admitted by all parties, and he would get his Railway as soon as it was possible to obtain it, under any circumstances; that to quarrel with Canada, and attempt to enforce a literal fulfilment of these rigid terms, would result in failure. Lord Carnarvon did me the honour to confer, informally, with me upon the matter. I felt it my duty as a Canadian, and as a public man, to warn him against burning his fingers by undertaking to arbitrate between Canada and British Columbia in that matter. But that nobleman, being anxious to remove all obstacles to the consolidation of British North America, because he was the Minister under whose authority the scheme of Confederation was planned, undertook the difficult and, as I think, ill advised office of Arbitrator, and the hon. gentleman opposite, the great Reformer, the great constitutionalist, abdicated his functions as a responsible Minister, and placed this Parliament and the people of this country in a false position, when he left it to a person in no way responsible to us, to say that we should spend \$2,000,000 a year in the construction of a Railway in British Columbia. That was a highly unconstitutional act in my view. It was a destructive blow aimed at the most essential principle upon which our constitutional system is founded. If the Government of the day can hand over the purse-strings of the nation to any one, even to the sovereign herself, to fix the amount and to specify the objects of expenditure, without, in the first place, consulting the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled, it has ceased to be the Government of a free country. The bargain was struck, the reference made, and the award of \$2,000,000 a year in favour of British

Columbia was rendered. The hon. gentleman brought down that proposition after the Arbitrator had given his judgment, and he succeeded in obtaining a *quasi* consent from Parliament. I do not know, for I was not a member of this House at the time, that it was ever formally approved, but assent, if any, was gained in such a manner, the case was conducted upon such false premises, that I, for one, was not surprised to find the vice of its origin prevailing it through all its stages. The hon. gentleman has been charged—I do not say justly charged—with having himself procured, by some underhand method, the defeat of his scheme in the Senate. Now, we have another Government in power and we have the Railway question still before us. We are called upon to say, by our vote on this Resolution, whether the work is to proceed in British Columbia or not. I confess, if I were free from these antecedent facts, which I think are binding to a certain extent upon this Parliament, I would hesitate to proceed. But as a supporter of the Government in one or two important matters, if not in all, I cannot well see how, in view of what has taken place between the British and Canadian Governments, in view of the money already expended upon surveys and actual construction beyond Lake Superior, in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues had adopted this very line in British Columbia, I can ask the present Government to reverse a policy to which most of its members have long been committed and refuse to proceed with at least a portion of the work in British Columbia. It is quite true if our financial position were such that we could not raise money enough to carry on the Government, and execute the great Public Works we have in hand, I should say that the Government must be carried on and the Public Works must stand. The interest on the Public Debt must be paid, the subsidies and charges for Civil Government must be paid, and many other items of ordinary expenditure must be met, whatever happens, and if I did not see a prospect of sufficient Revenue in the future, I would not hesitate a moment to say to hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, "you must postpone this work." But is our condition desperate? Is it true, as

was stated by the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House, that we cannot proceed with this work? Is it true that the amount required is so great that neither the Revenues nor the credit of this country are able to overtake it? I do not think so. If we look at the Railway Statistics of Canada we find that some 8,000 miles of railway have been constructed in Canada within a few years, costing \$273,826,000. Of this sum the General and Local Governments have contributed about \$80,000,000. But more than two-thirds of the entire amount has been furnished by private capitalists, and the purchasers of bonds sold in the market. I am not aware that the country has felt any severe pressure on account of the investment of this immense amount of capital in our railways, or that we have suffered from over-construction of railways beyond the needs of the country. I think if we look at the question in that light the dangers and difficulties that have been conjured up on the other side of the House will disappear. I believe railway men can be found with the capital at their backs to take up this Railway from Thunder Bay to its Pacific terminus at Yale, and for a subsidy of 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres of land as originally proposed, complete the sections that have not yet been contracted for. I believe there is no difficulty in finding a solvent company who would undertake to complete the Pacific Railway on those terms, and agree to keep it in repair and work it. The moment capitalists are convinced that this great Empire of ours in the West has within it even 80,000,000 acres of arable land, the moment they are satisfied that the immigration which has set in is likely to continue, that its climatic difficulties have been exaggerated, that wheat can be produced there in enormous quantities, and of superior quality to any grown in other parts of this continent, there will be no difficulty in finding a company willing to undertake the construction, at their own risk, of the balance of this great highway. I am told upon reliable information that at Minneapolis the millers will give ten cents a bushel more for wheat grown beyond the International Boundary than for wheat grown a few degrees south of it. For ages those vast and fertile plains have been covered with millions of

buffalo, subsisting upon the natural herbage of the soil, and we all know that domestic cattle are closely allied to the buffalo. So we have there a country that can produce both meat and breadstuffs in abundance, and this fact alone, with conditions for the incoming settler as favourable as those offered to him in the United States, will, now that the tide of settlement is steadily flowing westward, guarantee ample traffic for at least one trunk line of communication. The fact is that the population going into the country and the products coming out of it will, from the day it is opened, pay the running expenses and the interest on the capital. I therefore have no apprehension on the score of ultimate indemnity, and while I feel confident that our position and prospects are such as to warrant the Government in going on with the work, I should like to be sure that no more expenditure will be made than is absolutely necessary until we are a little farther advanced. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that the Tariff is the great difficulty, and that its operation will tend to prevent the prosecution of the work. On that point I will just say, that in my opinion that question was most fully discussed and considered by the electors of this country at the last election, and with what result? 40,000 Liberals voted in favour of the candidates supporting the present Premier. Why? Not because of his antecedents as a party politician, or the principles he was supposed to hold, but because they had confidence in his statesmanship and patriotism and his intention to carry out his pledge to protect the industries of the country. Well, Sir, the people having demanded that the industries of this country should be protected by a rearrangement of the Tariff, I venture to suggest that it is no compliment to our institutions, no compliment to the intelligence of the people of this Dominion, to tell them, before the policy they resolved upon has had a fair trial, "You made a mistake in demanding that policy." On the contrary, I think the great mistake the hon. member for West Durham makes, as a politician, is this,—he is setting himself up against the declared opinion, the settled verdict of the people. He, a lawyer, for many years buried in his briefs, sets himself up as an expert in finance and trade,

in opposition to the opinions of the commercial men, the manufacturers and the most experienced public men of the country, and contemns the judgment of the people at large in calling for the National Policy! He, a Liberal, a man of the people, comes here and declares that the Government is deserving of censure for carrying out the well-understood wishes of the people! Sir, it is a mistake to do this. The National Policy must have a fair trial. It has already proved a success, financially, inasmuch as it has given us, instead of a deficit of \$2,000,000—the normal condition under the hon. gentleman and his friends—a deficit of only half a million. It is the duty of the Government to maintain and carry out this policy. It is also its duty to exercise economy in the administration of public affairs. I was afraid just before the opening of the House, that the hon. the Minister of Railways would attempt to carry out his idea of building the Railway on the north shore of Lake Superior, but I am glad to find that the hon. gentleman's colleagues have induced him to abandon that part of the line for the present. I am also glad to find that it has been decided to proceed cautiously with the work in British Columbia. Under all these circumstances, I shall oppose the Resolution of the hon. member for West Durham. If the mover of the Resolution were logical, he would demand the abandonment of the work in British Columbia. Instead of doing that, he only asks for delay, and thereby affirms that the road shall be built at some future time. But probably the Resolution was framed in this way, to denounce the hon. gentleman's former leader, and to contradict the assertion of the organ of his party, that the Railway should be pushed on as rapidly as possible. But the motion is also a declaration of want of confidence in the Government. In view of all that has been said in favour of the Resolution, as respects its language and form—which has been little—and as respects its political consequences, if adopted, which, though not expressed, we can infer, I believe no independent supporter of the Government can possibly vote for it. I, at all events, will not assist to turn out the present Government in order to turn in the Government of the hon. member for Lambton.

MR. McLENNAN: We had this afternoon, from the hon. member for Cardwell, a clean and through statement of the history of the Pacific Railway. We have just had from the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall), an equally clear statement of the earlier history of our relations with British Columbia, and we have had from other members of the House very exhaustive statements with reference to this question. I propose very briefly, to consider the aspect of the matter as it is before us to-day, and as it is before the country, and I propose to do it with reference to our obligations and the wisest course to be pursued under the circumstances in regard to fulfilling those obligations. In this connection we naturally revert to the condition that has been repeatedly imposed, and that is, that the work should be carried on without increasing the burden of taxation upon the country. In the statements of the hon. Minister, in the opening discussion, I think we have reasonable assurance that this condition is substantially continued, that the proposal implies a fair adherence to this principle, in the manner in which he proposes to go on with the work, and as far as this goes, I believe, there is an agreement so far between all the parties who have taken part in this discussion. I believe, Sir, there is no difference of opinion as to the necessity of completing the work that has been begun and is so far advanced between Thunder Bay and Red River. I believe there is no difference of opinion as to the necessity for extending for at least 200 miles beyond Red River upon the prairie land, and in the fertile country for the purpose of settlement. This point, I believe, is conceded by all parties, and if we can carry out that project, and the further undertaking in British Columbia, with fair adherence to the principle of keeping within our present taxation, the case of the Government is clearly made. I think that with this understanding, and this point reached, we can then clearly afford to wait a little, as has been suggested by some parties. In these 200 miles beyond Red River, through the belt of country extending from the 49° northward, about 250 miles to the line of Swan River, or thereabouts, we are quite within the fertile belt. Within that space we have,

MR. MACDOUGALL.

measuring the entire ground from Red River, 50,000 square miles of land, or 32,000,000 of acres. If we take about half of that area for water, for unproductive land, and for land held by speculators, we have left a space that, computing at twenty people to the square mile (which is a very small number), we have room for half a million of people; the number that the right hon. the leader of the Government suggested in the calculations that were laid before the House, in the discussion of the Land policy, we should get in within ten years. I suggest that we should wait about half that number of years, to make this experiment of settlement, upon which all, in the first place, depart. We have had elaborate calculations made by the mover of the Resolution before the House, as to the possibilities of human industry in a new settlement, and we have statements from the experience of Western States, of what men can do in improving a new country; and we have had estimates made of the number of men, that, under peculiar circumstances, might emigrate from the older Provinces to the new. It is a well-known maxim that in estimates of this kind it is the impossible which comes to pass. The same thing never occurs twice in the history of a country, or in a history of an undertaking of this kind. And when we are told that the settlers of the Western States occupy an average of 12½ acres each, it gives us no clue whatever to what may possibly be done in these fertile prairie lands, the descriptions of which, so glowing and so extremely interesting to us who are the possessors of that country, do not by any means exceed the truth. The difficulty involved in the Resolution that has been proposed to the House then, concerns only the undertaking in British Columbia, and in respect to the distinguished gentleman opposite, the mover of this Resolution, and his leader—if he is the leader—I must say they occupy a very peculiar position. The mover of this Resolution has been like that brook that our poet laureate has seen—"in and out and all about," in his relations to his party and to the Government of which he was lately a member, and I believe he may be excused if he does not come heartily to the support of this undertaking in British Columbia. But

we have a very different condition in the case of the hon. member for Lambton. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), did not overstate the case, to-day, when he said that hon. gentleman attempted the extraordinary feat of turning his back upon himself. If there is any undertaking to build this Railway in British Columbia, if there is any obligation, at this moment, existing, it is the obligation undertaken by that hon. gentleman. Now, there are various kinds of courage in the world. Some men have the courage of their convictions, some men have the courage of their word — and that is often but the courage of their folly. Then some men have a kind of courage that is known by the name of Dutch courage. The hon. member for Lambton got up his courage, last night, by reading several pages out of a Blue-book, certainly not to illustrate the subject, because every member of this House has a copy of that Blue-book, and if he desired to know what is in it he will be very likely to read it. I am quite sure the gentlemen who heard them were no wiser for the reading of the pages out of that book last night. It was, however, a painful effort by which the hon. gentleman wrought himself up to that difficult point of turning his back upon himself. He has left us for ever in doubt as to whether, in his dealings with British Columbia, he “paltered in a double sense,” whether he meant in advertising for the construction of a section of road in that country “to keep his word of promise to the ear” of the people of British Columbia, while breaking that promise to their hope, or whether he really meant what he professed to do when he advertised for the contract for the work. I am afraid we shall never find out what the hon. gentleman opposite intended in that respect. The estimates for this undertaking in its entirety are very wide. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways has placed his estimate at \$64,000,000 from Lake Superior to Burrard Inlet. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have reached nearly twice that amount in the estimates they have offered. Well, Sir, judging by our experience of the past, estimates of this kind are very uncertain, and I think that is another reason why we should make a test, in a moderate period of time, to see what can be ac-

complished to place settlers in the North-West, who will help to develop the country and by that means assist in the construction of the Railway. Another part of the project that has been discussed is one upon which I am not quite in agreement with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and that is the question of extending by the route of the Canada Central through Sault Ste. Marie. I have no objection to extending the charter of the Canada Central or any other company to build a Railway to Sault Ste. Marie, but I see great objection to the application of public money for the construction of such a work. I believe in the use of water-stretches to make a present connection, not a stretch of mud and water of nineteen inches in depth as was found at Fort Frances Lock, but a real water-stretch such as we have in Lake Superior. If that water-stretch is used from Thunder Bay to Sault Ste Marie, it can very well be used for the additional distance to Georgian Bay, where we have a choice of two ports with railway connections at Collingwood and at Midland. I believe that that is our true policy, and one which will meet the requirements of the case until it becomes practical to get our all-rail route by the north shore of Lake Superior. Some parties have an idea that by making a connection with Sault Ste Marie we should obtain a good deal of traffic from the Western States. I have no confidence that we should do anything of the kind. This is a matter which has been considered in various forms for a long period in the history of this country. In fact, since the first undertaking of the construction of the Welland Canal the idea has come up at different periods, that, if we could enlarge our channels of communication, we should obtain a large portion of the traffic of the Western States. People have come from the Western States that have been interested in these routes: a Committee of the Senate visited this country a few years ago, and travelled over all our route, and they went home again. And what did we find. We found as the result of all these enquiries at the different points, that the advantage we had by the St. Lawrence in the existence of a Tariff of 6½c. per bushel on grain upon the Erie Canal, the great advantage we derived from that toll was

removed, and that the tolls throughout the length of the Erie Canal are to-day, as nearly as possible, as small a rate of toll as upon our own canals. The State of New York made that great sacrifice to retain the trade derived from the Western States and in doing so she had the advantage of her enormous capital, of all the appliances of ships and of men, ready for the enterprise, and to carry out all that was necessary to keep that traffic within their own control. We find also that the through trunk lines of railway in the United States adopted a similar policy, reducing their rates to such an extent, that many of them, for years after, paid no dividend to their shareholders, but they have kept the traffic and derived all the profit from this great carrying trade. We have discovered that we require something more than mere channels of communication, roads and canals, in order to obtain the advantage of a large carrying trade. We can only hope to obtain a measure of traffic that grows with our own people and by our own means, and with all the appliances that we can bring into use, in order to carry on that traffic; and in every undertaking connected with our canals and railways, we may assure ourselves that this is all we may expect, and that it would be folly for us to aim at anything more. The time has gone by when a small nation can hope to be the carriers of a larger nation; it never existed in conditions similar to those in which we stand in relation to the United States. We are competing with a people who have all the energy and all the enterprise that we have, and they will never let us take an important part of their carrying trade. In connection with this construction of the Pacific Railway, we have had again a re-hash of the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have exhausted this subject, I think, at last. The hon. member for Lambton finds it difficult to shake it off, but keeps repeating that we have adopted a Tariff by which "a few monopolists are enriched at the expense of the great mass of the people." And we are told, among other things, that Protection has ruined the shipping interest of the United States. Now, I happen to find, in an American Statistical Almanac, a statement of the number of vessels built in the United

States during the year ending June 30th, 1879. There were built 1,132 vessels measuring 193,031 tons. The statement of the hon. gentleman is one of those hap hazard statements which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) is in the habit of making, taking the chance that nobody will contradict him.

MR. BLAKE: How many of these are sea-going vessels?

MR. McLENNAN: About 408.

MR. BLAKE: Oh.

MR. McLENNAN: But, I think, that is a respectable number for a ruined trade.

MR. BLAKE: What is the tonnage of those?

MR. McLENNAN: You will find the tonnage at page 63 of the almanac, it is an almanac that is scattered about the House. Then as to the mass of the people—I would ask that hon. gentleman, and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), if the condition of the working people in this country is not much better than that of the same class in countries of so-called Free-trade? My impression is that the people are much better off here than in Free-trade England. We continue to hear of the "grating and grinding" Tariff, in order to make the statement emphatic. The hon. member for Gloucester entertained this House by grinding his teeth, but I do not think it makes all these figures any more true. This subject is exhausted. The country has decided this question, and it may be relegated to school boys and debating classes. I notice in an English Review, a well known publication, an article on the subject of the "Wheat fields of Canada," that might have been written by some hon. gentleman on the other side of this House. It reads:

"If Canada could be persuaded so to modify her Tariffs as to encourage the import of those goods with which we can best supply her, she might almost monopolise the English trade, receiving in return not only cheap manufactures and implements of agriculture, but a splendid revenue, which she now sacrifices for the sake of protecting a few manufacturing interests, and of enabling scheming tradesmen to wax rich at the expense of the whole community. If, however, she persists in her present policy, other corn-growing countries will doubtless undersell her."

I think, Sir, there are as many fallacies

as lines in this extract. The idea of importing agricultural implements, chiefly made of wood, from Great Britain, is the perfection of that sort of thing called Free-trade; and who are the "scheming tradesmen?" Then how are we to monopolise the trade in Great Britain in breadstuffs, or prevent all the world from competing, where we have no advantage, is something that requires a Free-trader to explain. The fact is, that a year ago we gave up the idea of being guided by the Free-trade theories of Great Britain; we decline to wear the old clothes of that or any other nation. But the hon. member for West Durham has something on his hands besides the Railway policy. The question of his Resolution is the subject of the construction of the Pacific Railway in British Columbia, but I think everybody has discovered that his object is to construct something much smaller—or larger, perhaps, to his views—than a Railway, that is: a platform. He appeals to the poor man in Canada, he appeals to the poor man in Great Britain, to the poor Irishman and to the German, he appeals to Ontario and Quebec, and he brings up that argument that we have heard so often of the great advantages of the neighbouring Republic; but he will have to try again. The Irishmen who have come to this country, for a great many years, find in this country that "beneficent" measure of Home Rule that we have heard so much about; I do not know any country under Heaven, where Home Rule exists more completely than in this country; the German is not to be misled; nor is the Irishman; he knows that his condition in this country is infinitely better than in Free-trade England. The hon. gentleman measured the value of the land by those going from the east, from the older Provinces into the new Provinces; he will have to begin earlier; he will have to begin with the Genesis of man, and consider all his relations, his rivals, and his helpers; he will have to take up the question of the potency of matter, and find some matter much more substantial to construct and maintain a platform than anything contained in his five or six hours speech.

Mr. BLAKE: Oh.

Mr. McLENNAN: But the hon. gentleman is in great haste; he thinks too

highly of my hon. friends on the Treasury Benches. We, on this side of the House, have a good opinion of them, but we do not think them quite an immaculate conception—he should have waited a year or two, or three, when they might have made some mistake—committed some folly—as they are human, and therefore short of perfection—he would, perhaps, have found some subject upon which to base an attack upon them; but his great haste has led him into the great mistake of building up a platform of sand, that is crumbling under his weight.

Mr. BLAKE: Oh.

Mr. McLENNAN: The hon. gentleman, in attacking the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, in his long speech, has sounded a note of warning; he has told them that if they adopt economy in every branch of the Service, and endeavour to make both ends meet, they may have some success; that is really the important part of that long speech, and to that part of it I would call the earnest attention of my friends on the Treasury Benches. This is the little mouse that has crept out of that great mountain in labour, and I think my hon. friends will do well to listen to the wise counsel it offers, and to guard well their expenditure, to practice economy, not only in the vast expenditure on the Pacific Railway, but in all the Departments in every form. This Railway policy, their land policy, and their financial policy are sound, but they require this standing guard, and if this is kept applied, we may hope that our friends will keep these Benches long enough to lay broad and deep the foundation of our future prosperity.

Mr. DAWSON: I have listened very attentively to the debate on this important subject, and while on the one side the policy of the Government has been very clearly explained by the hon. the Minister of Railways, the difficulties to be encountered, and, I trust, overcome, have been very fully set forth by hon. members on the Opposition Benches. I was glad to hear the hon. Minister say that faith must be kept with British Columbia, and, if we may judge of the feeling of the people of that Province by the sentiments expressed by their representatives in this House, I believe they will not be un-

reasonable in their expectations. In the present state of the finances we must proceed slowly and with caution. The country west of the mountains, no doubt, presents great difficulties to railway construction, so that the choice of route has been a matter requiring extreme care; and I am not prepared to say, from any reports with which we have been favoured, that the selection of Burrard Inlet as the western terminus—a selection which was made by the late Government and approved by the present—is not the best that could, under all circumstances, have been made. The sections which have been placed under contract, extending as they do, one hundred and twenty-five miles inland from the coast, and connecting with an important stretch of navigable water in the interior, will render a large district of country available for settlement, in the meantime. I was always in hopes that the Dean Inlet, Bute Inlet, or the Gardener Channel might have proved to be accessible from the Ocean on one side, and from the Interior on the other. East of the mountains, the route by the lesser Slave Lake and the Pine River Pass is evidently the one which would best promote the settlement and development of the country, but if, by taking that route, the only port available on the Pacific coast would be Port Simpson, it is, of course, out of the question for the present. If any of the Inlets which I have mentioned could have been availed of it would without doubt have been the best. But Port Simpson, although a good harbour, seems to be too far north. It is much to be regretted that, notwithstanding the enormous expenditure on surveys the reports supplied by the Chief Engineer should have left the subject so much in confusion. Last year he recommended Burrard Inlet, while now, in his report of the 30th September last, he suggests that no selection should be made until the country shall have been still further explored. After nine years of survey, with unlimited means at his disposal, this is surely a lame and impotent conclusion. I have looked over the reports submitted within the past few days to the House, and among these, I have read the paper furnished by the Rev. Mr. Gordon, with a great deal of interest. He describes

very clearly and graphically the intricacies and difficulties of the Pacific slope; explains the character of the climate of that region, and leads you, with the skill of an artist, through the passes of the Rocky Mountains to the wide-spreading plains of the Peace River. On reading his lucid descriptions of the country, and his very clear and practical views as to its adaptation for railways, one feels inclined to regret that he and the Chief Engineer could not change places, the Church might lose, but the public service would gain, at all events it could not lose. This report, so lucid and comprehensive, so cautious and truthful, is in striking contrast to the special pleading in favour of particular lines, which marks too many of the reports which we have hitherto had. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the House and the country will endorse the policy of the Government in placing under contract the sections west of the Red River, as they will render available a very large extent of the region best adapted for settlement. Two hundred miles may not count for much in a territory of such vast extent, but the construction of these sections is a step in the right direction, and we must proceed slowly and cautiously in the present condition of the finances. West of Red River the line will pass near the Manitoba Lake and be the means of rendering accessible the beautiful and extensive country bordering on that magnificent sheet of water. I was glad to hear the hon. the Minister of Railways express himself so strongly and favourably in reference to the Sault Ste. Marie Branch. Last year I drew attention to the advantages of opening this line, and I pointed out that while it would be the means of developing a fine country on lake Lake Huron, it would enable communication to be kept up for a much longer period than it now can, through Canadian territory with Manitoba—we have, indeed, a country worth developing on Lake Huron. It is not quite so level as the far-famed regions of the North-West; but it presents advantages equal, if not superior, to those to be met with on the prairies. To the north of Lake Huron, there is a country of great extent presenting a pleasing diversity of mountain and valley, of river and lake. In the valleys, there are wide stretches of the richest agricultural lands

and, all over the country, forests in which much valuable timber can be found. The new settler on the prairies shivers as the winter blasts sweep over the unbroken plains from which the slender boards of his new tenement afford but slight protection. In the valleys of Algoma he has always a generous log fire, and at least a comfortable hut; on the prairies, when the ground is deep in snow, he has no occupation. In the forests of Algoma he can always find work, even in winter, to remunerate him well. On the prairies, his hand must be often in his pocket, if only to purchase fence rails or a handle for a hoe. In the cozy forest, a few blows of his axe give the necessary supply. The prairies, no doubt, have their advantages, but on them a man requires capital to begin with, while in the friendly forests he needs little besides his axe. Settlement has been advancing fast, although but little noticed, in Algoma within the past few years. Five years ago the country was a wilderness, but wheat is now exported in considerable quantity from the Manitoulin Islands and the north shore of Lake Huron. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture sends but pamphlets inviting settlers to the prairies of the North-West, why does he not ask a few to come to the less distant and more genial country of Algoma. Let this Sault St. Marie Branch once be opened and such an impetus will be given to development that the local traffic will become a matter of no small importance to it. The trade in lumber would rapidly expend, the fish of Lakes Huron and Superior, packed in ice, would find their way to the cities of the East and the mineral resources of Algoma, among which we can reckon silver and copper and iron, would all help to give traffic to the Railway. It has hitherto been too much the custom to decry this vast region of Algoma. But, covering as it does a very considerable portion of the Dominion, with our great inland seas on its southern border, and navigable rivers to the north and north-west, with a climate throughout quite equal to the average climate of Ontario and Quebec, it is destined to become a region of great importance. But the Sault St. Marie Branch, while it would develop a new region, and thus gain a local traffic, would have a far

wider range of usefulness. Its western terminus would be within twenty-four hours run of Thunder Bay, and Lake Superior can be navigated through a great part of the winter, so that it would command the traffic of our own North-West; but in winter it would also have a large foreign traffic, for our neighbours are now busy with projects to connect Duluth and St. Paul by rail with Sault St. Marie. If these great schemes should ever be carried out, and there is every reason to believe that, at least, some of them will be so in the near future, the Sault St. Marie Branch will have a winter traffic fully up to its capacity for carriage. We will then have an easy and quick way of going in winter to Manitoba and the North-West. But it would give us another winter route, or at least a route that would be available for a great part of the winter. I have been for some time past in communication with parties well able to give information at Silver Islet and Sault St. Marie; and the result of such enquiries as I have made goes to show that outside the bays and sheltered sounds, Lake Superior, east of Isle Royal, is a permanently open sea. Captain Trethewey, the Manager of the Mines, and Mr. Livingston, the Custom-house Officer at Silver Islet, have furnished me with statements from which the following is compiled:—

MR. LIVINGSTONE'S REPORT.

Silver Islet—Winter 1870-71, mild. Tug ran all winter, except one month, from 8th February till 8th March, large steamers could have run all winter.

Winter of 1871-72—Tug ran ten months during season, stopped only from 14th January till 18th March. Open water within 600 yards of Islet, Isle Royal, sound open.

Winter of 1872-73, severe. Tug stopped running 28th January, and did not resume, but a powerful steamer could have run to the Islet easily, except for about two months. So severe was the weather in February that the ice took across Isle Royal sound.

Winter of 1873-74, mild. Tug stopped running 30th January and resumed 25th April. Sound, clear all winter.

Winter of 1874-75, very severe. Tug stopped running 10th January. Sound again, frozen over for a short time.

Winter of 1875-76 was moderate. Tug stopped running on 28th January. Sound clear.

Winter of 1876-77. Tug ran all winter, except five weeks, large steamers could have come all winter to Silver Islet dock.

Winter of 1877-78 mild. Tug ran all winter. No ice about the channel, and sound, clear.

Winter of 1878-79, mild. No ice to prevent steamers running

Winter of 1879-80. So far (28th January) mild. Tug running, no ice.

I have also returns from Sault St. Marie, and from the lighthouse keeper of White Fish Point, with which I need not detain the House farther than to say that, in ordinary winters, steamers could come all winter as far down as the Straits, but that, in severe winters, the outer edge of the strong ice forms a curve from Iroquois Point, on the United States side, to Isle Parisieu, on the north, or Canadian side. Outside Batchewana Bay, however, the lake is permanently open, and Batchewana Bay is a good harbour. All accounts agree in this, that the lake can be navigated anywhere by steamers all through December, and that, after the 20th of March, such steamers as were properly prepared for breaking through the ice in the bays, could resume running. So that it is safe to say, that Lake Superior could be navigated for nine months out of the twelve. It will thus be seen that, by constructing a railway to Sault St. Marie, and extending it from thence a few miles westward to some harbour at the lower or eastern end of Lake Superior, we can for nine months of the year keep up communication through our own Territory with Manitoba, and this is a very important matter, pending the construction of a railway to the north of Lake Superior. There has been some discussion during the present debate in reference to the sections extending from Thunder Bay to Manitoba. The late Premier, in explaining what had been his intentions in respect to the opening of the route in the first instance and the discrepancies between the Chief Engineer's estimates and the actual cost which are now dawning upon us, said that "he had not had the slightest reason to doubt the accuracy of the estimates of \$25,000 per mile from Thunder Bay to Selkirk, that he was not aware that there was any thing wrong with Mr. Fleming's estimates, that Mr. Fleming had said that he was prepared to abide by his estimates of quantities; and further that he never heard Mr. Fleming say that his estimates were mere guess work. The estimates and quantities were over his (Mr. Fleming's) own signature, etc." He now knows that the figures given by Mr. Fleming, with the weight

of his signature were the merest guess-work, and I am glad that the scales have fallen from his eyes at last. It might have saved him from many mistakes had he known sooner that the Chief Engineer's quantities and figures were the merest guess-work. In regard to this section between Thunder Bay and Manitoba, had he adhered to his first scheme of running a railway to Sturgeon Falls, improving the navigation between that place and the narrows of the Lake of the Woods, and running a railway from the latter place to Fort Garry, he would have saved to the country many millions of dollars which must now be expended, and the ultimate all-rail line would have been thirty-five miles shorter than the present roundabout one by Rat Portage, but he was led astray by his Engineer, who, in a pamphlet just issued by him, says:—"There are points between the terminus on Lake Superior and the prairie region which govern the whole location. The geographical position of the Lake of the Woods, on the international boundary, defines Keewatin, at the outlet of the Lake, to be one of these; Selkirk, in the writer's view, is clearly another. The problem was to connect these points, etc." Now, it is wretched crotchets like these in the Engineer's head which seem to have led to all the mischief. Most engineers, on looking at the map and knowing the character of the country, as the Chief Engineer should have known it, would at once say, that in running a line from Lake Superior westward, the governing points were Sturgeon Falls, the Narrows of the Lake of the Woods and Fort Garry, and they would have projected the work so as ultimately to connect these points by rail, even if they had to avail themselves at the outset of the water stretches. This was the intention of the late hon. Premier at the outset and, having this scheme in view, he commenced the lock at Fort Francis, but the Chief Engineer, with his crotchets about governing points and his "guess-work" estimates, completely overpowered the hon. gentleman and led him to adopt a northern route which is considerably longer and vastly more expensive. His first mistake was in yielding his better judgment to the conceits of a gentleman of exceedingly visionary tendencies and

and his next in continuing the lock when the scheme, which was to render it useful, was abandoned. The Chief Engineer in his pamphlet just issued appears to have treated his second in command with discourtesy and with great injustice, inasmuch as he throws on him the blame of all his own shortcomings. In reference to the difference between the original quantities and the work returned as executed he says "the fact fell upon him as startling from being unexpected," "as it was alarming and unaccountable," and goes on to say: "Had he been in the country his duty would have led him to take means to keep down the expenditure." etc. This is pretty good, seeing that the estimates and expenditure were all his own, and that he had suppressed the reports of his second in command, Mr. Marcus Smith, whom he thus seeks to make responsible. Take it all in all, the estimates over expenditure and injudicious location, go to show what I have always insisted on, and endeavoured in as far as I could, to bring to light, namely, that the system of management is a system of anarchy. There should be some arrangement by which the views of the able and distinguished Engineers should always be available in reference to this great work—instead of being dependent on a guide so unsafe as the present Engineer-in-Chief. There has been some discussion about a bridge at the Red River, and I observe the Chief Engineer has written a report on the subject, in which he opposes the crossing at Fort Garry because the plains become flooded at long intervals. He is right enough in arguing that, as floods have occurred in the past, we may look for them in the future; but he is quite astray in representing that there would be any particular engineering difficulty in building a bridge which should be above the level of floods, somewhere at or near Winnipeg. His report in this case is a sample of moderately good special pleading against one point and in favour of another, but he ignores certain obvious facts which, in stating the case, should have been taken into account. There have been some references made to Quebec and her system of railways, as also to the financial embarrassment they have occasioned. But in my

opinion, the Quebec system has been much in advance of that of Ontario as regards location. In Ontario we have, in some instances, rather too many parallel lines in close proximity. Quebec has at least built one most important line, and the North Shore Railway, now in operation from the city of Quebec to Ottawa, may truly be called a national work, for it gives the country an interior route, sufficiently far from the frontiers to be available under all conceivable circumstances. When connected with the Canada Central, and when the Toronto and Ottawa Railway has come into existence, it will be seen how much the Dominion at large owes to Quebec, for her spirited and well-directed action in constructing this most important national highway. I observe, Mr. Speaker, and I may mention it, although it may be considered a matter of small importance, that a great many very extraordinary names have been set down along the railway line, as shown on this map. Why should not the old names, connected as they are with historical associations, have been retained? Our neighbours retain the old Indian and French names in the North-West, and why should we discard them? In our North-West, there is not a stream, or a lake, a mountain chain, or plain, that has not been traversed by the adventurous French voyageurs of old, and surely the name of Verandrye, and a host of others who followed him to these regions, would look as well on a map as these grotesque and unpronounceable names fresh from the "High Latitudes" of Europe. Why seek to obliterate a country's history by ignoring all that can perpetuate it, in these official documents. A hundred years ago a great many Scotch Highlanders, who had in the first place to leave their own country on account of political troubles, and afterwards left the United States because they would not renounce their allegiance and live under Republican institutions, found homes among the wild Indians of the North-West. They soon became the virtual chiefs. They established good government, and brought peace to warring tribes, and they gave the names familiar on their native mountains to many a stream and glen; but these must all be swept off, while the fantastic maps with which we are

favoured are rendered still more grotesque by the use of these outlandish names. Really, Mr. Speaker, I think there should be some amendment in this matter.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier): I desire to take this opportunity to contradict a statement which appeared recently in the Liberal organ of Montreal, to the effect that I and some other members of Quebec were opposed to the policy of the Government on the Pacific Railway. The question involved in the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, in my opinion, is whether Canada is bound by a Treaty or other legal agreement to construct the Pacific Railway, from the Pacific to the system of railways in Canada or the United States, within a certain time, or at least as speedily as possible, or only so as not to increase the rate of taxation. I will refer to the Statute which authorises the Union of British Columbia with Canada, and in this respect I beg to lay down a proposition differing somewhat from that maintained by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall). Section 146 of the British North America Act says:

“It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on Addresses from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective Legislatures of the Colonies of or Provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those Colonies or Provinces, or any of them, into the Union; and on Address from the Houses of the Parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the North-Western Territory, or either of them, into the Union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the Addresses expressed, and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act; and the provisions of any Order and in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.”

Now, under what terms and conditions did British Columbia enter the Union? These terms are to be found in our Statutes of 1872, and it must be conceded that this Parliament has no jurisdiction whatever upon these terms, because they were made under the authority of an Act of the Imperial Parliament. We find among certain papers, which are annexed to the Canadian Statutes for 1872, an Order in Council of Her Majesty's Privy Council, to the effect that British Columbia shall be admitted into and become part of the Do-

minion of Canada upon the terms and conditions set forth in the respective addresses of the Parliament of Canada, and of the Legislature of British Columbia. At paragraph eleven it is said:

“The Government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement, simultaneously, within two years after the date of the Union, of the construction of the Railway from the Pacific towards the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocky Mountains towards the Pacific, to connect the sea-board of British Columbia with the Railway system of Canada, and further to secure the completion of such Railway within ten years from the date of the Union.”

We find in this clause that there is no reservation whatever, such as was made by the House of Commons in 1871, that is to say, that the said Railway was to be built in such a manner as not to increase the rate of taxation of the people of this country. We do not find this reservation, which was subsequently repeated, not only in a Resolution of the House of Commons, but even in the Acts of this Parliament, and more particularly in the Acts of 1872, providing for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and incorporating two companies for the purpose of building that Railway. It is perfectly plain that these Statutes, as well as these Resolutions of the House of Commons, cannot have any effect upon the terms and conditions which were agreed upon between the two parties, that is to say: British Columbia on the one side and the Dominion of Canada on the other, under the authority of an Act of British Parliament. I am opposed to the Resolution of the hon. member for West Durham, for the simple reason that we have no jurisdiction in this Parliament to change the terms and conditions under which British Columbia was admitted into the Union. These changes could be made only by the consent of both parties, under the authority of a new Act of the Imperial Parliament. For these reasons, I am sorry to say, that I consider it absolutely impossible for this Parliament to accept of the proposition of that hon. gentleman. If it were not for this difficulty I would feel disposed to vote for his motion. A good deal has been said about what has been called the Carnarvon Treaty, and I am inclined to think, with the hon. member for West Durham, that that Treaty

has not much force, for the simple reason that it did not receive the sanction of this Parliament. But if this Carnarvon Treaty is to be set aside, in what position are we? We are in a still worse position. Then we have to fall back upon the Terms as laid down in the Addresses from this Parliament and from British Columbia at the time of the Union. The road must be constructed within ten years, that is to say, in 1882. We are in a worse position, because under the Carnarvon Treaty we have until 1890, and we have a still more important clause, to the effect that we are not bound to expend more than \$2,000,000 per annum. I do not think it was patriotic on the part of the hon. member for West Durham to repudiate this Carnarvon Treaty, which certainly introduced better terms in favour of Canada. If I voted for the motion of that hon. gentleman, I would consider that I was voting for repudiating an obligation of this country. In a new country like ours, public works must generally be carried on by means of loans in foreign markets; and I ask any hon. member of this House, whether it would be wise for us to establish such a precedent in view of its effect upon our credit? We are carrying on important works in this country. We are enlarging our canals, we are building railways, and if we are going to lay down the principle here that we may repudiate an obligation to do a certain public work, what guarantee can we give to the world that we may not repudiate our other obligations—our public debts. For that reason, and that is the principle reason, in my opinion, I must vote against the Resolution of the hon. member for West Durham. I heard, this afternoon, the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) state, that this Resolution did not amount to repudiation, but that it purports only to enlarge the time of construction of the Railway. It seems to me that if we endeavour to extend that time we are guilty of repudiation, and, therefore, I must vote against the Resolution.

MR. COCKBURN (Muskoka): I regard the motion of the hon. member for West Durham as a very proper one under the present circumstances. It must be remembered that we have a deficit this year, and, moreover, I have no great faith

that we will be able to realise large sums of money from the sales of land which are expected by the hon. the First Minister. I think he has taken a very visionary view of the receipts from sales of land in the North-West. I hope his anticipations may turn out correct, and, if so, then we can go on with the western section of this Railway. I have had some experience about the collection of money for land sold to new settlers. I have known, in some instances, parties who have been on the land for twenty years without taking a patent from the Government. We may rely upon it that, in some instances, we shall not receive anything from the settlers on this land for about twenty years. Many of them will bring a strong pressure to bear upon the Government to have the interest commuted, and also the principal in many cases. I think that these hon. gentlemen, who have directed their shafts against the hon. member for West Durham, have mistaken the feelings of this country. That hon. gentleman has a great mass of friends of both political parties. I have heard many Conservatives entirely subscribe to his view. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) stated it would only be necessary to extend the line of Railway about two hundred miles to the west of Winnipeg, now to carry on the present development of our prairie country. I am sure that it will require a more comprehensive scheme than that to develop our North-West. I sympathise with the hon. members from British Columbia, and I do not blame them for the language they have used. It is their duty to insist that the terms and conditions of the Treaty should be fulfilled. They would be recreant to their trust if they did not do so. At the same time, we, on the other hand, have got to look at facts as we find them. The motion of the hon. member for West Durham does not propose to abandon the construction of the Pacific Railway, but merely to postpone it. No doubt a large amount of money will be required for the working of that road, with but little traffic returns to compensate for the outlay. With respect to settlement in the North-West, I have heard a great deal about pamphlets treating on that question. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture has been pretty well catechised on

that subject, but I am sure he would not intentionally allow any such literature to go out. I think that hon. members on both sides of the House have erred in sending out hundreds of thousands of these pamphlets. I think many Ontario members, on both sides of the House, have committed a grave mistake in sending out vast numbers of these pamphlets to people who had no intention of leaving the Old Countries, and the new country was not sufficiently opened up to receive a very large influx of emigration. The large emigration to the North-West has been alluded to, but it is well-known that a great number of those who have taken passage to Manitoba have returned in disgust from Winnipeg and settled in Dakota or Minnesota. My chief object in asking the indulgence of the House for a few moments, was to refer to the past policy of the late Government in respect to the more easterly section of the road. The hon. member for Lambton inaugurated the Georgian Bay Branch scheme, which was well calculated to serve the interests of at least Quebec and Ontario. My constituency in particular has suffered a gross injustice at the hands of the present Administration, by the cancellation of the contracts which my hon. friend from Lambton had entered into. If the claims preferred against the Government are paid \$200,000 will have been expended, or rather wasted, upon that road by the cancellation, and if the contract had been gone on with fifty miles would have been completed by the 1st July. They have, in the course they have taken, abandoned a scheme which would have been most serviceable to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and the people will hold the Government to strict account for the \$200,000 which have been wasted upon that branch. It has been contended that the motion of the hon. member for West Durham is a blow at the Union, and that it is a repudiation of the Terms of Union. It is, however, nothing of the kind. It merely asks for a postponement of the undertaking. Although the British Columbia members have a certain right to insist upon the Terms being carried out—but I hope they will exercise some patience, and wait a little longer, in order that we may see how matters are going, until we see how the land scheme will

work, until we see how the hon. the Minister of Finance comes out with his Budget next year—I trust that the motion of the hon. member for West Durham will prevail in the House, as I am sure it will in the country.

MR. BARNARD: We can regard the motion of the hon. member for West Durham in no other light than a Repudiation Resolution. We do not take the exact wording of the Resolution, but we go back over the conduct of the party in Opposition in reference to this matter. From the first discussion that arose in reference to the admission of British Columbia into the Dominion, we can see a determination on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite never to admit British Columbia on anything like fair terms: and even if we did succeed in obtaining fair terms, those terms could be broken upon the first opportunity. Hon. gentlemen have asserted that the people of British Columbia have been extremely unreasonable, but they have satisfied themselves with making the assertion. They have not attempted to show that we were unreasonable. The people, I think, under the circumstances, have been extremely reasonable. We regarded the Terms as exceedingly liberal, and when the two or three years elapsed between the confirmation of these Terms and the resignation of the Macdonald Administration, we did not complain that the work had not been commenced. We simply entered a protest to the effect that the surveys had not been completed. The first move of the hon. member for Lambton, after succeeding to power, was to assume that we were going to be hostile to him. He took the ground that some alteration of the Terms was necessary. We contended there was no alteration required, but we were offered additional terms which involved an additional expenditure of \$4,000,000. I was utterly dumbfounded that this additional taxation should be necessitated by the party which had persistently declared that the offer already made was so onerous that Canada could not bear it. I regret exceedingly that subsequently no arrangement could be arrived at between our Government and the Dominion Government. The result was that England was appealed to and the Carnarvon Terms were agreed to, which I maintain are not less

onerous than those formerly entered into. Let me here call the attention of the House to statements that have been made in reference to the value of British Columbia as a country. It has been asserted, over and over again, that British Columbia was of no value to the Dominion, and, in fact, the hon. member for West Durham went so far as to make the statement that the country was utterly worthless. It was contended that British Columbia was of no value because she was not a grain-growing country. Now, there is a mistake about that. There is more arable land in British Columbia than it is generally credited with possessing. We never put forward a claim that it is a grain-growing country. Our claim is that it is a mineral Province of great value, as will ultimately be proven. Our grain-growing section lies principally east of the Cascade Range. As was shown by the map laid on the Table of this House, a few days ago, which purported to exhibit the tracts of good and bad land in the North-West and in British Columbia; in that map a tract of good land, lying between the Rocky Mountains and the Cascade Range, was shown, which, on measurement, was declared to be 20,000 acres in extent, in which, I take it, sufficient wheat could be grown to make an important item in the traffic of a railway. After my election I obtained information from every district in the Province as to the quantity of grain that had been grown in the Province. I was astonished at the result. I found that our farmers had raised during the year 8,000 tons of grain, and when we come to consider the small number of farmers to be found in a population of 12,000 or 15,000 persons, the House will easily understand the ground must have been very prolific to raise so large a quantity. We must remember also that the crop was put in at a time of serious depression, for this House had just declared that the location of the Burrard Inlet route was premature, and everything indicated that the Railway would be carried away north of all settlement. Consequently, each farmer put in a limited number of acres. It will hardly be assumed that we have now under crop one acre in every hundred of arable land we possess. Should we have an addition to our population of 12,500 farmers, who

will cultivate eighty acres each—and surely this is a moderate calculation—the result would be that 800,000 tons of grain would be raised yearly. Taking it for granted that we could spare 400,000 tons, or say one-half, for exportation, would that not yield to the Railway quite a considerable revenue. It would go a long way towards paying the expense of that 127 miles for twelve months, and, in fact, would very likely yield a revenue. Well, now, it might be said: “Is it likely that this 127 miles of road which simply, as it were, enters the country—is it at all likely that there is country enough through which it runs to raise 800,000 tons of grain, and is it concentrated in such a shape that the Railway can take it up?” Extraordinary as it may appear, that is a fact. The road starts at Yale, it goes through the canons where there is no land of any account until it reaches Lytton. At Lytton, by taking the course of the Fraser, and expending a few thousand dollars in the improvement of that river, we secure navigation for 25 miles. I have the report made to the hon. Minister of Public Works, a few years ago, dated 1875. Before reading extracts from this report, I will inform the House that the Columbia River is very similarly situated to the Fraser River, and that previous to the improvement of that river, it was impossible to move grain to the front; and agriculture to the east of the Cascades, in Washington Territory and Oregon, was, as it is with us at the present time, confined to supplying the wants created in the vicinity. I gather the following from the Report:

“I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of Mr. G. B. Wright's Supplementary Report on the big bar canon of the Fraser River, showing the nature of the obstructions to the navigation of the river at that point. Mr. Wright estimates the cost of removing rock at \$100,000, but I think that his estimate is far too high, even for work carried on so far in the interior. It appears that a road or tramway can be built from the reach below to that above, not exceeding two miles in length, at a cost of about \$3,000 to \$4,000, with a good landing at each end. With a view to show what has been done in Washington Territory and Oregon by the improvements of the Columbia river, in developing the country, I desired Mr. Wright to obtain some statistics bearing upon this subject, the general results which I now lay before you for the consideration of the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

“One cannot fail to observe the general similarity between the Columbia and Fraser rivers, in their course, nature of obstructions, and source, as well as in the fact that both plow through the Cascade Range of mountains in their passage to the sea. The upper waters of both are sluggish and well adapted to steamboat navigation. In the Columbia, the first serious obstacle occurs at the Cascades, where a railway five miles in length has been built, to avoid rapids, considered incapable of improvement. Another portage occurs forty miles above this point, from the Dalles to Cilito, a distance of thirteen miles. A railway has been built here. From this point the river is navigable at all stages of waters to Wallula, a distance of 140 miles. At high water, steamers ascend 160 miles further, to the town of Lewiston. Large sums of money have been, and are still being, expended in blasting and removing rocky obstructions from this river. Prior to the improvement of the navigation of the river and the construction of the two railways before mentioned, freight was carried from Portland up to Wallula at \$100 per ton. There was no freight downwards, as the rates were prohibitory, although the country was admirably adapted for raising wheat. The rates now on upward freight is \$20 per ton, and on downward freight \$5 per ton. The effect of the improvement to navigation is shown by the tonnage, chiefly wheat, shipped during the last three years :

1872	1,500 Tons.
1873	6,200 “
1874	9,600 “

Lately I applied to the Oregon Steam Navigation Company, and they have sent me the following returns, which brings the statement down to date :

1875	10,600 Tons.
1876	18,700 “
1877	30,000 “
1878	29,500 “
1879	44,800 “

It will be noticed that the quantity of freight offering has gradually increased since the improvements referred to have been made. Here we have a country lying to the east of the Cascades fit for the produce of cereals, but the produce of which, up to 1872, could not be utilised on account of the difficulty of forwarding it to the front. That is precisely the position we occupy in British Columbia to day. We have a grain-growing country to the east of the Cascades, and have not, so far, been able to move one bushel to the front, and there they have been compelled to use foreign grain up to the present. The Report goes on to say with reference to the improvement of the Fraser :

“These improvements would open up the

principal grain-producing region of the interior, which may be estimated at not less than 200,000 acres, capable of producing 300,000 tons of wheat per annum. Now it is a desert, owing to its inaccessibility, and the exorbitant rate of freight.”

Thus we find that a comparatively small sum expended in improving the Fraser River, above Lytton, would not only enable the farmers of Lilloet district, who are already large producers, to reach a market, but the whole line of the Fraser River up to the Quesnelle would furnish freight and become a feeder to the Railway. Thus, from Lytton, we have a river running 260 miles through a territory, on each side of which there are grain-growing lands. I know, from my own observation, the area of good land is much greater than reports and accounts of travellers estimate it. The report to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, from which I have already quoted, comes much nearer doing justice to the value of that section of British Columbia than those of casual travellers. From Savona's Ferry, the northern terminus of the present contract, we have a water stretch. We have navigation up North Thompson's River, for 100 miles on each side of which we have considerable tracts of land fit for cultivation. Then we go in a south-easterly direction another 100 miles, where we have another very good grain-growing section of country, on each side of the South River. Quite a quantity of grain can also be raised along the valley of the Spallumcheen, which stretches out in a southerly direction towards Lake Okanagan. This valley is very low, scarcely above the water-level of the lakes, between which it lies. A very few thousand dollars will suffice to clear out that stream, and enable steamers of two feet draught of water to reach Lake Okanagan, thus opening up another seventy miles in the direction of the southern boundary. Thus we see that the location of this Railway gives us the advantage of opening up our country 260 miles in one direction, 100 in another, and 100 in a third direction. We are too much in the habit, if I may use the vulgar term, of crying stinking fish. I have heard gentlemen on the other side decry our country in their ignorance, and, notwithstanding what they might read in the various reports, never giving us credit for what good does exist in that country. Taking

up the reports of gentlemen travelling through the country, camping out in all weathers, one cannot expect to find in them a very pleasant description of the country. That is no reason, however, why the leading men of the Loyal Opposition should stand on the floor of this House and read by the hour such reports as they think are the most damaging to our Province. But, Sir, why should we complain? We are not alone in this matter. Other countries on the Pacific coast have been equally misunderstood. In the early settlement of California it was declared by farmers, who went in there for gold, that there was no agricultural land in that state—in fact for years they used Chili flour there. To-day California exports \$16,000,000 worth of wheat, a great portion of which is sent to the British Empire. The first men who turned their attention to farming there complained that the good land was all taken up by the missions, and that none was left for settlement. To-day, however, the area is increasing, because they find it is not necessary to have land on the levels; even those high lands are being put under cultivation by a new system of irrigation by which a still greater area of land is made fit for cultivation. I mean the system of tunneling the hills to obtain water, a system that can be made applicable to our hills as well as those of California. Oregon ranks high among the grain exporting countries whose exports of wheat, to-day, are 225,000 tons. Well, what was said of Oregon by the first settlers was similar to what is now said of British Columbia. Mr. Keith, who was in charge of the Hudson's Bay Company's business in Oregon, at the time they purchased the right to carry on the fur business there, wrote to London to say that if they wished to carry on business there they would have to send flour out for their employes, 'as the country would not grow anything. Yet, to-day, there is shipped from Oregon 225,000 tons of wheat alone, besides what was raised for her own consumption and what she shipped to California, in which business two lines of steamships running to San Francisco are engaged. It was said of California that there was no agricultural land. The same statement was made with regard to Oregon, and we have heard it

made here with regard to British Columbia. I think I am not wrong in saying that the hon. member for Lambton said, on one occasion, that there was not as much land in British Columbia as would make a good farm.

MR. MACKENZIE: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. BARNARD: Well, it was something near it.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, it was not near it.

MR. BARNARD: Perhaps I can recall the incident to the hon. gentleman's recollection. He said he had very good authority for the statement, because his brother was in British Columbia and gave him the information. Perhaps that will bring the matter to the hon. gentleman's recollection.

MR. MACKENZIE: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. BARNARD: Well, perhaps I am wrong. I can understand that a man going through that country, for the first time, would declare, most unhesitatingly, that the land he was walking over would yield nothing, I had the same impression myself until I saw miners, who had come from countries where the value of irrigation was understood, busily tilling the land, and obtaining large results. All that is required is water, and that we find by digging ditches in the land. With water you can raise cereals to good advantage. Talk about the country being of no consequence at all; why, even the Indians there are bidding with the farmers of Ontario, and taking prizes from them for wheat, as they did at the Centennial Exhibition. Here, in this city, at the Dominion Exhibition, a medal was awarded to an Indian who raised grain in British Columbia, for the best sample of wheat shown. He also took a medal for the best sample of oats at the Philadelphia Exhibition. Is it not well to hesitate before denouncing, in a wholesale manner, our country. What part of the play is it that hon. gentlemen opposite are acting here. Over and over again they take up documents, as if our word was not to be depended upon, to declare that there is no land in that Province fit for cultivation. I never before heard of a country so traduced by its own people. Go into the United States and you will not find, anywhere, a set of men in any po-

sition of life, that will stand up and systematically denounce the country that gives them their bread, as has been done by gentlemen of the Opposition during this debate. Here is a map of the Railway from Omaha to San Francisco. Some 200 miles out of Omaha you reach the North Platte River, and from there to within a few miles of Sacramento, there is not a solitary farm to be seen in the whole length of the road between those two points—some 1,600 miles. You will find nothing in the way of agriculture in sight of the train beyond a few garden spots. All is a wilderness of wormwood and sand. As we go through the State of Wyoming, there are no farms or farming land in sight, yet people are coming in and settling all the time. In Colorado there is a large portion of the land unfit for cultivation. Yet we never hear Americans denouncing these districts, but, on the contrary, agents are employed to induce emigrants to go there; and so on through Utah and Nevada. Nothing in sight but a cheerless waste; no improvement beyond a few houses at the railway station. Yet, travel as you may, converse with whom you please among the Americans, you meet with no man who denounces his country. They are always ready to point out the advantages each State possesses. Not so with gentlemen of the Opposition. If I were an agent sent out to promote emigration to the United States, I would ask no better argument than to take up the *Hansard*, as it will appear in a few weeks from this, with the speeches of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and send their statements broadcast throughout the world. Our poor little Province has to come in for her share. Our people went out there to better their condition by gold-hunting, and, therefore, are not deserving of consideration. I beg hon. gentlemen to remember that those of us who first settled there, did much to create the good, wholesome Canadian sentiment that resulted in our joining the Dominion and giving her an outlet on the Pacific, without which her North-West would have been of little value. We knew that Canada would, one day, be a large and influential nation, and we hoped and desired to be a part and parcel of her as such; but the gentleman who claims to be the eminent defender of public mora-

lity wills it not. "If she is not reasonable let her go," is the argument used. "We have made a bad bargain and must stand by it if we wish to be honest;" "but we have made a bad bargain, and, therefore, must break it." If it is not repudiation; if this putting off does not mean breaking the Terms entered into with British Columbia, what else is it. We know that, nine years ago, British Columbia entered into this Dominion with the distinct understanding that the Pacific Railway should be built in the course of ten years from that time. Now, Sir, the ten years have nearly rolled by, and not one foot of that road, which was promised to British Columbia, and upon the promise of which she entered into the Confederacy, has been built. And now that an effort is being made; now that a policy has been propounded by the present Administration for carrying out the work for the benefit of the whole Dominion, as well as for British Columbia; now that the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury Benches have hit upon a scheme for carrying the work into execution; now that they have adopted and propose to carry out this grand scheme—a scheme that the hon. gentlemen opposite would have given their eye-teeth to have dreamt of—those hon. gentlemen try to throw discredit on it at once, and endeavour to knock it on the head—they did that in antagonism to a former scheme, which would have saved the country many millions of dollars; now that the hon. gentlemen who now carry on the Government have whipped the whole affair clean out of their hands, they say we are going to be ruined entirely by the policy which is being adopted, and they seek to embarrass it by discrediting the country in the eyes of the world. An hon. gentleman on this side of the House, took a manly position, knowing the advantages of a Pacific Province to the Dominion, defended the Province of British Columbia. His speech was a credit to the House and the country; and I take it that the people of British Columbia will understand that their best thanks are due to that hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), for his very able defence of that Province on the floor of this House, and for the effective manner

in which he repelled that tirade of abuse from the other side. In looking over a copy of the *Bystander*, I find that Mr. Goldwin Smith, in speaking of an act of Mr. Blake's, said: "It is written on a disastrous and somewhat inglorious page of Canadian history." May we not ask whether that hon. gentleman has not, in moving this Resolution of repudiation, added another "inglorious" page to Canadian history. Another page of that book says: "Mr. Blake is our most eminent defender of public morals." I would like to know, after the debate of the last four or five days, what position in history that great defender of public morals will take. It may not be immoral to bring down such a Resolution as he has brought down; it may not be immoral to place it before the members of this House, and ask a vote on it, but every act of his, in connection with the British Columbia difficulty, points to the fact that expediency and not morality governs him. But when the Terms with British Columbia first failed, he thought the Ministry of that time had better offer us something for its non-fulfilment, and an offer was made accordingly. It contained one particular clause. I do not know who drew up the document, but the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was the Minister of Justice, perhaps he did. There was one clause which it was impossible to understand: the question was, whether the \$750,000 offered was for the abandonment of the Railway term or in compensation for delays that had taken place. It is most extraordinary how a highly moral man, a great "defender of our public morals," could endeavour to foist on a "miserable handful of people," with probably not a constitutional lawyer in the land, a document that contained such ambiguous language. The hon. gentleman from West Durham has made it plain in his speech, for he has asserted most positively, that the \$750,000 was intended as compensation for all delays past and to come. It suited the hon. gentleman to say that during this debate, for it places his party in a better position; but how did he advise Lord Dufferin to explain the offer to our people. His Lordship's words were these:

"Now, here again I will not touch upon the irritating controversies which have circled round this particular step in these transactions.

I am well aware that you consider this offer to have been made under conditions of which you have reason to complain. If this has been the case it is most unfortunate, but still, whatever may have been the sinister incidents connected with the past, the one solid fact remains that the Canadian Government has offered you \$750,000 in lieu of the Railway. * * * * This sum may be inadequate, but still I may mention to you the principle upon which this sum has been arrived at under the Nanaimo and Esquimaux Railway Bill, whose rejection by the Senate we have been discussing, Canada was to contribute a bonus of \$10,000 a mile. The total distance is seventy miles, consequently, the \$750,000 is nothing more or less than the bonus converted into a lump sum."

The House will readily see that the two statements are wholly irreconcilable. It was complained this evening that British Columbia had no faith in the former Government, that they wanted "millions poured into their own laps." What faith could be placed in a party who could send a document like that, and endeavour to entrap us into accepting a trifling sum in lieu of the non-fulfilment of these Terms. In refusing that \$750,000, I think we showed distinctly that it was not for money considerations that we formed the connection with Canada. Our desire to enter the Union was both a proper and patriotic one. We looked on Canada as a progressive country, about to establish herself a nation, that could afford to sustain the dignity of a nation—a country that would, if she undertook an agreement, carry it out faithfully; and we looked, naturally, to the country of our birth as the proper country to ally ourselves with. I am satisfied, whether we get this Railway or not, we should have accepted the invitation to join this country. It is hardly fair, therefore, to charge us with being so anxious to obtain money as to be willing to take it under any circumstances. I would like to draw attention to a document circulated, a copy of which has been sent to each member. Were I asked for an opinion, I should say it was issued by the Opposition. In describing the Railway route, the author says:

"From Yellow Head Pass to the Pacific stretches the enormous barren mass of the Rocky Mountains, rent assunder here and there by fearful chasms and terminating abruptly in the sea. The location having surmounted this formidable barrier at an elevation of 4,000 feet winds its gloomy way to the sea, through and along the sides of these mountains which overhang the water roaring

beneath in the canons of the Thompson and Fraser Rivers."

This string of nonsense was written by an American engineer who professes to know a great deal of the country. I have travelled from the Yellow Head Pass to the Pacific Ocean, and this description is not in any way applicable to the country. From the centre of the Mountains, down to the sea, I have travelled over the located line. So far from there being such tremendous difficulties, there is nothing of the kind. There is not one engineering obstacle or impediment to the road; in no place do the roaring waters make more disturbance than the falls at the Chaudiere; there is no serious difficulty or impediment to the Railway. I contend that the figures reported to the hon. the Minister of Railways, and by him announced to the House, respecting the cost of construction of the Railway between the summit of the Rocky Mountains and Savona's Ferry, are far in excess of the correct statement. The country is comparatively open and favourable to railway building. It will prove a much lighter piece of work than the hon. gentleman has any conception of. I felt it my duty to defend British Columbia at present; and to inform the House that there is a larger quantity of arable land in it than supposed; and that, with the assistance of this Railway, it will become a considerable grain-growing region. Instead of being regarded as a worthless country, it will yet be considered as rich a Province as Canada possesses. She has within herself all the elements necessary; her coal and iron, her fish, her lumber, her gold, silver and copper, will one day place her among the richest Provinces of this Canada of ours.

MR. BURPEE (Sunbury): My apology for detaining the House at this time of the morning, is the extraordinary position assumed by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Barnard), who has just taken his seat, as well as other hon. members from British Columbia, namely: That the motion of the hon. member for West Durham would be repudiation of our engagements, a violation of our contracts, and would break up the Union. Mr. Speaker, there is another view of the subject from an eastern standpoint, which, as only one other hon.

member from the Maritime Provinces has spoken on the subject, I think should be further urged, even at this late hour. I have listened attentively to the discussion of this most important subject during the debate, and I understood the hon. the Minister of Railways to say that he would be justified by the Act of Union with British Columbia, to stop the construction of the Pacific Railway whenever the Government decide that it would add to the burdens of the people, as provided by the rider to said Act. If that is the case, the difficulties of the situation will, in my opinion, be met by the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, which should be adopted in view of the embarrassed state of the finances, and the amount of taxation already imposed, which is so unsatisfactory in the east. This motion, now under consideration, only asked for delay on the British Columbia end of the line. The question at issue is, whether we can go on and finish the whole road, including the British Columbia portion, at once, and at the rate indicated by the hon. the Finance Minister, spending on that work \$10,000,000 this year, and the same amount next year, and \$5,000,000 each succeeding year, until the road is completed, without adding to the burdens of the people. All parties agree that it is expedient and necessary to build that portion of the Canadian Pacific road from Lake Superior to Winnipeg, and thence into the North-West Territory, as far as is required for the settlement of that country; but I do not think that the finances of the Dominion will justify the immediate construction of any portion in the British Columbia Territory, and I think that the hon. member for West Durham has proved and demonstrated that fact by data that cannot be controverted. I have always held, and frequently expressed this opinion in this House: that the building of the Pacific Railway was a burden which should not have been undertaken by Canada alone; but it was quite as much of an Imperial as a Colonial work, and should have received substantial aid from the British Government. It should have been made a condition by Canada before accepting the burdens and responsibility of uniting with that Colony, and adopting what was notoriously the

MR. BARNARD.

policy of the Home Government. But the correspondence on this subject informs us that British Columbia only asked for a carriage-road through their Province, uniting them with the North-West Territory as a condition of Union, and why the Government of Canada should have voluntarily proposed and bound themselves and the Dominion, as far as our resources would admit, to build a Railway in ten, or even twenty years, is beyond my comprehension. I not only think that the British Government should have assisted, as an Imperial work, the construction of the Pacific Railway; but I think that they should have paid any claims fairly due to the Hudson's Bay Company upon Rupert's Land and the North-West Territory if they had any. Canada should not have been called upon to pay \$1,500,000 to that Company, besides giving said Company 50,000 acres of land, and 5 per cent. of the balance of all the land in the Territory. Was it not enough for the Dominion to assume the burdens of colonising this great country with the costs and risks of purchasing the claims of, and caring for, 60,000 Indians, without further burdens and responsibilities? I repeat that the building of the Pacific Railway, and colonising the vast territories through which it runs, is quite as much an Imperial as a Colonial work, and its costs should have been shared by the British Government. I am fortified in that opinion by the declaration of Sir A. T. Galt, the especial Envoy and High-Commissioner of this Government, in a speech delivered by him at a dinner given at Montreal immediately before leaving this country. He said that:

"The people of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or even of Ontario had no more interest in acquiring or settling the North-West Territory than had the labourers of England or the tenant-farmers of Tipperary."

We have been called upon to pay out of the Revenues of the Dominion for annuities, gratuities to Indians in the North-West for the past year, nearly \$1,000,000, including the expenses of the Mounted Police, which are necessary to be maintained on their account, and these Treaty obligations must annually increase as the settlement of the country progresses and game becomes more scarce. In view of these, with our other heavy obligations of our al-

ready very large and increasing debt and heavy taxation, I think that we should pause before committing the Dominion to the building of the British Columbia end of the Pacific Railway until the North-West Territories are colonised and settled, and our resources are in a better condition for proceeding with the whole line. The contention of the hon. the Minister of Railways is that we are now able to do so, and the hon. Premier has furnished the House with a calculation in which he proposes to show us that the road can be built out of money from the sale of lands in the North-West. His calculation is to sell, during the next ten years, 32,000,000 acres of land, on which he proposes to settle over half a million of people in that time, and for which land he expects to receive \$38,000,000 in cash and \$32,000,000 in securities. I think that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has most clearly demonstrated the utter futility of this calculation. He has shown that, in no case, in the United States, where land is equal in fertility, and there are better facilities for settlement, have they been able, in the same extent of territory, to realise, in ten years, more than six millions in money and a like sum in securities. To enable a person to have some idea of the extent of 32,000,000 acres of territory, it is necessary to compare it with some other territory with which we are acquainted. The Provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick combined, just about represent the area of the territory which the hon. the First Minister hopes to settle in the North West in the course of ten years. It would take all the land in the Maritime Provinces, good, bad and indifferent, settled and unsettled, to make the extent of territory which he proposes to sell and settle in this brief period. The absurdity of the thing is very apparent. But take another view. Take the land which is purchased for settlement in the whole Dominion. In Ontario there are 19,605,000 acres sold; in Quebec, 17,701,000 acres sold; in New Brunswick, 5,453,000 acres; in Nova Scotia, 6,607,000 acres, making a total of 49,000,000 acres of land purchased from the Government by private individuals. Some 13,000,000 acres of this land are held for lumber purposes, and for

mining purposes, which will leave only 36,000,000 acres, or a little over the amount of land which the hon. Premier hopes to settle in ten years in the North-West. We have been settling this Dominion nearly a century, and we have only succeeded in all these Provinces in settling 36,000,000 acres of land. Yet the hon. the First Minister proposes, in ten years, to settle 32,000,000 acres in the North-West. I think these two statements are sufficient to illustrate the impossibility of the hon. the First Minister's anticipations being realised. As to the quality of the land, it can scarcely be contended that this new territory will be any better than the land in Ontario. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) stated, that the motion of the hon. member for West Durham was a kind of repudiation. The hon. the Minister of Railways did not take that ground. He took the ground that if we found at any time the state of our finances did not admit of continuing the work we could then stop. He may find that the finances of the Dominion will not admit of our going on with the road even next year. If we went on with the present contracts, even for one year, large liabilities would be incurred, and contractors would want to be reimbursed for their outlay and for damages, and the difficulty in the way of stopping the work would be very great. Another objection to the Resolution is that it will break up the Union. We have heard much of this from the hon. members from British Columbia, and we can sympathise with them. I believe the Union between British Columbia and the other Provinces was premature. I believe that worse things may happen to this Dominion, and worse things may happen for British Columbia than that the Union should be dissolved. The Union, by Act of Parliament, cannot long subsist when there are no commercial ties to strengthen political Union. I think it can be demonstrated that it will be impossible to have commercial Union with that country for many years to come. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) has, on several occasions, asked for a separate Tariff suitable to British Columbia, and differing from that of the rest of the Dominion. I felt that there were many good reasons why British Columbia should have a separate Tariff.

The circumstances of that country are very difficult from those of the rest of the Dominion. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that there could be no commercial intercourse between these two countries, I hold it was premature for British Columbia to be annexed to this Dominion, and that the Union was detrimental, not only to Canada but to British Columbia herself. If it is dangerous for the British Columbia end of the road to be delayed until our finances will permit of the work being proceeded with, it is more dangerous to go on and build this road in the present state of our finances. There is more danger of breaking up the Union by proceeding at present than by halting at present. I state that advisedly. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that, in the Province from which I come—and I think the same remark will apply to other Provinces—there is great dissatisfaction at the amount of debt we are rolling up and the amount of taxation already imposed, and the recklessness with which the Government is being conducted. That dissatisfaction is assuming proportions which cannot ere long be controlled, and will culminate, I fear, in a storm which the hon. gentlemen opposite will not be able to allay, and in worse disaster than the secession of British Columbia. If we go on and build that road at present, it will certainly add one hundred million dollars to the heavy debt with which this country is already burdened, and will absorb the entire Customs Revenue to pay the interest alone. I ask is it fair to absorb the whole of our Customs dues and deprive the other Provinces of necessary public works in order to build the British Columbia end of this road, which can be of no service, commercially, at present, but which must entail a large additional burden to operate it? For the reasons I have given to-night, and in view of the state of our finances, I must enter my protest against proceeding with the construction of this portion of the road.

MR. SCHULTZ: As this discussion has been so long and so exhaustive, I desire only to ask the indulgence of the House long enough to enter my protest against the manner in which the western Provinces have been treated by many of the supporters of the amendment. One

would think from the tone of hon. gentlemen that the proposed expenditure was to be utterly unproductive of good results either in the development of this western region or of lasting good to the Dominion at large. They seem to have forgotten that the largest, the most productive, and in the near future, the most populous part of this "Canada of ours" lies beyond the western limit of the Province of Ontario, west even of the Province, a portion of which I have the honour of representing in this House. It would seem that, in the grubbing of Ontario stumps and the ensnaring of east-coast lobsters, it is apt to be forgotten that, west of the narrow field of petty provincial jealousies, we have a vast empire, rich enough in agricultural and mineral resources to support a population of 100,000,000. Had it ceased to be true that the tread of empire was westward, or, if true, was its progress to be barred by the Rocky Mountains? By what right did hon. gentlemen sneer at the small population of British Columbia, and jeer at her representatives in this House for their manly endeavours in her behalf? Had it not been shown that, man for man, the population of the Pacific Province have contributed more to the support of the General Government than any other. Have they not waited for the fulfilment of the conditions of Union, with a patience all the more admirable, for the mutterings which showed the forbearance to be one of loyal patriotism rather than indifference. By what right, then, do we exclude these transmontane Canadians from our sympathy, and affect to look upon them as a semi-foreign element, more intent upon rifling the public purse than of aiding the common weal. I am afraid that we are all apt to forget that while political British Columbia is bounded on the east by the Rocky Mountains, yet that physical and commercial British Columbia has for its eastern boundary the one hundredth degree of longitude, and that between that point and the Pacific Ocean there is more of wealth of arable land, of timber, of iron, coal, and the precious metals, than in the whole of the rest of the Dominion. They who live in the east forget that our magnificent prairie country, west of the one hundredth degree, is all tributary to the west coast, and that

through some Rocky Mountain Pass and over the portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway, now so severely criticised, its wheat must find its way to the sea, and by the sea to its natural market. In the ten years I have been in Parliament, I have seen the fulfilment of many predictions regarding the Province of Manitoba; and I now venture the prediction, regarding British Columbia, that, if in the ten years to come we make an honest effort to fulfil what we fairly may of the obligations solemnly entered into on her Union, that Province will contribute more to the material wealth of the Dominion, more to the support of the Government, than any of those Provinces which now occupy a front rank in the Union. She is no dowerless bride, this fair Pacific Province; she brought a wealth of resources specially valuable to the rich but useless region on her east, and even if her rocky ranges, so commented upon here, did not contain vast mines of yet undeveloped wealth, she still was necessary as an outlet for the greatest continuous extent of wheat-growing lands the world has seen, which would be useless to us but that a feasible line of Railway has been found to the sea. I shall vote against the Resolution, because I believe the expenditure to be necessary; because the national honour is involved in the attempt, at some measure at least, of our undertaking with British Columbia; because I feel that this branch of our great public works will be as profitable, from its commencement as other detached portions of the natural line, and because this much-belied, patient, long-suffering Province, is for well or for ill, a part and parcel of this Great Dominion, and notwithstanding that nature, as if wearied with the monotony of the prairie, has there thrown the earth's surface into fantastic forms. She has still, as if forecasting the part this Province was to play in the censuring of this Dominion, provided these low passes and natural conditions, which allow the easy curves and low gradients of our great national railway line to the western sea.

Motion made:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

Motion in amendment *made*, and question *proposed* :

To leave out all the words after "That" in the said motion, and to insert the following instead thereof: "The public interests require that the work of constructing the Pacific Railway in British Columbia should be postponed."—(*Mr. Blake.*)

The House divided: Yeas, 49; nays, 131.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin	Killam
Bain	King
Béchar	LaRue
Blake	Macdonell (N. Lanark)
Borden	Mackenzie
Bourassa	McIsaac
Brown	Malouin
Burpee (St. John)	Oliver
Burpee (Sunbury)	Oliver
Cameron (South Huron)	Paterson (South Brant)
Cartwright	Pickard
Casey	Rinfret
Casgrain	Rogers
Charlton	Ross (West Middlesex)
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Rymal
Coupal	Scriven
Dumont	Smith (Selkirk)
Fiset	Smith (Westmoreland)
Fleming	Snowball
Geoffrion	Thompson (Haldimand)
Gillies	Trow
Gillmore	Welton
Gunn	Wiser
Haddow	Yeo.—49.
Huntington	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott	Kranz
Allison	Landry
Angers	Lane
Arkell	Lungevin
Baby	Lantier
Baker	Little
Bannerman	Longley
Barnard	Macdonald (King's)
Beauchesne	Macdonald (Victoria BC)
Benoit	McDonald (Cape Breton)
Bergeron	McDonald (Pictou)
Bill	McCallum
Bolduc	McCuaig
Boulbee	Macdougall
Bourbeau	McGreevy
Bowell	McInnes
Brecken	McKay
Brooks	McLennan
Bunster	McLeod
Bunting	McQuade
Burnham	McRory
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Masson
Carling	Massue
Caron	Merner
Cimon	Méthot
Colby	Mongenais
Connell	Montplaisir
Costigan	Muttart

MR. BURPEE.

Coursol	O'Connor
Currier	Ogden
Cuthbert	Orton
Daly	Patterson (Essex)
Daoust	Perrault
Dawson	Pinoaneault
DeCosmos	Plumb
Desaulniers	Pope (Compton)
Desjardins	Pope (Queens, P. E. I.)
Doull	Poupore
Drew	Richey
Dugas	Robinson
Elliott	Ross (Dundas)
Farrow	Rouleau
Ferguson	Royal
Fitzsimmons	Ryan (Marquette)
Fortin	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Fulton	Schultz
Gault	Shaw
Gigault	Skinner
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Sproule
Girouard (Kent, N. B.)	Strange
Grandbois	Tassé
Hackett	Tellier
Haggart	Thompson (Cariboo)
Hay	Tilley
Hesson	Tupper
Hilliard	Vallée
Hooper	Vanasse
Houde	Wade
Hurteau	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Ives	Wallace (West York)
Jackson	White (Cardwell)
Jones	White (E. Hastings)
Kaulbach	White (North Renfrew)
Keeler	Williams
Kilvert	Wright.—131.
Kirkpatrick	

PAIRS :

<i>For—</i>	<i>Against—</i>
Chandler	Platt
Mills	Domville
Robertson (Shelburne)	Cockburn (W. N'land.)
Flynn	Bergin
Laurier	Macmillan
Guthrie	Stephenson

Motion *resolved* in the negative.

Main motion *agreed to*.

SUPPLY.

XII. RAILWAYS AND CANALS CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway.

86 British Columbia, Emory's Bar to Savona's Ferry.....\$1,000,000

Resolution *ordered* to be reported.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill (*from the Senate*) was introduced and *read the first time* :—

Bill (No. 105) For the relief of Permanent Building Societies and Loan Companies, and

to restrict their modes of lending.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

House adjourned at
Ten minutes after
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 21st April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PICTOU HARBOUR ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

FIRST READING.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.), in moving the first reading of the Bill (No. 106) To amend an Act respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia, said: The Bill is intended to give power to the three Harbour Commissioners to manage the business of the harbour. Under the present Act the Government have appointed Commissioners, and this Bill proposes to authorise them to appoint a Harbour Master as is done by the Harbour Commissioners at Montreal, Quebec, Sydney and other ports.

Bill read the first time.

REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS BILL.

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

FIRST READING.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.), in moving the first reading of the Bill (No. 107) To amend the law respecting the removal of obstructions in navigable waters by wrecks, said: The Department of Marine and Fisheries is continually receiving complaints of wrecked vessels and other obstructions impeding navigation. It is the practice of many parties to put those wrecks on the banks of rivers and on the coasts, and leave them there, so that they are carried away by high tides and sunk in channels and other places where they become an obstruction to navigation. The Department is often called on to remove these obstructions; and we merely ask by this Bill for power to make the parties blameable for those obstructions, responsible to us for the cost of their removal.

Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. BUNSTER: I would like to ask the Premier, after his great success last night, on the motion respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, whether he will commence its construction in British Columbia this season?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think the hon. gentleman ought to have given notice of his question. However, I may say that the matter is under my serious consideration.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY STATIONS.

QUESTION.

MR. DUMONT enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to construct railway stations in the parishes of St. André, Ste. Hélène and St. Denis, in order to meet the requirements of traffic in those several localities.

MR. LANGEVIN: In the absence of the hon. the Minister of Railways, I may inform the hon. gentleman that the subject is under the consideration of the Government.

COST OF MARINE DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

QUESTION.

MR. HOUDE enquired, What was the expenditure incurred for the publication of the Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the years 1877 and 1878, respectively? What amount of saving, if any, has the Government effected in the publication of the Report for 1879.

MR. POPE (Queen's P.E.I.): The Accountant of the House of Commons reports that the amount of expenditure incurred between the 1st July, 1876, and 30th June, 1877, for publishing the Report of this Department, with the supplements, was \$13,597.82. In that year no list of shipping was published, but the Meteorological Report, and the Lists of Lights were published as supplements to the Report, along with other supplements, and they are now published separate from the Report; the Meteorological Report being charged to the vote for Meteorological purposes, and the List of Lights being now charged to the Department. The amount expended by the Accountant of the House of Commons, from the 1st July, 1877, to 30th June, 1878, was

\$14,639.58. This amount included the Meteorological Report and the List of Ships registered in the Dominion, which was very large, and also the Lists of Lights. None of these are printed in this year's Report as supplements, and the List of Ships is only published every third year. The amount expended from 1st July, 1878, to 30th June, 1879, for our Report, with its supplements, was \$11,614.33, and this did not include the Meteorological Report and the List of Ships, but it included the List of Lights. The Accountant states that he cannot say whether these sums were for the particular Reports and the supplements of these years. He can only say that he expended these amounts for the respective fiscal years for our Report and supplements, but cannot distinguish for what portion of our Reports the amounts were expended. The supplements for our Report for 30th June, 1879, are not yet completed, and therefore the Accountant cannot state what the cost of the Report and Supplements will be; and the amount paid by him up to the present time, on account of our Report cannot either be given at present by the Accountant, as it has not yet been charged in his books.

MANITOBA LAND ALLOTMENTS.

QUESTION.

MR. ROYAL enquired, Is the Government aware that, by virtue of a certain allotment of lands in St. Agathe, County of Provencher, Province of Manitoba, to the Hudson's Bay Company, quite a number of lots have been allotted upon which settlers had made large and valuable improvements; and is it the intention of the Government to deal promptly with this grave question so as to prevent any gross injustice being done?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This matter has been pressed upon the attention of the Government by my hon. friend, and from other sources. The Government are now making enquiries, and will see that prompt justice is done to any person who may have suffered injustice in the matter.

DISMISSAL OF THE ST. ROMUALD POSTMASTER.

QUESTION.

MR. LARUE enquired, For what reasons did the Government dismiss Germain Cantin, Esquire, Postmaster of the

MR. POPE.

Parish of St. Romuald, County of Lévis.

MR. LANGEVIN: On behalf of the hon. the Postmaster-General, I beg to reply to the hon. gentleman that the Postmaster at St. Romuald was dismissed for dereliction of duty, caused by his incapacity.

COMPENSATION TO MRS. GARRETT.

QUESTION.

MR. WALLACE (West York) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in accordance with petitions and documents presented to them, to grant compensation to Mrs. Garrett, widow of the late Thomas Garrett, whose property at Winnipeg was appropriated or destroyed by the insurgents in the rebellion in the North-West, in 1870.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The whole question is a large one and has been long under the consideration of the Government. The case is now before the Courts.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. MUTTART enquired, 1st. Is it the intention of the Government to lower the freight and passenger rates on the Prince Edward Island Railway. 2nd. Is it the intention of the Government to increase the salaries of the superintendent and other employes in connection with said Railway.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: At an early day when passing the estimates for the Island Railway, I will take an opportunity to answer fully the question the hon. gentleman has asked.

CROSS POINT FERRY, N. B.

QUESTION.

MR. HADDOW enquired, Whether it is true that Mr. Quinn's tender for the ferry at Cross Point, Restigouche, was accepted and bonds given in 1878; and if so, why was he refused a license.

MR. BABY: To the first part of the question I can answer affirmatively; to the second part, I would say, the license was refused on his declaring that he did not intend to comply with the conditions of his license.

MR. HADDOW enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to

require the present ferryman at Cross Point, Restigouche, to use a steam ferry-boat for that service.

MR. BABY: He is not required to do so by his license; but in due time the ferryman of the place in question will be required to do so.

TENTH ROYAL REGIMENT, TORONTO
MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. CASEY, in moving for an Order of the House for (1) Copy of Commission to Colonels Durie and Denison, to investigate the affairs of the 10th Royal Regiment, Toronto, in reference to difficulties between its officers; (2) Copy of their report and recommendations; (3) Copy of any order or orders made by Lieut-General Sir E. Selby Smyth, in the premises; (4) Copy of correspondence between T. Rolph, lately an officer in said Regiment, and the Department of Militia, in reference to further investigations; (5) Copy of Commission to Colonel Taylor, and other officers, to make a second investigation; (6) Their report and recommendations; (7) Any subsequent order or orders of the Lieut.-General commanding in the premises, said: I suppose hon. members of the House, at least from Ontario, are aware that great difficulty arose in that regiment between the Colonel Commanding and several of the officers, and that two investigations sprang out of the difficulties. I think it would be in the interest of volunteering generally and the public service, that the facts of the case should be brought out here.

MR. MASSON: I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his motion, for if he did and it was carried by this House, it would be establishing, in my humble opinion a very grave and serious precedent in regard to our dealings with the militia force. Questions similar to this have been brought up in this House before, and every time they have been successfully resisted, it being held that these questions should not be brought before the House. This House is not the proper tribunal to revise decisions of Courts-Martial, or courts of enquiry. I could understand this action being taken if the subject was one of great importance, or if a great grievance was complained of; but it is not of that importance which, at times, induced the English Government to grant such a commission. The hon.

gentleman knows that this is only a matter of discipline, and if any grievance has existed it has been remedied by the tribunals which judge military men in this country, and which proved conclusively that Parliamentary interference was not necessary. I hope the hon. gentleman will not push his motion further. I remember when I sat in this House in 1868, questions similar to this relating to Colonels Dennis and Shaw were brought up, and the Government, in both cases, resisted the motion. The subject was fully discussed, and no less a gentleman than the hon. member for Centre Huron opposed the motion. The argument Sir George Cartier put successfully to the House was as follows:

"Anyone conversant with Parliamentary practice in England must be aware that papers connected with the proceedings of a Court of Enquiry should not be laid before Parliament. Again and again motions similar to that made by the hon. member for Lambton had been made in the English House of Commons and rejected by the Ministry of the day. The mover of the motion had argued that the papers should be laid before the House as a matter of right, but it was abundantly evident from English precedent that the House had no right to receive such papers. The proceedings of a Court of Enquiry were in their very nature confidential, and the proposition that, as a matter of course, they should be laid before Parliament, was too absurd to be established. In this case it was not alleged that any injury had been done to anyone connected with the enquiry, and considering English precedents and the former practice of the House, he regretted to state that the Government could not consent to bring down the papers."

On that the hon. member for Lambton withdrew the motion, and I do not think the hon. gentleman on this occasion can take a better guide than the hon. member for Lambton, the more so that every hope was entertained that the 10th Royals would be soon restored to its former state of efficiency.

MR. CASEY: I confess I had not looked up the precedents bearing upon this matter, not supposing that any difficulty would arise in regard to the bringing down of those papers. I am surprised at the doctrine laid down by the hon. the Minister of Militia that these enquiries are strictly confidential, and not to be discussed in Parliament. If there are precedents for this contention they are bad ones and should be changed. These enquiries do not refer to matters

of discipline alone. In this particular case the enquiry involved a charge of fraud made by certain officers against the colonel of the regiment, and a charge of insubordination and slander against the officers; it involved the question as to whether the colonel had defended the regiment or whether the officers were telling what was untrue and libellous. That is not a question of discipline, but a question affecting the standing and character of the colonel and the officers respectively, and the enquiry into this should not be concluded in a sort of Star Chamber Court. The hon. Minister went further. He said there was no wrong done; but there have been complaints of wrong, and we cannot see whether there is any wrong or not until we have an opportunity of seeing the evidence. The Toronto press ventilated the matter; and a subsequent enquiry, which was granted, appears to have resulted in the reversal of the decision at the first enquiry, for the officers dismissed under the first enquiry have been reinstated. The House has a right to know what is done by these Courts of Enquiry. This is a matter which concerns the civil standing of the persons, not merely their military position. There was an action entered against the *Globe* for having reiterated the charges preferred against the colonel and the latter failed to prove his case. There were heavy damages involved; and this shows that there were matters involved altogether outside of a question of discipline. If my withdrawal of this motion would be construed into an acquiescence of the principle laid down by the hon. Minister, I should not feel justified in withdrawing it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is at liberty to take his own course; but I think he would do well to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend to my left. These motions are always resisted in England, not only in matters of this kind relating to the regular army, but to the militia and volunteer and yeomanry forces, for this reason: that a military force is to be governed by military precedent and discipline; and questions affecting the force should not be dragged into the political arena. In this case nobody complains. The hon. gentleman takes action on his

own motion with a creditable desire to institute an enquiry. In England such motion would not be made. If any person—any soldier or officer—is aggrieved, he has a right to come to the grand inquest of the nation, and lay his petition before Parliament. If any British subject shows that he is entitled to redress, he can get redress; but there is no suggestion of that kind that there is any complaint of a grievance.

MR. CASEY: Yes, there is.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD: There is no petition. We could only know of a grievance by petition. In a matter affecting Col. Shaw, and affecting other persons, the subject was discussed fully. The hon. member for Centre Huron discussed it fully, and by universal consent of the House, it was understood that these matters should not be dragged into Parliament, or into the political arena, unless a person presented a grievance for which he could get no redress except through Parliament. If every soldier, every officer, sergeant, corporal, or private, can rush into the House, through a member, asking for liens by means of a motion, and for whom he has voted, perhaps, why all discipline, all training, all is gone. In this case there is no person complaining. I know something of the circumstances. I have had correspondence about it with gentlemen who felt aggrieved. They, however feel aggrieved no longer. I think the hon. gentleman should take the advice offered him and withdraw the motion.

MR. CASEY: By permission of the House, I rise to say that I consider that the right hon. gentleman has put it too strongly in leading to the supposition that my motion involves a question of politics. It is quite a different sort of matter, and it is not either an interference with discipline. I do not appeal to the House to change anything in the matter. I do not ask a change in the decision of any superior officer, but that publicity may be given to everything done in these Courts of Enquiry; they should not be held in a hole and corner fashion, and it is only on the understanding that I do not acquiesce in the principle laid down that these Courts should be thus privileged from having their proceedings made public, that I will consent to withdraw my motion. If, as the hon. gentleman says, the parties

do not wish a publication of the facts, then, of course, I do not want to press the matter. I have had no communication that they do. I cannot endorse the principle that the House has no right to secure publicity of the proceedings of these Courts of Enquiry, but if my withdrawal of the motion be taken as not denying the right of the House to secure such publicity, I would consent to withdraw.

MR. MASSON: Parliament has no right to interfere with these cases.

MR. CASEY: I do not ask it to interfere.

MR. MASSON: If once this motion were admitted there is an end to all discipline.

MR. CASEY: I cannot withdraw the motion on that understanding. Of course I will not press it to a vote; but it may be called lost.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman ought to withdraw the motion. He says he cannot endorse that Courts of Enquiry cannot have the evidence taken before them laid before Parliament. It is just a thing that should not be done; such evidence ought not to be laid before the House. The proceedings of Courts-Martial may be laid before us, as may those of the Queen's Bench or other courts. But the Court of Enquiry is different; it is semi-confidential in its nature. I will give one instance: We will suppose that one officer is appointed to a particular command over another who is his senior; the latter pleads that he has a right to the command, he being the senior officer; he appeals to Parliament; the Court of Enquiry may have privately and confidentially decided that the officer, on the ground of want of intellectual capacity or military spirit, is unfit for the command. These things are never sent to Parliament. There is no suggestion of a grievance here in this case now brought up by the motion, and the hon. gentleman should withdraw it.

MR. MACKENZIE: I cannot agree with what the hon. gentleman says, as to what determines the publication of documents. What determines the publication of documents, is not the mere question of whether they are of a military nature, or connected with military matters, but whether the Government consider that they are or are not of such a character that

it is advisable not to give publicity to them. I think he cannot lay it down that we have no right to order any papers of this kind to be laid before the House. He cannot, I think, lay down the principle that in England it was invariably the rule not to bring any papers in connection with a Court of Enquiry. I would be disposed, as a general rule, to withdraw a motion upon the strong representation of a Minister that it would injure the public service; but not merely upon the assertion of a principle I did not believe in. Can any of the papers asked for be produced? The right answer to a motion of this kind is, that there are certain papers which, in the public interest, it is not desirable to produce, but that the others would be. It would never do to set a Military Court of Enquiry above Parliament, which is the principle practically laid down by the hon. the Minister of Militia, and, I fear, endorsed, to a great extent, by the hon. the Premier. In this particular case there was a great injustice done. The hon. Minister says, first, there was no injustice done, and, second, that, if any was done, it was remedied. We ought to know something of the proceedings that led to that course.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What object is there in letting the House know it?

MR. MACKENZIE: There is no doubt in the minds of the people that this 10th Regiment got thoroughly demoralised.

MR. MASSON: It is all right now.

MR. MACKENZIE: Such was the popular belief, and great interest was excited by the dismissal of the officers. True, they may have condoned that ill usage; but I do not think it can be called improper for Parliament to enquire into the circumstances.

MR. MCCALLUM: I moved once for the statement of evidence taken at a Court of Enquiry held at Fort Garry, and the Government refused my request, although they had established a precedent on a former occasion, under like circumstances, for granting my motion. Hon. gentlemen will remember a Court of Enquiry was held at Hamilton in regard to the management of the 13th Battalion, the evidence taken being pub-

lished to the world. Yet, when I afterwards moved for the evidence taken in the Court at Fort Erie, I was refused, on the ground that it would not be in the interest of the public to publish it. Some years afterwards I was told if I moved for it, I should get it, but I declined that offer then. If the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) insists on his motion, he will have my vote; because I consider that certain people had great injustice done them by the refusal of the Government to grant the publication of such evidence formerly.

MR. MASSON: The Court of Enquiry sat with open doors, and the evidence was published. The motion is therefore unnecessary.

MR. CASEY: If the hon. Minister will say that the case is of such a nature that he cannot bring down the papers, I will follow the ordinary course, and withdraw the motion, which I could not do on the general principle advanced.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government cannot say that, or make this an exceptional case. We say it is not for the interest of the public to send down any papers on a motion of this kind unless at the instance of a party aggrieved, who states he is aggrieved, and requires them to vindicate his case, and for the remedy of his grievance.

MR. BLAKE: I think there can be no doubt of the supreme and preeminent power of this Parliament to enquire into all matters which affect the public welfare. I cannot agree in the limitations that the First Minister has given as the only limitations on general principles, as the only grounds he will concede for bringing down the papers in this class of cases. That is a very good reason for bringing down the papers in a particular case; but I do not believe that the prerogative of Parliament to enquire into affairs of this description, depends wholly or even chiefly upon only private individual making a complaint to Parliament. Because there may be many reasons why an officer who was very ill-used might not choose to bring forward the subject in the form of a complaint. He might think he would put himself, as an individual, in antagonism to the Government, and the Minister of Militia, and the chief officers of the force, by making such a complaint, while Parliament

might say—we believe for all that, the public apart, that an injustice has been committed, and in the interest of the service at large we are determined to enquire into it. That is the reason why I cannot accept that limitation which the hon. the First Minister has stated as the only circumstance under which it would be proper for Parliament to make an enquiry. At the same time there are strong reasons, perhaps stronger than exist in England, there being greater difficulties arising from the acrimony of politics in our country, against interference with the force, except for gravest causes; and, while I have stated the theoretical powers to be exercised, and the practice to be followed in a just cause, even if no officer interferes, I am disinclined myself, when a Minister makes the statement made in this case, to press for the papers in relation to it. If, as I am informed in this case, a miscarriage of justice did occur, and if it has been rectified, I do not see there is a pressing necessity for bringing the papers to Parliament, merely for the purpose of ascertaining what went wrong; and on that ground I am not indisposed to favour the withholding of the papers. In opposition to the principle laid down by the hon. the First Minister, I think that the circumstance that Parliament asserts its power in a fitting case of apparent wrong, in overlooking the proceedings of the militia authorities, is the very best thing to keep those gentlemen in a proper state of supervision in which they are most likely to do their duty. I can conceive of nothing more likely to make them despotic, whimsical, arbitrary and tyrannical than the statement that their proceedings are secret and sacred, above our power, beyond our ken and not to be touched by us—within the holy of holies, past criticism and discovery. That very statement would lead to abuses.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think the hon. member for West Durham has misunderstood me. I did not, in any way, deny the right of Parliament, to enter into any investigation of this kind. As the Grand Inquest of the nation they have the right to enquire about anything and everything; but I pointed out it was exceedingly inexpedient that that right should be exercised except in the case of

a grievance stated to the House, and application to Parliament for a remedy. In this case, it would be exceedingly inexpedient, when the grievance has been remedied to the satisfaction of the parties, to keep it alive by sending down the papers to Parliament.

MR. CASEY: As the First Minister considers it would be inexpedient to keep alive the difficulty, I withdraw the motion.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

BRITISH COLUMBIA INDIAN LANDS ALLOTMENT.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BARNARD moved for an Address for all correspondence between the Indian Land Reserve Commissioner, or the Government of British Columbia, and the Government, respecting the allotment of lands to Indians, or relating to any disagreement with settlers in respect of Indian Reserve Lands in the District of Yale, with copies of any map or sketch, showing the lands set aside for Indian Reserve purposes in the same district; also, of any Report showing the quantity of land set aside for each Indian, Indian family, camp or Tribe of Indians in the locality above named, with a statement of any lands given or arranged to be given, by Mr. Commissioner Sproat, in exchange for lands held by settlers, and said by the Commissioner to be required for Indian Reserve purposes, with the names of parties with whom such exchanges are made or proposed to be made, and the quantities of land involved in each such exchange; also, a return of the Census taken by the Indian Reserve Commissioner of the Indians living in the various camps in Yale District, as far as ascertained, giving the number belonging to each family, or camp, of each Tribe, and their location, also the number of horses and horned cattle owned by each Indian or camp of Indians; also, copy of any agreement entered into by the Government with the Government of British Columbia, showing the quantity of land to be given to each family, distinguishing agricultural from pastoral land. He said: My reason for asking for this information is that a great deal of ill-feeling exists in my district in reference to the Indian Reserve Lands, owing, in a

great measure, to the secrecy observed in dealing with this question. Previous to 1877, the period at which the Indian Reserve Commissioner was appointed, we had little or no trouble with the Indians, the settlers agreeing with them and working with them in harmony, frequently assisting them with advice, by loan of implements, and in other ways encouraging them in the art of cultivating land. Unfortunately, the Commissioners appointed to discharge this important duty were not fully up to the mark, and did not understand the genius of the people they were dealing with, consequently, important mistakes have occurred, calculated to lead to trouble between the whites and Indians. We take it that, in the settlement of the Indian Reserve, it was intended the Indians should be brought to follow agriculture for a living. With this view it was understood certain sections of land should be allotted to them, not only for agricultural but for pastoral purposes. The Commissioner, however, seemed to think that all he had to do was to give the Indians whatever land he fancied, whether it was the property of the Government, or of actual *bona fide* settlers; and not only was he to receive this land, but certain fishing rights, or streams, should be secured to him, even if these rights could only be obtained by interference with the whites. An instance is on record where a fishing station was located in the centre of a farm, the consequence of which was that the settler could not obtain water for his stock without committing a trespass. In another locality Indians being anxious to secure a piece of land—the property of an actual settler—for root digging purposes, an arrangement was made by the Commissioner whereby the settler was to have 500 acres of public land in exchange for six acres ceded to the Indians, a transaction of a very suspicious nature in the first place, and in the second, one calculated to encourage the Indian in following his old habit of root digging, at the time of year in which he should be seed sowing; the one obtaining food for present purposes only and the other providing for future contingencies. Another instance is given of a settler who had taken up a piece of land, in order to secure fence timber, was deprived of it, so that Indians should have the right

to fish in a stream running through it. These fishing stations are scattered through the country. The fish has little value as an article of food. Securing the fishing station only tends to encourage the Indian in habits of idleness, and seriously retards his civilisation. In this connection I do not refer to the salmon fisheries. These are a fixed industry, and necessary to the sustenance of a number of families, who have not, and do not, seek lands for cultivation, relying entirely on trading with other tribes for dried salmon, a favourite and nutritious article of food. We contend that it is wrong to afford Indians an opportunity of following nomadic habits, instead of encouraging them to engage in agriculture, and to settle on the land allotted to them. This Commissioner has gone further than that; for when he had made up his mind to allot certain quantities of land to Indians, he does not seem to have been particular as to whether the land was the property of the Crown or not. He has undertaken, on several occasions, to interfere with the title of settlers, arrogating to himself the position of a judge, to determine whether the settler shall be deprived of the land or not. Settlers naturally resent this kind of thing. In one case it has amounted to a serious difficulty. A settler, residing in the vicinity of an Indian Reserve, took up a tract of land of 160 acres. Having a partner who owned a piece of land at some distance, he lived with him while he cultivated his land. The Indian Commissioner claimed this land for Indian purposes, because he had not fulfilled the conditions of settlement, and gave the land over to the Indians. The settler applied to his lawyer, who advised him not to permit Indian or Government surveyors to go upon that land, but to resist by force if necessary. When such matters as that are in dispute between Indians and whites, they should be immediately settled; but three years have passed and nothing has been done yet. I hope the right hon. the leader of the Government will give his early attention to this matter. I can do no better than conclude by reading the closing portion of a letter I have received, bearing on Indian affairs:

"I request that you, our member, will use your influence with the Government to procure, at least, an investigation into the matter of the

settlement with the Indians in Nicola Valley, with a view that the same be modified so that injustice may not be done to either whites or Indians."

Mr. MILLS: I think it is desirable that all the papers relating to this subject should be brought down. I do not think the facts will be found precisely as the hon. gentleman has stated them, although he has doubtless stated them as they were represented to him. The hon. the First Minister will remember that the Terms upon which British Columbia entered the Union overlooked entirely the Indian claims to the territories where the Indian rights had not been surrendered. I think it is the only instance in the whole history of British colonisation in North America, where the Government have undertaken to deal with the land without first securing the extinction of the Indian titles. It is my opinion that the terms and conditions of the Union did not, and in law could not take away the rights of the Indians in the soil. Looking at the provisions of the British North America Act, relating to the Indians, and bearing in mind that all terms and conditions of Union to be valid, must be consistent with these terms and conditions; I do not think it is consistent with those provisions that the Governments of Canada and British Columbia should make an agreement between themselves that would entirely ignore the Indian title. That title is protected by the law, and that protection is not abrogated or taken away by the arrangement that was made between the parties. While I was in the Department, I was not disposed to raise the question of the Indian title, if a reasonable settlement could be otherwise obtained on behalf of the Indians. The hon. gentleman must know that before this Commission got to work, the country was on the brink of an Indian war. In British Columbia a Confederation was organized between the Indians of Washington Territory and British Columbia, and it was only the failure of Chief Joseph in his contest with the United States troops that saved us from that calamity. If the hon. gentleman looks into the papers, he will find that, while it was proposed that the Indians should learn the habits of the white people, the amount of land allotted to them was so limited, that it was impos-

sible for them to subsist. The Commission was appointed, with the consent of the Government of British Columbia, to enquire into the matter, to take into consideration the grievances of the Indians, and to make such allotments as was proper. The papers will show that, in many instances, where the Indians have their burying grounds, and in other instances where they had made improvements for themselves, the whites had rented the land from the Indians in order to get possession, and they were no sooner in occupation than they applied to the Government as occupants of public lands, and obtained preemption rights to those lands, thus practising a fraud on the Indians. In some instances these lands have been taken from these parties and restored to the Indians, who had been unfairly deprived of them. My opinion is, that the Commission, which was appointed with the view of settling these disputes, has gone a long way to allay the fear and ill-will in the minds of the Indians in British Columbia, and that the three Commissioners, in the first instance, and Mr. Sproat, up to the time I left office, performed his duties in a very satisfactory manner. I think it is extremely desirable that the Government, after making the Indians dependents and wards, should exercise the utmost vigilance in protecting their rights and preparing them for emancipation, otherwise more serious complications will grow up there. It is perfectly obvious that many who have gone into that country do not regard the Indians as having any rights to the occupation of the lands; and unless the Government stand by the Indians a very small measure of justice is likely to be meted out them.

MR. DECOSMOS: The hon. gentleman has made a charge against the people of British Columbia.

MR. MILLS: I have made no charge. I have simply stated some facts.

MR. DECOSMOS: He said the people who went there had no regard for the rights of the Indian. I will say this: That up to the time of Confederation, we had no trouble with our Indians at all. Occasionally, an Indian depredation was committed, but it was soon suppressed. Our whole cost for the management of Indian affairs was only

from \$500 to \$1,000 per annum; but from the false policy of dealing with the Indians adopted by the late Government, the expenses now amount to \$50,000 a year. After Confederation all the Dominion Government was expected to do under the Terms of Union was to deal as liberally with the Indians as before Confederation. So far as the rights of the Indians are concerned, the entire feeling of all classes in British Columbia has been to give the Indian, no matter when or where, all the land he could utilise, and treat him upon an equality with the white man. It was to the interest of the white settler that that should be done, and it has been done invariably. It is a mistaken policy on the part of the Canadian Government to make Indians a privileged class, in regard to the ownership of land. The Indian should have been taught to earn his living the same as a white man. The manner in which Indians have been dealt with, both on the American side of the international boundary as well as on this side, cannot but be regarded practically as fraud perpetrated in the name of right, if I read rightly the manner in which they were dispossessed of their lands. The Indians were told that they were the original and rightful owners of the lands over which they roamed and hunted, and of the rivers and lakes in which they fished. The whites wanted their land; they knew its great and increasing value; they offered them presents and annuities and reserves, bearing no proportion hardly to its real and prospective value. The Indians were induced to surrender their so-called title, and the white man became the possessor of their inheritance. The white man then boasted of his successful and profitable bargain with the Indian tribes, who were ignorant of the real and future value of the lands they had parted with. The Indians were treated similarly to a child who surrendered a valuable jewel for a showy bauble or toy. The proper way—the just way—ought to have been to ignore the so-called Indian title. The Indian should have been told that the white man had as good a right to share with them in the possession of the lands as they had. That his right to hold all he could use would be respected, but his so-called title to land that he had not made and never could use,

would be disregarded. Had such a policy obtained there would have been no deception and no heavy annual expenditure for Indian annuities. Such had been the policy of British Columbia and it had worked well.

MR. MACKENZIE : I am quite surprised to hear the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, and who was so very zealous of his own rights and the rights of the people of British Columbia, a few nights ago, propound so inhuman a theory regarding Indians.

MR. DECOSMOS : We know them better than you do.

MR. MACKENZIE : I do not think the hon. gentleman knows them as well as I do. I have lived close to Indians for nearly a third of a century, and I know they respect the rights of other people a great deal better than many whites do. If we had pursued the course the hon. gentleman has propounded as the right one, we would have had Indian wars desolating the whole country. I maintain that we have no right to the soil until we arrange with those who inhabited the country originally, and if we have paid too little for the lands that was the fault of the negotiators. I propose to amend the motion by adding the words :

"Also a copy of the memorandum of the Minister of Justice upon which the Lands Act of the British Columbia Legislature was disallowed, and also any correspondence between the Government of Canada, the Commissioner and the Local Government, in reference to the allotment of lands to the Indians."

MR. DECOSMOS : I am not one of those who have any wish, neither have I ever advocated, that Indians should be treated other than as human beings. On the other hand I have no wish, nor do I propose, that Indians should be treated any better than white men. If an Indian wishes to cultivate land, let him have it on the same terms as a white man. With regard to the fisheries, I am opposed to their having privileges which are not accorded to white men.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Of course it is the duty of Parliament and the duty of the Government to protect the original occupants of the soil against new comers. We are having the same experience in British Columbia as we have always had in old Canada. The whole thing is a question of management.

MR. DECOSMOS.

The Indians should be protected, but at the same time the progress of any large section of the country should not be impeded by the enforcement of any philanthropic idea of protecting the Indian even against the attempt to win him from his semi-savage customs. As far as the Commissioner, Mr. Trutch, is concerned, he resigned his office, and his successor has not been appointed. Mr. Trutch is still, however, acting as agent for the people of British Columbia, and the Government expect shortly to receive a report upon the subject.

MR. MILLS : I do not think, if the hon. gentleman looks at the report that the Commissioner has from time to time submitted, that he will find the quantity of lands set apart for Indians is at all extravagant. If the reservation have not been confined to any particular locality, it is simply because it was not possible to find sufficient arable land in one place. There has been no complaint so far, as I know, from any white man in regard to lands to which he was legally entitled, but cases have arisen where the local Government had issued patents to parties who had gone into the centre of an Indian reservation, or upon other lands to which the Indians had claims by long and continuous occupation.

MR. BARNARD : I think the remarks I made were not properly understood. The settlers of British Columbia do not complain of justice being done to the Indian. What we complain of is that great injustice is being done to white settlers, by awarding much larger tracts of land than the Indians can have any use for. It is estimated that as much as 3,000 acres of land has been given to each adult Indian in Nicola Valley, and in Okanagan the land granted is also excessive, according to an estimate made. There are only 400 Indians, men, women and children, say 100 families at eighteen acres of arable land for each family as agreed, making 1,800 acres. Owning 500 head of cattle, and being allowed twenty-two acres per head, they are entitled to 11,000 acres of pasture land, making a grand total of 12,800 acres to which they would be entitled. The quantity agreed to be given them, however, is in the vicinity of 41,000 acres, not in one or two reserves, but taken in sections and

scattered over the entire district. Trouble has been caused by this blundering. We do not desire to do injustice to the Indians. You could not find a single settler that would advocate that. The Indians render valuable assistance, and it is to the interest of the settler to live on the best terms with them, but questions of farming interest to them should be settled; and, therefore, it is that I bring this matter up and urge the Government to attend to it with a view of making a proper settlement of all matters in dispute.

Mr. MILLS suggested the addition of correspondence between this Government and the Commissioners, and between the Government and the Local Government.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to.*

STORMONT, DUNDAS AND GLENGARRY DIVISION COURTS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. BERGIN, in moving for a Return showing number of cases tried in each of the Division Courts in the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, during the years 1877, 1878 and 1879, by the Judge of the said United Counties; also, by the Deputy Judge, and other barristers in the said United Counties, and the amounts, if any, paid by the said Judge to the Deputy Judge and other barristers for the trial of such cases, said: That some of the Division Courts, during the past few years, in these United Counties, presided over in the country districts by young barristers, employed by the Judges, had caused great dissatisfaction, and that it was desirable that there should be some change, so that either the Judge himself should hold these or the Deputy Judge.

Motion *agreed to.*

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE FORCE.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. ROYAL, in moving for a Return of all complaints, reports, documents or papers, relating to the state of discipline, efficiency, conduct and physical condition of the Mounted Police Force in the North-West Territories; the number of posts or forts, the number of men at each post, and the reasons given for the location of the said posts or forts; the number of drill days every week at every post; the nature, the quantity and the con-

dition of arms, saddlery, accoutrements and ammunition in each post, according to the last report; the number of horses at every post; the complaints as to the quantity, the quality and the distribution of supplies and clothing in the various posts; the mode of paying the officers and men, whether in kind or in money, said: The motion was made with a view to place before the House and the country information which would clear up rumours spread against the efficiency of the Mounted Police Force, and their moral standard, and with a view to change the system if these rumours are shown to be well founded. This Force was established seven years ago; it had cost the country an average of about \$300,000, or \$1,000 for each man a year; a total of over two millions of dollars. If the reports in circulation were to be relied on, the Force in Manitoba and other parts of the country was a discredit to Canada. The Force had been originally established for the protection of Indians as well as white men, and to assist in the maintenance of good order and conduct of these territories. One of the principle objects was to prevent the sale of liquors in the North-West. The Force had a double mission, first, for the civilisation of the Indians, and on the other hand for the protection of emigrants going into these territories to settle. The Force, to be efficient, should be beyond all suspicion. Therefore, in view of the rumours in circulation, it was important to bring the matter up so that the Force might be vindicated; but if the result showed that the rumours were true the sooner the character of that Force was changed and placed on a more strict basis, as to discipline, the better for those territories, both for the Indians and the white settlers. According to these rumours there was very little training in the Force, and there appeared to be a very sad state of affairs, both as regarded the men and officers. The facts are very grave, and must be stated with much diffidence and caution, still the truth must be told, and it was very important, in particular, not to spread amongst the Indians the vices of the white men, for instead of advancing civilisation we should retard it. With regard to the supplies, if the rumours were true, the men were suffering badly for want of

good supplies, both food and clothing being delayed, in several cases, as long as six months.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: If all that the hon. gentleman asks by his motion were granted, we should have to bring down a large volume, nay, perhaps, a hundred volumes; for a return is made every morning of the physical condition of the men at each post. I think the hon. gentleman should be satisfied with a much less comprehensive return than that; a general report as to the general efficiency of the Force, I think, will serve his purpose. I may say that, on the whole, I am not quite satisfied with that service; but it is scattered over that immense country, and they cannot attain that degree of discipline as a military or semi-military force collated in larger bodies. This whole subject is receiving the attention of the Government, including the necessity of introducing greater stringency in the training of the Force; and, at this moment, orders are issued for the redistribution of the Force, so as to prevent some of the evils to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. There are no grave complaints against the Force, generally, or any members of it, so far as I know—no specific charges. I have no objection to the motion, in which I understand the hon. gentleman means merely to refer to any general complaint against the Force and not against any individuals of it.

MR. ROYAL: It is not my intention to require more by this motion than is absolutely necessary. There have been no specific charges made against officers or men of the Force. But when French half-breeds come into Manitoba to sell their furs, we hear a great deal about its working and conduct. I believe one great object in connection with it was the establishment of friendship and harmony between the Force and those half-breeds. If a war broke out in the North-West, they could be an important factor in the cause of peace and order. Unfortunately, however, the half-breeds are treated with more than contempt by the Mounted Police, according to reports from most reliable sources, and the two parties are estranged in consequence. The half-breeds are treated by the Force worse than the Indians, and I do not believe that, in case of need, they would rally

round our nucleus of an army. All over the North-West the Force is accused of disgraceful immorality; one of the chief traders, who spent the winter at the forts, reporting an open quarrel between an officer and one of the constables for the possession of a squaw. He reported also that he saw another soldier slap his officer in the face on account of a squaw. This is not the way to civilise the Indians, or promote morality and good order in the country. Such misconduct has produced trouble with a section of the population. I am glad the Government is reorganising or reforming the Force. I have no objection to accept the motion amended as suggested. I want those papers either to clear up the character of the Force or lead to its abolition, with a new system for the maintenance of peace and order in the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to.

CHATHAM, N.B.—CASE OF TIMOTHY SULLIVAN.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. SNOWBALL, in moving for an Order of the House for copies of all papers and correspondence in reference to amount forwarded by the Board of Trade, London, through the Marine Department here, for Timothy Sullivan or James Sullivan, of Chatham, New Brunswick, said: Timothy Sullivan is a very old man, residing at Chatham. His son Frank went to sea and worked himself up to a good position. He eventually joined the St. John ship *Alex. Yeats* as first officer, and sailed in her to the East Indies. His father not hearing from him, and being unable to write, got an acquaintance to commence a correspondence of enquiry which extended over considerable time. He was referred to the Board of Trade, London, and by them informed that his son was taken ill and landed at the Mauritius and died in hospital there. That there was £49 9s. 11d. sterling due him as wages at the time of his death, which sum the father was informed would be forwarded to him through the Marine and Fishery Department here. The money not coming as expected, Tim Sullivan now got his friend to write to Ottawa, and was then informed by the Marine Department that the money had been forwarded to James Sullivan, Chatham

It now transpired that the Board of Trade had mistaken "Tim" for "Jim," and had ordered the money to be paid to James Sullivan, of Chatham. There however, was no James Sullivan in Chatham, but a person of that name in Douglastown getting word of the transaction, probably by intercepting some of the previous letters, managed to get the one containing the draft also, and going with it to the Bank of Montreal at Newcastle, got identified as James Sullivan, drew the money and absconded. Timothy Sullivan and his wife, are both old infirm people, without any family able to assist in their support, and are very much in want of this money. I think it extremely hard they should be deprived of it through no fault of theirs, and trust the hon. Minister will present their case strongly to the Board of Trade, London, and endeavour to get their money for them. The Board of Trade, has, I understand, a large amount of unclaimed money in their possession, got under similar circumstances, and I consider this as a just claim on that fund. Failing in this, I would urge the Government to take this extreme and special case into their consideration, and pay this small sum of \$241, that appears so large to these poor people. The case is so exceptional it could not be construed into a precedent, and could not open a door to future difficulty.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.): The papers asked for can be laid on the Table. The facts of the case are pretty much as the hon. gentleman has represented them. The mistake was made in London, and the Canadian Government is not liable for the amount, which should have gone to Tim Sullivan. We will do our best to procure the amount from the Board of Trade, and pay it to the old man. But, not being liable for it, we have no right to pay it out of the public moneys of the Dominion. The James Sullivan, who got the money, absconded, and has not been heard of since.

Motion agreed to.

TORONTO FIELD BATTERY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. WALLACE (West York), in moving for an Order of the House for a Return of all correspondence between the Inspector of Artillery, at Kingston, and

the Officer commanding the Toronto Field Battery, relative to the issue of nine-pounder M.L.R. Sponges, previous to said corps going into camp last year; also, the proceedings of the Medical Board, and their Report in the case of Gunner Dempster, of the Toronto Field Battery, said: My object in moving for this Return is, in the first place, to call the attention of the Government to the fact which the Returns when brought down will show, that the Officer commanding the Toronto Field Battery has made repeated requisitions and requests to Colonel Irwin, the officer in charge of the stores at Kingston, for these sponges, or he would not be responsible for the lives of the men, and that great risk was incurred by using the old sponges. Colonel Irwin replied that the old ones would do, and refused to furnish the new ones required. The result was, that Gunner Dempster, while in the discharge of his duty, in assisting to reload, had his hand blown off. I think that the Government should enquire into the conduct of Col. Irwin more particularly, and give that personage to understand that he must pay some regard to the lives and safety of the volunteer service. We are bringing men of that class from the old country to control, and in cases, like the present, to injure the Volunteer Force. My next object in bringing the matter up is to call the attention of the Government to the case of Gunner Dempster, and that they will consider it to be their duty to grant him a liberal allowance for the injuries that he has sustained through no error of his own.

MR. MASSON: I do not exactly know the details of this affair, but I do know it is the intention of the Government to indemnify the engineer for the accident that occurred. At present I understand the accident occurred from firing a gun too soon, by a mistake in the word of command.

Motion agreed to.

MAIL SERVICE IN BRUCE.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. GILLIES, in moving for an Order of the House for copies of correspondence relating to the extension of the evening mail service from Walkerton to Paisley, Port Elgin and Southampton, said: During the Sessions of 1876, 1877, and 1878,

various applications were made to me, and petitions were forwarded to be presented to the hon. the Postmaster-General of that time, stating the claims of these villages of Port Elgin, Paisley and Southampton, to have an extension of the evening daily mail service from Walkerton, which place had enjoyed the privilege of an evening mail for several years. The petitions referred to were presented by myself to the Postmaster-General, of that day, who promised that the matter would be looked into. While attending the Session of 1878, I endeavoured to press this matter upon the attention of the hon. Postmaster-General, showing him that the people of that section of the country, especially the business men in these villages, were anxious to have the accommodation of a second daily mail, to which it can be shown they are fairly entitled. These places are all of considerable importance. Paisley and Port Elgin have a population of over 2,000 each, and are centres of business importance. A considerable grain trade is carried on in each of those places, especially Paisley and Port Elgin. Therefore, the business community, in particular, naturally desire to have advantages conferred upon them similar to that of those enjoyed by the town of Walkerton. The village of Southampton also presented her claims, desiring similar privileges. After the elections of 1878, and previous to the resignation of the then Ministry, I received a correspondence from the hon. the Postmaster-General stating that instructions had been given to the Post-office Inspector, in that section, to have papers prepared and to have this service extended from Walkerton to Southampton. During last Session, I made enquiries of the hon. the Postmaster-General as to the cause of delay in carrying out the late Ministry's arrangement in this affair, when I was promised that the matter would be looked into. I also put a question on the Notice Paper in relation to the question at that time, but received no satisfactory answer. This Session I have again renewed my enquiry receiving the old stereotyped reply that the matter was under the consideration of the Government. But nothing has yet been done. I do trust that the hon. Minister will no longer delay in giving the promised ad-

vantages, and thus cease to hold the question in suspense.

Motion agreed to.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

SELECT COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

MR. DECOSMOS moved :

"That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all petitions presented to this House during the present Session, respecting Chinese immigration, who shall report on the same, and generally on Chinese labour and immigration, as affecting the Dominion; with power to send for persons and papers, and to report from time to time; said Committee to consist of Messrs. DeCosmos, Williams, Charlton, Bannerman, Brooks, Trow, Ouimet, Thompson (Carriboo), Connell, McInnes, and Schultz, five of whom to be a quorum."

He said: When I offered this motion appointing a Committee on Chinese immigration last Wednesday the hon. member for Lambton asked that it should stand with a view to its being adopted. There is no time now to adopt it and we can take it up again next Wednesday. If the hon. member will consent to it, I am willing to move it now, and to move the adjournment of the debate, in order that the debate may take place next Wednesday.

MR. MACKENZIE: It was my intention when that motion was made the other day to enter upon the discussion of this question at some length. At this period of the Session it is impossible for the Committee asked for by the hon. gentleman to do any work. If the hon. gentleman chose to call witnesses from China or Japan, it is evident they cannot be here this Session.

MR. ANGLIN: Witnesses coming from British Columbia would be entitled to a considerable amount of travelling expenses and remuneration for loss of time. I would like to understand what the hon. gentleman means to do. He should be restrained within some bounds in this matter.

MR. DECOSMOS: So far as I am concerned, and the other gentlemen named on the Committee, there is no desire to incur any expense, if possible. We have no notion of sending to Japan or China for witnesses, nor even to Texas. I believe there is abundant evidence obtainable even in this House, and already in the possession of this House, upon which a

Committee might frame a Report that will be of value, at a future time, when it may be taken up with a view to legislation.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think there could be no objection to the Committee going on. The hon. gentleman desires simply to have a Committee formed to lay some basis for a future enquiry at another Session.

Motion agreed to.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

NORTH-WEST COLONIZATION LAND COMPANY INCORPORATION BILL.—(BILL 74.)

(Mr. Schultz.)

COMMITTEE POSTPONED.

Order for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill read.

MR. CHARLTON moved:

"That the House do go into Committee of the Whole on the said Bill this day three months."

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: As the amended Bill has not been distributed, I think it desirable that this debate should be adjourned for the purpose of giving hon. gentlemen an opportunity of reconsidering the measure.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read a third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 60) To incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Robertson, *Hamilton*.)

Bill (No. 49) To incorporate the Red River and Assiniboine Bridge Company.—(Mr. White, *Cardwell*.)

Bill (No. 36) To authorise the Corporation of Emerson, in the Province of Manitoba, to construct a free traffic bridge across the Red River at Emerson.—(Mr. Royal.)

CANADA CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 67.]

(Mr. Fitzsimmons.)

THIRD READING.

Bill considered in Committee of the Whole, amended, and reported.

Question put, to concur in the Bill, as amended.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) moved:

That the said Bill, as amended, be not now agreed to, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the Bill by adding the following clause:—"As soon as the said Railway shall be constructed and in running order to the navigable water at the eastern end of Lake Superior, and in the event of any bonus or subsidy having been granted by the Dominion of Canada for the construction of such line, all railways intersecting or connecting with the said Railway, shall be entitled to and shall have running powers over so much of the said Railway as any such bonus or subsidy may at any time have been granted by the Dominion of Canada in respect of, on terms to be determined by the Governor in Council, and in accordance with the provisions of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, 1874."

He said: This addition is substantially the same as I moved in the Railway Committee. The importance of this question to all the western part of Ontario is very great. The Bill as now proposed gives the Kingston and Pembroke, the Ontario and Pacific and the Quebec Government Railways running powers over this Canada Central Extension, but no other roads receive this advantage. Those other roads should have equal rights and powers over the Canada Central. Two years ago, I contended in this House that, by the 14th clause of the Canada Pacific Railway Act of 1874, the roads sought to be excluded had equal rights with the favoured roads, and that the Government had no right to discriminate between the different companies. The present hon. Premier then said that the Government had no right to exclude the Midland and other Railways, as a reference to the *Hansard* of 1878, will show. Any one may see by the Act that the moment the Canada Central obtains a subsidy, other roads become, *ipso facto*, entitled to running powers over it, and that all the Government has to do is determine the terms on which those powers shall be exercised. I think it would be premature for the Government to aid the Canada Central in the extension of its line to Sault Ste. Marie, and that the true interests of Quebec and Ontario are rather centred in the construction of the all-rail line of the Canada Pacific Railway, rather than to connect with the

American railroads. If the object of extending the line to the Sault be the reception and conveyance eastwards of the grain and other freight reaching Thunder Bay from the North-West, a vessel could, with greater advantage for the carriage of freight, continue its journey to one of the ports on the Georgian Bay, securing more water carriage, and a shorter distance to Montreal than if it went all the way by land to the Sault, and thence by rail; in addition, it would be much cheaper. The sole effect of constructing the Railway to the Sault would be an increase of the cost of freight through an increase of the land carriage, without benefit to Quebec or Ontario, because the business would go away north of us. When the American railroad connection is made with our road at the Sault, the most dangerous competition to the Thunder Bay Section of the Canada Pacific Railway will be established. For these reasons I do not think we ought to favour the bonusing of the Canada Central road; and if they get the charter they now ask, it should be with no promise held out or any foundation for the expectation of receiving a bonus from the Government, and only as a private company. But if this charter is granted, running powers ought not to be limited to particular roads. I contend we are entitled to running powers so far as the portion of the Canada Central already or hereafter to be subsidised is concerned.

MR. DAWSON said that vessels might desire to go as far east as possible before discharging cargoes in summer; but navigation closed early at the Sault Ste. Marie. There were 100 miles east of that place which closed early, and by running the road to the Sault there would be two or three months more navigation on Lake Superior from the end of which freight could come down by rail. The road to the Sault would not only secure communication with the North-West, but open up 200 miles of a good agricultural and mineral country, and would receive a great deal of American freight, too, as the Americans were now extending their lines by the south shore of the lake to St. Paul and Duluth. He quite agreed with the views of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) generally, but in this instance must suggest that he

MR. CAMERON.

was somewhat mistaken in reference to the advantages of the proposed Railway.

Motion *negatived* on a division.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) moved to add, at the end of Section 12, the following words:—

“Of which amount five hundred thousand dollars shall be subscribed and ten per centum thereon paid up and deposited to the credit of the Company in one of the Chartered Banks of the Dominion before any of the powers hereby granted to the said Company shall be exercised.”

He said: My object in moving that additional clause is because, as has been explained in Committee, this company has no resources, no capital for the construction of this great work that we are asked to give them powers to build, beyond the equity of redemption, subject to the mortgage, of \$2,500,000 on the existing line. They propose to make this extension a separate undertaking from their present line, while they, under the name of the Lake Superior Section, call the existing road the Ottawa Section. They propose to have separate rolling-stock, separate mortgages, separate bonds, and separate tolls and revenues. It is virtually an independent company we are chartering; and I think we ought to exact that the company should have not only power to subscribe shares, but that they should give evidence of their acting *bona fide* by subscribing half a million, and by paying 10 per cent. upon it.

Amendment *negatived* on a division.

Bill read the *third time* and passed.

REAL ESTATE ENCUMBRANCES REGULATION BILL.—[BILL 11.]

(Mr. Orton.)

THIRD READINGS.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On Section 5.

MR. WELDON: I question whether we have a right to pass that section. This legislature may have a right to deal with usury and interest, but I do not think we have any right to interfere with a contract. If a borrower makes a contract for a number of years I question the right of this Parliament to say that that contract may not be fulfilled, or that its terms may be altered. I think it is

an interference with civil rights. I move that that section be struck out.

Motion *negatived*.

Bill *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

(In the House.)

Bill *reported*.

Mr. ORTON moved:

That the said Bill be not now agreed to, but that it be re-committed to Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the Bill by adding the following Clause:—“If any person, loan society or other corporation stipulates to receive, either directly or indirectly upon any mortgage or other lien on real estate, a greater rate of interest than 8 per centum per annum, or by any other device whatsoever receives an equivalent for such higher rate of interest; or if any person, loan society or other corporation secures by mortgage, judgment *fi fa* or other lien on real estate, the payment of any business debt, note of hand, contract, written or verbal, or any promise whatsoever in which a higher rate than eight per centum per annum forms a part or parcel of such lien on real estate, such person, loan society or other corporation shall forfeit *ipso facto* as a penalty the whole of such interest or equivalent therefor so received, which, if paid, shall be recoverable by suit by the party who has paid the same, and shall further forfeit a sum equal to the principal sum named in such lien, and the said sum so forfeited shall be recoverable by any person suing for the same by suit in any Court of competent jurisdiction, and by distress of the goods and chattels of the defendant.”

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is a very complicated motion. I have never heard it before, and the House should certainly have time to consider its provisions.

Amendment, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

MR. ORTON moved the third reading of the Bill.

MR. WELDON moved:

“That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be read the third time this day six months.”

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): I do not think there is a Bill which has come before Parliament this Session of a more important character than the one now before the House. If the hon. gentleman knew how the Province of Ontario has suffered by the operation of loan companies, and persons lending money, he would not have moved the six months' hoist to this Bill. I refer to a case in point. The Hamilton Provident and

Loan Society loaned to a gentleman in the county of Peterborough, \$1,000, and I received a letter from Mr. Roxburgh, enclosing the statements of the Secretary, which are as follows:—

THE HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.

HAMILTON, Ont., March 4th, 1879.

WM. E. ROXBURGH, Esq.,

Norwood.

DEAR SIR,—

Re A. R. WIGMORE, No. 2069.

The following is a statement of the Society Claim, as at October, 1879:—

Statement.

Fourteen instalments yet to pay of \$131.37 each, the first due Jan., 1880.....	\$1,839 18
Less discount for prepayments.....	736 58
	<hr/>
	\$1,102 60
Add first instalment, due Jan., 1879	\$131 37
Interest on arrears, October, 1879...	11 25
Costs, selling, commission, solicitor, etc.....	210 09
	<hr/>
	\$1,455 31
Property sold for.....	1,400 00
	<hr/>
Amount due the Society.....	\$55 31

Yours truly,

H. D. CAMERON,

Treasurer.

This measure should undoubtedly be allowed to become law, and I am sorry the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) could not get his amendment in, in order that we should have the rate fixed. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has drawn up the Bill carefully, and I am satisfied it would be a great improvement on the existing law. We have heard a great deal about the large numbers of people that are leaving this country, and if this measure is not amended, the exodus will be greatly increased in the future. I trust the six months' hoist will not pass. The following is a statement furnished by the Provident Loan Society of part of the expenses of this loan. This statement bears the seal of the company, which shows it is correct:—

(Copy.)

THE HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.

In account with M. S. PUTNAM,

In re A. R. WIGMORE, No. 2069.

1879.

May 17 To fare and hotel bill to Peterborough	\$5 50
“ “ “ Livery and expenses, two days, to Norwood.....	9 00

May 21	To Fare and return to Hamilton and hotel bill	5 50
" 29	" Fare, Hamilton to Peterborough, and hotel bill . . .	5 50
" "	" Livery and expenses, two days	9 00
" "	" Fare and return to Hamilton and hotel bill	5 50
Mar. 29	" Fare to Peterborough and hotel bill	5 50
" "	" Three days livery and hotel bill	14 00
" "	" Fare and return to Hamilton and hotel bill	5 50
" "	" Thirteen days wages in the above trips at \$3 per day . .	39 00
" "	" Advertising property in the daily and weekly <i>Globe</i> and Peterborough paper, also advertising in circular	15 00
		\$119 00

(Commission \$14 included in the bill.)

Sept. 13 Received payment

M. S. PUTNAM,
Inspector.

MR. SPROULE: I am very sorry that an hon. gentleman should have taken the trouble to move the six months' hoist to such an important Bill as the one under consideration. Since this Bill was introduced, I have received a letter from one of my constituents in reference to the company my hon. friend has just referred to. It stated that the Hamilton Bank and Loan Company lent a gentleman in his neighbourhood \$1,500 two years ago. It was to be paid up in twenty equal annual instalments. The first payment was made, and the second was due last January. Between then and the end of March sometime, without any notice, they issued a distress warrant and seized everything he had in the house, even to a child's cot, and sold on eight days' notice. The man was a comparatively ignorant man and was not aware of the kind of mortgage he had signed, or the amount of interest he was paying. Negotiations were entered into with another company, and this company were asked how much they would take to raise the mortgage. The reply was that they would take \$2,000. It seems strange that they should require an advance of \$500 on the original loan to raise the mortgage after one year's payment had been made. This is an evidence that the company is not carrying on business in a legitimate way, and that they are obtaining money from the borrower by false pretences, because he did not know, in

MR. WHITE.

this instance, the nature of his mortgage. I think a clause ought to be inserted in the Bill compelling these companies to accept their money within a period of three years; and I am of opinion that the evidence we have before us ought to induce us to pass this Bill now. It can, however, only be accepted as a half-measure in the right direction, to be amended, from year to year, as the requirements of the country necessitate.

MR. ROBINSON: A charge was made the other evening, something similar to this, against the Trust and Loan Company, but it was subsequently confessed to be erroneous.

MR. ORTON: The charge never was made, and it was never required to correct it.

MR. ROBINSON: Well, something was said of an extravagant charge made by that company that was afterwards, no doubt, very properly denied. I rose to remark upon what has been said by my hon. friend from Prince Edward, (Mr. McCuaig) in regard to the Western Canadian Loan Society having made a very extravagant charge for interest and other expenses in the purchase of some mortgage. Now, that society, to my own knowledge, is presided over by gentlemen of as high character, ability and standing, as are on the board of any other loan society in this country. I take upon myself to deny the correctness of the statement of my hon. friend. I believe it will be found, on enquiry, that this statement, like some others made regarding these societies, is without any authority except that of someone who borrowed money and was unable to repay it.

MR. MCCUAIG: I am very cautious in making any statement to this House, and the case I refer to is that of David P. Sales, of the county of Prince Edward.

Motion in amendment *negatived.*

MR. OLIVER moved in amendment:

"That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to strike out Clause 5."

Motion in amendment *negatived.*

Bill read the third time and passed.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION LAW AMENDMENT BILL—[BILL 4.]

(Mr. Colby.)

SECOND READING POSTPONED.

Order for second reading read.

MR. COLBY, in moving the second reading of the Petroleum Inspection Bill, said : The Act passed at the last Session regulating the inspection of petroleum, fixed the standard fire test on Canadian oils at 105° Fahrenheit, and the standard fire test on imported oils at 130° Fahrenheit. The present Bill proposes to substitute a uniform fire test of 115° on all oils, whether Canadian or foreign. I introduced this Bill at a very early stage of the Session, but I purposely allowed it to remain on the Orders until now, because, for one reason, it affected a large interest engaged in the production and manufacture of petroleum ; and I felt it to be due to those so interested to have a full opportunity of considering to what extent the proposed change might affect their interests, and of placing their views on this subject before the House : and I am happy to know that they have availed themselves of the services of a very intelligent and active gentleman, who has resided at the capital during the Session, and who has endeavoured to impress their views on the members privately. I permitted it to stand in order, also, that, as it is a matter affecting life and property, I might make no error in judgment. In the meantime, I have spared no reasonable effort to obtain the opinions of men supposed to have a knowledge of the subject—both those interested on one side and the other of the question, and those entirely disinterested—and I desired the members of the House and the Government to fully consider the matter. But I would say further, that the delay has been allowed to take place with the understanding that an ample opportunity should be afforded me to present and to push this measure. The Bill proposes to deal with the fire test only. There are other matters relating to the inspection of these oils, well worthy the attention of the Government, and which fall more immediately within their Province. The first, indeed the paramount, consideration, in regard to the fire test, is that of safety. The numerous heartrending accidents

of which we have had accounts through the newspapers during the past year, and which have resulted from the use of dangerous oils, are something startling. It is of the greatest importance to provide, by law, for the proper inspection of these oils, and to prescribe such tests and regulations as will ensure safety, and prevent the recurrence of those accidents. Nothing is more fraught with danger than dangerous coal-oil. It is an unseen and subtle danger, more to be dreaded than the careless use of gunpowder. We are aware of the presence of gunpowder, but we cannot detect the presence of the inflammable vapours which arise from petroleum, and which are concealed in a lamp in which the oil is partly consumed. The flame of a burning lamp is conveniently near to these explosive vapours, so that, by the carelessness of servants, or children, or by accidents, we are constantly exposed to such conflagrations as unhappily raged across the river here to-day, and too often to the most horrible sufferings and death. We cannot be too careful—to keep in view the question of safety as a paramount consideration—in determining the test to which all petroleum burning oils should be subjected. If by lowering the test I should incur the risk of trenching upon safety, I should most deeply regret it, but I shall endeavour to avoid that ; and my proposition, I think, has avoided it. As every hon. member is probably aware crude petroleum contains gases and volatile liquids giving off, at ordinary temperatures, vapours which are explosive when mixed with air. It also contains heavy oils which injure its burning properties, but are useful as lubricators and paraffine. By proper distillation the volatile constituents, such as gasoline, naphtha and benzine, are eliminated on the one hand, and paraffine, tar, and the heavier ingredients of weak illuminating power, are removed on the other, leaving the intermediate hydro-carbons, freed from their lighter and heavier associations, a good and safe burning oil. By the fire test we ascertain whether the volatile constituents are present in a dangerous degree, and by the gravity test we ascertain whether the heavier ingredients are present in such quantity as to impair the illuminating properties of the oil. A correct fire test and a correct gravity test, properly ap-

plied, will give both a safe and good illuminating oil. In order to ascertain whether an oil be safe or unsafe, different countries have adopted different tests. One is known as the flash or vapour test, and determines at what temperature the oil will emit a vapour which, when mixed with atmospheric air, will ignite and cause an explosion. The other test is known as the burning test, and determines the temperature at which the body of the oil itself will ignite. Oil does not ignite when brought in contact with flame at so low a temperature as that at which explosive vapours are evolved. The difference in temperature between the point at which explosive vapour is emitted, as indicated by the flash test, and that at which the body of the oil ignites, as indicated by the burning test, ranges ordinarily from 20° to 30°. An oil which would stand a flash test of 105° would commonly stand a burning test of 125° to 130°. In Canada we use the flash test, while some of the United States use the flash and others use the burning test. As an explosion is not without danger, even if the oil does not ignite, the flash test indicates danger with more certainty than the burning test. In fixing the test it is important to ascertain the temperature at which oil is ordinarily exposed in lamps, and to prevent, if possible, the sale of any oil which would emit an explosive vapour at that temperature, or at a temperature consequently above it. I have consulted authorities and obtained the opinions of experts on this point. In the last edition of "Appleton's Cyclopaedia" (1877) I find the following:—

"As the temperature of this oil in a burning lamp seldom or never exceeds 100° Fahrenheit, it is obvious that such an oil is perfectly safe, as it would never yield any vapour below 110°, which, by mingling with the air above the oil in the lamp, would form with it an explosive mixture."

The point here fixed is a flash test of 110° as the safety point. I am able to lay before the House another authority entitled to weight. It was found at New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, that oil considered to be safe in New York, when taken to the higher temperature prevailing there, proved unsafe. Exhaustive experiments were made by the Board of Health of New Orleans, under Dr.

White, the President, and the result of the investigation was the enactment of a flash test of 110° Fahrenheit, as the safety point in that latitude. The ordinance prescribed that every vendor of kerosene oil, or other illuminating oil or oils, or any illuminating fluid or fluids, derived wholly or part from coal or petroleum, shall, before actual delivery thereof, attach, or cause to be attached, securely, to the cask or vessel containing the same, a card, label, or tag, upon which shall be printed in plain type, not less than one-eighth of an inch in height, the correct name and brand of such oil or oils, fluid or fluids in such cask or vessel contained; also, the words and figures following: "Inflammable at —° Fahrenheit" (naming the degrees), or "Inflammable at any temperature" (as the case may be); also, the words and figures following: "Explosive, at —°" (naming the degrees), or "Non-Explosive" (as the case may be); also, the words following: "Board of Health Standard Flashing Point, 110°." I find that this ordinance was subsequently approved by a very high authority. I have had placed in my hands by Mr. Young, Chief of the Fire Brigade in this city, a report of the proceedings of a Convention, held in New York, in 1876, of the Chief Engineers of the Fire Department, representing over sixty different cities in the United States and Canada; by which you can see that it was a largely representative body of men specially conversant with such subjects. There were also present a number of underwriters and fire insurance delegates, and others greatly interested in these problems. Among the subjects discussed was that of "Regulating the sale of petroleum." The question was referred to a Sub-Committee which, after giving it the fullest consideration, reported to the Board, and the Board adopted the report, upon which they based the following recommendation:—

"We cordially recommend to the Convention the resolutions adopted by the Board of Health of the City of New Orleans, and would commend to the cities and towns of the country the ordinance regulating the sale of petroleum in said city of New Orleans."

Thus, the conclusions of the New Orleans Board of Health, and the city ordinance establishing a flash test of 110°, were, after a trial of seven years, cordially en-

dorsed and recommended by this highly respectable and intelligent convention of fire engineers, underwriters and fire insurance delegates. I think I have quoted good authorities to prove that a flash test of 110° may be considered safe. Among the many accidents that have startled us in this country, and which have been investigated, I have not been able to find a single instance in which the explosion or accident took place where the oil had stood a test of as high as 100° even. There have been instances where the barrel containing the explosive oil bore the Inspector's mark of 105° and upwards, but the particular sample of oil which exploded, when tested, did not go above 92°. I have yet to learn of an instance of an accident where the oil stood the flash test of 100°; but I am desirous of allowing every reasonable margin for safety. The States of Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire and New York have a burning test of 120°, which is equivalent to a flash test of 100° or less; but my proposition, the House will bear in mind, is a uniform flash test of 115°, which would be equivalent to a burning test of about 140° or 20° above the test adopted by the several States I have mentioned. I find Massachusetts has a burning test of 110°, that is to say 10° lower than the other states which I have named, and 30° lower than the test which my Bill proposes, making allowances for the difference between the flash and burning test. New York city adopted a flash test of 100°, which is 15° lower than my proposition. In the City and State of New York, in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Massachusetts, I think we shall find as much intelligence and good sense, in regard to this subject, as in any part of the United States; and those states have adopted tests far below that which my Bill proposes. Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio and Michigan have adopted higher tests. I think Michigan has gone to the extremely high burning test of 180°. I have information, from a reliable source, that the price of these oils, required to meet these exaggerated tests, averages 10c. per gallon above the ordinary standard oils. In New York the price is 9c., and in Michigan, 19c; that is the penalty paid for such a wild and extreme test. With these data and the

experience of experts and dealers in oils, confirmed by my own observation and experience, I am thoroughly convinced that the flash test of 110°, which would be equivalent to a burning test of 135° or 140° would provide a perfectly safe oil. But in this Bill I have not contented myself with resting within a narrow margin of safety, but have added what my judgment tells me, and the best information shows, will make a perfectly safe test, five degrees more, placing it at 115°, a point at which the oil must be, in all possible circumstances, excepting gross carelessness, a perfectly safe article. It has been urged, recently only, that there should be a distinction between the test to be applied to American and that to Canadian oils. That there is a difference in the comparative safety of the two oils in favour of the Canadian, nothing seems to me more unreasonable or improbable. If any difference exists, it is precisely the reverse. Experiments were recently made in the Inland Revenue Department, and high scientific authorities tend to show that the American oil is, of the two, the safer, where both stand the same flash test. In confirmation of my statement, I will quote a passage from the "Popular Science Monthly," a high authority:

"Dr. White, President of the New Orleans Board of Health, found that, on adding to oil which 'flashed' at 113° F., one per cent. of naphtha, the mixture flashed at 103°; with two per cent. at 92°; with five per cent. at 83°." (Report on Petroleum to New York Board of Health. Dr. C. F. Chandler, 1871.) Dr. Chandler says: "The addition of one per cent. of naphtha will lower the flashing test 10° in a good oil, when it would not materially affect the burning point. A quantity of naphtha, gasoline or benzine, quite insufficient to affect the burning test or the inflammability of the body of the oil, would make a very appreciable difference in the flash test."

If then there be more naphtha in American oil than in Canadian the flash test instantly detects it, and the difference between the point at which it will so flash, and the point at which the oil will ignite, must therefore be greater in American than in Canadian of the same flash test. A long series of experiments has been made to determine the difference between the relative flashing and burning points of American and Canadian oils. It has been shown to be two degrees in favour of American oil. So, the proposition that there shall be any discrimination against

American oil, based on considerations of safety, is to my mind entirely without foundation in science or good sense. Whatever the test may be, it should be uniform.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in thinking there is naphtha in the Canadian oil.

MR. COLBY: There is naphtha. I have it on high authority.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. COLBY: Yes, and benzine; but there is little or no gasoline. Those elements are all inflammable and give out an explosive gas. The question of safety is not the only—although it is the most important—consideration in determining the test of an oil. It is an established fact that, after you pass a certain degree or test, you impair the illuminating qualities of the oil. After you have removed the lighter constituents of the oil, so as to bring it above 115° or 120° you reduce the illuminating power, leaving a larger proportion of paraffine. So the effect of having a test higher than is necessary for safety, is to give an inferior illuminating oil. Dr. Baker Edwards, than whom there is no higher authority on this subject, says: "I consider 120° too high a standard to ensure an equably burning oil, especially in the winter season." He fully approves of the 115° test, and gives the weight of his authority to my proposal, saying if you go above 115° you impair, in a corresponding degree, the illuminating qualities of the oil. It then becomes a heavier oil; it follows up the wick less readily; it chars the wick, heats the burner and smokes the chimney. I called on Mr. Shaw, a large dealer in Canadian and American oils in Sparks street, and he assured me that the present test prevents him from obtaining the ordinary astral oil, of 150° burning test, which is one of the best grades in the market, and compels him to pay 3c. a gallon more for oil that would stand 175° burning test. He also says that this higher priced oil, is inferior to the other as an illuminating oil, and so does Pratt the producer; and yet he is compelled to pay that much more for it by the very remarkable legislation of last year. I have also the opinion of an experienced oil dealer in Montreal, a

MR. COLBY.

man entirely disinterested, who writes me as follows:—

"The proper fixed point should be 115° flash test. This would ensure perfect safety and a good illuminating power. After it passes that point its illuminating power becomes affected in ordinary lamps, and when it reaches and passes 120° its power is decidedly impaired. For imported oils, I can see no reason whatever for placing the fire test one degree higher than the test for Canadian oil. Dangerous oil will be effectually barred out at 115° degrees Canadian flash test.

"I have had oils brought from many different refineries in both Canada and the United States, and have always critically watched my oils, testing and examining them personally, and in a free and open market I would prefer an oil at 115°, and would consider doubtfully an oil at 120°, and decidedly object to an oil at 125°, and very much dislike some of the oils imported now at 130° for ordinary lamps. Another point to consider is the fact that the high test oils are costing, to-day, in the United States, three to five cents per wine gallon more than a really safe and good oil, and have done so for years past. This would be an increased tax upon the consumer without any benefit to the revenue of our own country, and with a loss instead of gain in the quality of the oil to the consumer. I consider oils safe enough at 110°, but 115° would place them beyond the effects of any carelessness or differences in testing; and considering the question from all the points I am acquainted with, 115° flash test would hit the happy mean."

This is the uniform testimony of all whom I have consulted on this subject. It is very certain that we are obliged to pay very much more for the high test oil—from 6c. to 10c. a gallon more—than for ordinary standard oils used under tests adopted in the New England States and New York. I received only last evening, from one of the largest dealers in oil in my county, the information that the operation of this act had obliged them to pay fully 9c. a gallon more for oil not worth one cent more than the old oil—he might have said not worth as much. I will give the prices to the House of the different kinds of oils in New York on the 13th April, 1880:

"Oil, for shipment, about 108° test, barrels included, in lots of 5,000 to 10,000 barrels, 7½c. to 7¾c. per wine gallon. Forty-five gravity oil, 135° to 140°, 14¾c. per wine gallon. One hundred and fifty to one hundred and sixty degrees, say Pratt's or Devae's, 16c. to 17c., barrels included."

The standard oils are manufactured in large quantities under most favorable conditions; and are brought, by competition, to the lowest remunerative price; but special oils, manufactured to supply a

limited demand, command a special and excessive price not at all commensurate with the actual cost of raising the oil to the higher test. In the section of country in which I live, we have had, in consequence of the legislation of last year, to pay a much higher price for petroleum than ever before, and the consequence is that a great deal has been smuggled. I would call the attention of the House to the history of legislation upon this subject. The first test that we prescribed was in 1868, when we adopted the very test I propose now, that is, 115°. That was afterwards reduced, in 1871, to 105° at the instance of the very gentlemen who are now asking us to change it to 120° or 130°. After having led us to adopt the 105° test for eight years, they have suddenly changed all their views upon the subject, and have been inspired, in some way, with a new illumination. Now I am sure they do not care how high they get it, because, like all persons engaged in trade, they wish to make as much money out of their business as they can. I can quite understand why these gentlemen, after having brought it from 115° to 105°, and kept it there for eight years, now take this sudden tack and endeavour to bring it up beyond 115° to 120°. It is because they would then have to compete with an oil higher in price, and inferior in quality to that which would be brought into competition with them under a lower test. If they must have competition, they prefer it in the form of a high-priced and poor article, rather than a low-priced and good article. I have reason to believe that the legislation of last Session was wholly inspired by them. It came before the Government at a time when it could not receive that consideration which its importance deserved, and their opinions were accepted as those of experts. It was supposed they knew more about this matter than any one else, and their representations were received by the Government and the House without suspicion. The consequence has been that we have had legislation during, the past year, of which I, as a member of this Parliament, am totally ashamed. To declare a difference of twenty-five degrees in the fire test of American and Canadian oil when,

as a matter of fact, there is no difference whatever, is a position which I am not very proud to have been one in taking. If the result of this legislation had been to give us a better oil, there might have been some compensation; but I appeal to every member of this House if he has ever known, in Canada, such a great number of accidents from explosions, as have taken place during the past year. With regard to the other qualities of the oil, I have no doubt the experience of my county is like that of the country generally. I have in my mind the case of a merchant who tried in December last to buy in the ordinary market American oil that would stand our fire test, and not being able to find it, he introduced Canadian oil as a substitute. He obtained the best quality he could find in Montreal. He purchased it by the carload, and arranged with several retail dealers to take a barrel each and to assist him in introducing it. Every barrel, every gallon, came back upon him, and he was obliged to gather it in and send it into the back country and exchange it for oats. People would not buy it, it was so offensive in its character. It only stood the test of 96°, although it bore the standard mark of 105° and upwards. It was an ill-burning oil, had an offensive odour, charred the wick and smoked the chimney, and people who had been accustomed to and wanted a better oil would not buy it at any price. You may lead a horse to the water, but you cannot make him drink. The fact is legislation cannot compel the people on the frontier to do what is against their interest and pleasure in this matter. They say this: We are quite prepared to pay a high duty on oil; but if the Government prohibit it by the adoption of an impracticable test, and leave people no alternative but to smuggle American oil, or use such offensive Canadian oil as has been sent to us, they may expect that people will smuggle. And that course has been taken. I do not believe the legislation of last Session—while it has injured the consumer, while it has caused more annoyance than any other measure that was passed—has been of any benefit to those gentlemen who inspired it. The oil has come into the country surreptitiously; it has been found impossible to keep it out. I think—and my Free-trade friends will applaud me here—that

if those who are engaged in refining oil in Ontario, instead of seeking a factitious and unreasonable protection, under the guise of a fire test, were to endeavour to compete with the American oil in the quality of their own production under the very high protection which the Tariff gives, they would succeed better. They have to day a protection on their oil of 6c. a gallon, when oil is worth in New York only 7½c. They have a protection of nearly 100 per cent. If that is not enough, and if this House is willing to give them more, let them come to this House and ask it straight. But this disguised protection, which compels us to pay a higher price for an inferior article, is a double injury to us. It is far better that we should pay an additional 4c. a gallon as a direct protection, and have the privilege of buying the best illuminating oil wherever we choose, than to be compelled to pay 4c. a gallon more for an inferior oil as we now do. This is precisely the condition of affairs that I—in the interest of a large body of consumers in the Lower Provinces and along our extended frontier, who prefer to use American oil until our Canadian producers give us something better—an endeavouring to rectify. But it affects all those who consume Canadian oil as well. Do Canadian oil refiners give their customers a better article than they did last year, because there happened to be legislation that suited them? I have yet to learn that they do. Do they give it to them at a lower price? I have that also to learn that they do. I believe that the injustice of the present discriminating test bears just as heavily upon the consumers of Canadian as of American oil. Now, I would not willingly or wantonly add one straw's weight to the difficulties under which those gentlemen in Petrolia are labouring; I believe they are having a hard time of it, and we ought not to disregard the claims they have upon the consideration of the country. They are pumping oil out of wells that yield them but two to four barrels per day, in competition with American wells that yield 40 barrels per day. Our refiners are obliged to use a crude oil that costs \$1.12 a barrel, as against the American refiner who buys at 75c. or 80c. a barrel, while the American crude yields a larger percentage of illuminating oil than does the Canadian. I have a firm belief that

MR. COLBY.

Canadian crude oil is susceptible of making just as good an illuminating oil as the American crude, and would do so but for the greed of the refiner who takes 50 per cent. of illuminating oil out of the crude oil when he should take but 40 per cent. The 10 per cent. so improperly taken consists largely of paraffine and other constituents, which impairs the illuminating quality. If the Canadian refiner would take 10 per cent less of refined oil from his crude, and charge 5c. a gallon more for it, he would find hundreds of purchasers among people who will not buy his oil now at any price. Canadian oil is a more lasting oil, and people would buy it in preference to American oil, if it was equal in its illuminating properties and somewhat free from offensive odour. They would have the advantage of nearly 20 per cent. in durability. Considering the difficulties which beset them, I certainly do not wish to state the case unfairly against them or in anyway do them an injustice. But the hon. members of this House, mostly, represent the consumers of oil. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie), in whose constituency most of the oil is produced, the hon. member for Middlesex, and the hon. member for London, and one or two other hon. gentlemen, are the only gentleman who represent the producers. We are told the Canadian refiners cannot live under the present protective duty of 6c. per gallon. I am very sorry they cannot live under it. I am sorry the wells are so poor; but if the industry cannot live, if we have to be taxed excessively, in order to keep them alive, the question has to be considered: is it better the industry should be supported and bolstered up by oppressive taxation upon all the people of the country, or that it should rest for a time until the unprecedented flow of American oil wells shall have been exhausted.

MR. ANGLIN: This is treason against the "N.P."

MR. COLBY: It is not treason against the "N.P." I am sorry my hon. friend has made that remark, because it compels me to speak a little longer in explanation of my views. I know many other persons have made the same remark. They have said, Mr. Colby takes an anomalous position in advocating Protection and being a Free-trader in respect to oil. Well, this

is not the first time I have bored this House upon the oil question. I have bored here for oil before now, and struck it once or twice. We protectionists believe that competition regulates prices, no matter whether it be foreign or domestic competition. We do not propose to give protection to any article where the element of competition will not come in, sooner or later, and regulate the price and bring it down to a fair point. That is our general belief. That is applicable to most of the industries of this country; to the manufacture of agricultural implements, for instance, where a man can go to the forest and get his timber and buy his own iron and steel in the open market. But this oil industry is about the only industry in the Dominion that is susceptible of being brought under the control of rings and monopolists. We know that such is the case; we know that rings, at one time, controlled the entire source of production in Lambton, controlled all the refineries in London, and dominated the market all over Canada. In that way this competition, which ordinarily reduces prices, cannot be depended upon in respect to oil, because the moment it falls within the scope of a ring there ceases to be the possibility of domestic competition. The only competition then that can be depended upon to regulate the price is foreign competition. What I want to see is that that foreign competition is not placed under too great a disability. I would take the liberty of suggesting to the hon. Minister, that I do not believe any of these accidents and explosions have been the result of the fire test. I believe they have been owing to some defect in the inspection of the oil, which should be more thorough. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to another thing. The act as it is now reads almost relieves vendor and refiner from responsibility. I think the man who refines the oil, and knows its constituents, should be responsible to the public. He should verify the test of the Inspector, so that when it goes out of his refinery it goes out with his endorsement, and he should be responsible for the consequences. I think, in these particulars, this Act requires amendment. I would say, that it is very important that the gravity of the oil should be readily determined, so that the purchaser should not be compelled to

buy a lubricating oil, when they require an oil that will burn. The wording of the clause, in relation to the gravity test, should be simplified so that every one could understand it. It should define the gravity by pounds and ounces, so that every man who has scales can weigh it. At present it is defined by the number of degrees of Baumé; and but few persons understand the signification of the terms, or have the proper instrument. I would also suggest the appointment of a special officer to oversee the Inspectors of Oil, and see that they do their work properly, and who should move about from place to place, dropping in upon refiners and vendors unawares, and confiscating such oil, foreign or domestic, as did not stand the legal test.

MR. FLYNN: I was pleased to see the hon. member for Stanstead, early in the Session, introduce the Bill now about being read a second time. He very correctly states that the present law is one that we ought to be ashamed of. I was aware this Act was introduced last Session, but I had no idea that any discrimination was made between the fire test of American oil and that of Canadian oil. In the Maritime Provinces this law is felt as a great injustice. The hon. member for Stanstead has correctly stated that the present Act is a virtual exclusion of American oil from the Maritime Provinces and other parts of the Dominion. Still, I believe that a large quantity of oil was smuggled into the country, because the people will use American oil. We have always found that the American oil is less offensive in its smell, and that it is more free from explosive qualities. It is very desirable that we should have a uniform test for American and Canadian oils. I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to the fact that there is another discrimination made between American and Canadian oils which should not be made. For instance, the cost of inspection of a 50-gallon cask of Canadian oil is only 10 cents, while the cost of inspecting a similar cask of American oil is 30 cents, or a difference of 20 cents. I do not see why the law in this respect should remain on the Statute-book any more than the legislation in regard to the test referred to, and I hope the hon. the Minister of Inland

Revenue will see his way clear to making the inspection fee equal upon both oils.

MR. MACMILLAN: I coincide with the desire of the hon. member for Stanstead that the fire test of oil should be placed at a point which would prevent the calamities which have taken place for years past, so as to avoid a repetition of such accidents in the future. One can scarcely pick up a newspaper without finding in it a report of some shocking accident by an explosion of coal oil. Even to-day, I took up a paper and found an account of a disastrous fire which was caused by an explosion of coal oil. It is as follows:--

"A coal oil lamp exploded in the residence of Mrs. Cole, school-teacher, Weedon, P.Q., setting fire to her three children and burning them frightfully. Mrs. Cole was also badly burned in trying to extinguish the flames."

And again, last month, we read of a distressing accident which was published in all the papers:

"Kleinsburg, Ont.—About 8 o'clock last night, as Mrs. Archy McTaggart was returning from putting her children to bed, the lamp which she was carrying exploded, and the burning oil flowing over her clothes set fire to them, burning her in a frightful manner. She lingered in agony until this morning when she died."

Such a state of things should not exist in this country; and when I hear an hon. member ask the House to reduce the fire test on oil, I tremble for the consequences. With reference to the explosive character of the two oils, it is well known that, in regard to Canadian oil, there is much less chance of its exploding at the same fire test than of American oil. My hon. friend has quoted from many American journals, with reference to the fire test used in the respective states. Take, for instance, the States of Michigan and Ohio. There they ought to know much better than we do what the proper test should be, for the simple reason that they have much more experience in regard to it than we have. I find the fire test of these states, and also a number of others to be considerably more than that of Canada on Canadian oil. The Inspector of Petroleum, at Cleveland, Ohio, which is the great oil market of the United States, in his report for the year 1878, says:

"The standard test for all illuminating oils in Ohio is 120° Fahrenheit's thermometer, and all illuminating oils that will not bear a flash

test of 120° cannot be legally sold in this state for illuminating purposes."

Now, Sir, with regard to the statement of my hon. friend, when he says that there should be no difference between the flash test of Canadian and American oil, I will read what Professor Keadzie and other members of the Michigan State Board of Health say on the subject. This body gave the subject of petroleum the most minute investigation, and I avail myself of their experience in reference to the difference between high and low test oils, as to the cause and the results of accidents, as contained in the report of the Secretary of the State Board, which says:

"Under all such circumstances, when, by the breaking of a lamp, or otherwise, a quantity of illuminating oil is exposed to a flame, the chances of possible control are very much in proportion, inversely, to the volatility of the oil; for when oil that is volatile at a low temperature is so exposed, the entire surrounding atmosphere becomes almost instantly impregnated with its vapour, which, as soon as a flame comes in contact with any part of it, becomes a continuous sheet of flame, completely enveloping persons or surrounding objects, and, therefore, entirely beyond any control, which can immediately be brought to bear upon it. Under such circumstances, loss of life and property is imminent. With less volatile oil, under an equal accession of heat, there is less pressure of vapour, and if the mass of oil is exposed by the breaking of a lamp, or otherwise, a longer time elapses before the oil is converted into vapour. Under such circumstances, the element of time makes all the difference between certain death and destruction of property, and possible escape with life and property."

Now we claim that Canadian oil is less volatile than American oil, and consequently not so dangerous. American oil has 20 per cent. of gasolene, benzine, benzole, and naphtha in its component parts, while Canadian oil has only 5 per cent. of benzine in the crude oil, just as it comes from the ground, and no gasolene or other explosive substances in it whatsoever. Gasoline is more volatile than benzine, and, therefore, American oil is more volatile than Canadian oil, and will explode with more violence at the same temperature than Canadian oil, and consequently do more damage. The higher the temperature of the oil is, the more violent the explosion. American oil being more volatile than Canadian oil will throw off a greater body of vapour at the same temperature than

Canadian oil, and consequently do more damage, and would be sure to set fire to the oil, whereas Canadian oil, at the same temperature, would not throw off such a large body of combustible vapour, and would either not explode to all, or, if it did, would not have force enough to set fire to the oil. It takes ten degrees more temperature to heat up Canadian oil to a point at which it will throw off an equal amount of explosive vapour as American oil; and, therefore, in fixing the fire test of illuminating oil in this country, to do justice to the Canadian manufacturer, there should be ten degrees of difference fixed between the flash test of Canadian and American oil, if there is any less difference than that made, you legislate in favour of the American refiner and against the Canadian oil interest. Now, the lowest point at which we consider Canadian oil safe, is 115° flash test by Fahrenheit's thermometer, therefore, the test on American oil should be 125° and no less. My hon. and learned friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) says that a high fire test impairs the burning qualities of the oil, and the public who prefer to burn American oil, while they are obliged to pay a higher price for it, are compelled to use an inferior article in consequence of this high fire test. In relation to that matter, I will read what the same authority I quoted before, says, on that point:

"The lighting qualities of some of the oils lately sold in this state have not been good. Some people have pretended to believe that it was because of the high fire test required by law. Those who understand the facts know that this is not true."

And then he goes on to point out the reasons why some oils do not give as good light as others, and recommends more care in keeping the lamps clean, and in the selection of burners and wicks, and winds up with paraffine, and I will read you what he says on that head:

"The presence of a superabundance of paraffine has much to do in reducing the illuminating power of the oil in which it is contained by gumming or charring up the wick, and thereby preventing a sufficient supply of oil to the wick to produce combustion."

Now, Sir, it is well known that the longer the oil is distilled the more paraffine will be in the refined oil. The cause of the burning qualities not being

good is the presence of paraffine in the refined oil, because the refiner has taken too much refined oil out of the crude, the heavy vapour containing the paraffine being the last to come off the still, and in order to get up the fire test, the refiner blows the lighter and more explosive particles out of the oil, leaving the paraffine or heavy oil, and consequently the percentage of paraffine or heavy oil becomes too great and impairs the illuminating qualities of the oil by gumming the wick. You can have a good burning illuminating oil of any fire test you like, by proper care being taken in the manufacture of it. The Legislatures of a number of states in the American Union, having a population of over 15,000,000 inhabitants, have fixed a flash test, which is much more severe than a fire test, on their own oil of 120°. In the State of New York the test is 110°, and I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to what took place there a few days ago. The newspaper of the district, where this accident occurred, says:

"One of the most remarkable tragedies that has occurred in this section of the state for many years took place at Norwich, Chenango County, N. Y., early last Saturday morning. Mrs. Mary E. Griffing, a wealthy widow, and cousin of Senator Conkling, was found upon the floor of the hall in her mansion horribly burned. When picked up she was unconscious, and died in about an hour. On Friday night, Mrs. Griffing, her mother, and Miss Conkling retired at 9 o'clock. The widow slept alone in a spacious chamber on the second floor. It was her custom to leave a lamp burning by her bedside. This morning about 4:30 o'clock Miss Conkling was aroused by a strange noise, and a few moments later the household was awakened by the agonising screams of Mrs. Griffing. The oil from the exploded lamp had saturated the pillow which supported the head of the victim while she was asleep. Grasping the other pillow with rare presence of mind she attempted to smother the flames. Failing in this, she sprang from the bed and rushed into the hall, where she was found as above described. She was burned beyond recognition."

In consequence of such accidents as these, the Americans themselves have raised the fire test on their own oil, and why should not we do likewise. I cannot imagine why the people in the Lower Provinces have such a prejudice against our Canadian oil. We burn it altogether in Ontario, and find it to give great satisfaction, it burns so long, and is so cheap. The best oil is now selling in London for

8c. a gallon without the barrels, and 11c. per gallon, barrels included. I have an instance here of how much longer Canadian oil, of the same strength, will burn than American oil. Messrs. C. S. Shaw and Company, of this city, who keep both American and Canadian oil for sale, tested the burning qualities of both oils in lamps in their store for eight consecutive nights, using one pint of each kind of oil each night, and they found that the gallon of Canadian oil had burned one-fifth longer than the American oil, or, in other words, had given thirty-five hours more light, the American gallon of oil having burned out in 110 hours, and the Canadian oil having lasted for 145 hours; and yet, in the face of all this, my hon. friend from Stanstead is trying to make it easier to import American oil to be used in this country, and to come into competition with our Canadian oil. It is to my mind most desirable that we should give our Canadian oil encouragement as far as possible. My idea was, when the National Policy passed, that we should protect our industries as long as we did not protect them to death, as one hon. gentleman has said. If through misfortune the hon. gentleman's constituents get hold of bad oil, certainly something should be done to have the inspection so fixed that a better oil would be secured, to compel people, in fact, to prepare a better oil, or see that the inferior oil is destroyed. We are desirous to have as good oil as possible, and we can have as good oil as American oil by taking a less quantity out of the crude oil. I would suggest that an Inspector be appointed by the Government, and give him absolute authority to go through the country, and wherever he finds any oil not up to the proper fire-test, that he should destroy it. That would enable us to get a first-class oil, and put us in a position not to have to go across the border to get it from a foreign country. With reference to a coal oil ring, which has been referred to, it was true that a ring did exist in the West among the refiners; but that is past. It is impossible to renew anything of the kind now; because the only way to establish the ring was through the instrumentality of the books they had to open up for the Inland Revenue. These books were

sworn to by the refiner and verified by the Inland Revenue officer, and were open to the inspection of the refiners, and they could tell exactly how many gallons were made. No Excise duty is charged now, and any combination of that kind could not exist; they could deceive each other if they chose, and the consequence is no ring has been established since the Excise duty was taken off the oil. It could not be now done with any degree of success. I feel very strongly in favour of having the fire test increased upon Canadian oil, and decreased upon American oil, that is that the test on Canadian oil be increased from 105° to 115°, and that it be decreased on American oil from 130° to 125°. In this way we will succeed in getting a good safe oil, either by importation from the United States or from Canadian manufacture; and if that regulation is established, my hon. friend will have no cause to grumble. Mr. Charles A. Ashburner, Assistant State Geologist for Pennsylvania, in an interesting lecture which he delivered some weeks ago at the Franklyn Institute in Philadelphia, said: that from actual records kept in the Department, over 30,000 human lives and \$20,000,000 worth of property have been destroyed during the last ten years by the use of badly refined burning oils. If we can defend ourselves against this, and in the way I suggest, I think we should use every exertion to do so, and appoint an Inspector to go through the country as I have suggested, and see that proper and safe illuminating oil is manufactured or imported and sold throughout the Dominion.

MR. CASEY: I am sure the House will agree that great credit is due to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), for bringing up this matter this year. He has applied himself, on several occasions, to this coal oil question. I cannot absolve the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue from all blame for letting the existing provision of the law go through. It is not expected that he, himself, should know all about coal oil; but he has experts in the Department, and he should know that there ought not to be any discrimination, or he should have had the subject argued.

MR. BABY: It was argued.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Well, there was a little discussion on it, but not very much.

Mr. CASEY: I think the hon. Minister should have seen that there was just ground for this discrimination before introducing it. In reference to the test, the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) has tried to show that American oil is much more explosive than Canadian. I think it is likely that a sample of American oil, taken at random, will explode at a lower temperature than average Canadian oil. It is, however, absurd to say that of two samples which stand the same flash test, one will explode at one point and the other at another, as that test shows the temperature at which explosion takes place. A gentleman who has been for some time in the city, as the representative of the oil producer, has given me a memorandum on the subject for use in this discussion, the pertinent part of which I will lay before the House. He says:

"Mr. Colby says that there should be a uniform fire-test on both Canadian and American oils. This is unjust to the Canadian manufacturers. Canadian oil is a less volatile oil than American oil, and has no gasolene in it, and only a small proportion of benzine, which is not so volatile or explosive as gasolene. American crude oil contains 20 per cent. of gasolene. If you take an American oil and Canadian oil, which will both burn upon the application of flame, at a given temperature of say 130° Fahrenheit, the American oil will throw off a vapour which will explode at 10° lower temperature than the Canadian oil. The vapour from oil explodes before the oil will burn; therefore, there should be 10° difference in the flash-test to put both oils on an equal footing."

The hon. gentleman to whom I have referred argues that a uniform test on both kinds of oil is unjust, because the American oil, even if no more explosive than Canadian, is more liable to burn, and so set fire to the house after it has exploded. I argued with him that those figures upset his case, and I think so still. They show that, of two specimens of oil, American and Canadian, that will both burn at the same temperature, the American will flash at 10° lower than the other, there is then 10° greater difference between the exploding and burning points of American oil than between the exploding and burning points of Canadian oil. Therefore, we can only conclude the lighter—or American—oil will not burn at quite so low a temperature as the

heavier, if they both explode at the same point. I am informed that a series of experiments have been made in this city by a Government officer, which establishes the same thing. I think, then, we may conclude that, if we ascertain positively that the American oil, which we allow to be imported, will not explode at any lower point than the Canadian, there is no danger of its taking fire at any lower point. The explosion of a lamp which scatters the oil into fine fragments, may cause it to burn at a lower figure than if the flame were applied to it in an open saucer; and the same results might not flow from explosions as tests made in the usual way, but the relations of the two oils would remain the same, although the figures at which explosions took place might be different. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) has referred to several accidents which had occurred with American oil under a burning test of 115°, to show that American oil generally was unsafe. Now, it would be a very low grade of oil that would burn at 115°—not such as would be admitted by the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), which required a flash test of 115° since there were 20° or 40° between the flashing and burning points. We know that oil that will explode at 105° is reasonably safe; it is not an oil that frequently explodes. We know also that in Canada—though no oil is supposed to go out under that figure—oil frequently explodes. It follows, therefore, that the explosions in Maine, even if their law required a flash test of 115°, may have been due to some such error in testing, or to carelessness on the part of officers or dealers as has occurred in connection with explosions in Canada. As to the matter of trouble and expense, as I am informed, the fire test is raised by blowing air through the oil, which carries away the volatile elements. There is some expense in the process, and loss from the removal or dispersion of those particles to raise the oil to a higher test. There is a difference of 8½c. between the lowest and highest of these oils, whose prices were quoted by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan), consequently the higher test involves the production of a more costly oil. I think that an oil bearing a burning test of 130° or 150°, or some-

thing between 130 ° and 150 ° would, probably, be the sort of oil that would be admitted by the 115 ° flash test. There would be a difference of 1½c. to 2c. between those two oils—the sort now admitted, and that which the Bill proposed would admit—in the cost price, caused by the difference in the flashing point. This is quite a serious difference, if it can be shown that the lower of these two oils is safe. But the hon. member for Stanstead has shown that the difference is greater, because a special grade has to be manufactured at an extra cost. This was an unnecessary tax on the people of Canada, because they dare not buy ordinary Canadian oil, and had to buy the American, the cost of which is artificially increased by the present law. I think, then, there is no necessity for discrimination as to the flash test between Canadian and American oils. If there was a burning test, there would need to be a discrimination of 10 °, according to the figures of my informant. It will be incumbent on the advocates of the present discrimination to show grounds for it, in public opinion, which they have failed to do. The member for East Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) says the Canadian oil burns more slowly. That does not show it is safer. It is, however, better value for its cost. That is a considerable protection for the Canadian dealer, as every consumer wishes to economise in the consumption of oil. I think the late Government gave a great boon to the country in abolishing the Excise on this oil, and breaking up the coal oil ring. I shall have great pleasure in supporting the Bill of the member for Stanstead, and I hope the Minister of Inland Revenue will consider the suggestion of both the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this measure (Mr. Colby and Mr. Macmillan), and of my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Flynn), in regard to the inspection and seizure of bad oils and kindred matters.

MR. LONGLEY: Nothing connected with the Tariff has produced so much dissatisfaction in the Lower Provinces as the raising of the standard of American oil. This was done through the agency of a Bill passed during the last hours of the last Session; which seems not to have attracted the attention of anyone outside of the promoters thereof. In truth it was scarcely open, straightfor-

ward legislation, which thus, practically, secured to the Ontario refiners double protection. We do not much object to the duty of 6c. per gallon on American oil, though we may think it a pretty steep protection on an article worth only from eight to ten cents per gallon at the place of production; but when an attempt was made to give a double protection to the Canadian article by making a distinction of twenty-five degrees between the standard of American and Canadian oils, it need be no matter of surprise that the people of the Lower Provinces should protest against such an imposition. The Bill which we are now considering proposes a uniform standard for Canadian and American illuminating oils; and proposes to fix the standard at 115 ° Fahrenheit's thermometer. This standard will be generally accepted as fair and right, and will be attended with satisfaction. It is matter for general regret that, up to the present time the Canadian refiners have not succeeded in producing a really good and pure article of illuminating oil, equal to the American article, and the result has been that a great preference has been shown for the American oil. The Canadian refiners seem confident that they can bring their oil up to a standard equal to that of the American oil, and it is to be hoped that they will do so; for it is not very creditable to Canadian enterprise that their products should not more favourably compare with those of their neighbours across the border. For these and other reasons which might be urged, I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead.

MR. KILLAM: I think I owe an explanation to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) for asking him what he expected his Bill was going to accomplish. I was afraid the Government, whose avowed policy is to tax certain industries for the benefit of others, and who pushed this oil legislation through the House last year in some mysterious manner, might allow it to slip by this year without taking any action upon it, and that the Bill of the hon. member for Stanstead might be found among the slaughtered innocents. I am sure we are all obliged to the hon. gentleman for the manner in which he has explained this matter to the House. I do not profess to have any

technical knowledge of the oil business. I know a great deal of dissatisfaction existed last year in relation to this matter, and I presume the Government intends to allow this Bill to pass, as they have expressed no opinion in opposition. If we are to have, for the next three years, to submit to the infliction of a Protectionist Government, it would be fitting that when the hon. member for Stanstead next has to make explanations on a Government Bill he should be provided with a position, which he is quite qualified to occupy, on the Treasury Benches.

MR. PLUMB: It is always pleasant to hear a speech from the hon. member for Stanstead. Everyone knows he brings to the discussion of any subject which he takes up in this House a remarkable degree of research. I am afraid, however, that my hon. friend who has taken up as a specialty the question of duties on petroleum, in this House, has allowed his enthusiasm and his zeal to outrun that calm judicial spirit with which he usually approaches those subjects. He might have explained that there is a vast and important difference between American and Canadian oil in their crude state, and in the conditions under which they are found in the depths of the earth. Canadian oil is reached at a depth of 500 feet below the surface, and is very much unlike the product of that of Pennsylvania wells, different in colour, quality and component parts. The crude oil of Canada is brown in colour and possesses a very small quantity of gasoline, or naphtha or benzole, and but say five per cent. of benzine. The latter is the only explosive substance it contains. The crude oil of Pennsylvania, which is dark green in colour, is found at a depth of 1,500 or 2,000 feet. Pressure is supposed to alter the character of the crude material, if it is the same in origin, which is not certain. It contains about 20 per cent. of four volatile and explosive products, gasoline, naphtha, benzine, and benzole, which are always present in greater or less relative proportions in American oil. These are not entirely dispelled by distillation. They are the dangerous elements in oil, and I think it would be hazardous to the people at large not to extend to them that protection, in requiring close inspection, and a fire-test which will ensure absolute safety, which experi-

ence has proved to be desirable; and in this it is well to try experiments, and far better to err on the side of requiring too much than too little. It is impossible for the ordinary consumer, who buys from the retail shops this article of prime necessity, to ascertain with accuracy whether it is of the proper fire test, and, consequently, whether it is explosive or not. It is well-known, also, that in the poorer houses inferior glass lamps are used, which are constantly carried about, thus enhancing the risk of breakage, and the danger of explosion is increased in proportion to the vicinity of the lamps to the overheated stoves which are found in most houses in winter. There is a constantly increasing heat in the lamp chimney while the oil is burning, the volatile elements are given out in increasing quantities, the surroundings are charged with them, and the least cause may precipitate a fatal explosion. If the fire test is a low one, there is a larger quantity of volatile material constantly escaping. It is the greatest and most culpable possible error for us blindly to deal with a question of the kind proposed; and when we have what we consider a safe standard, it is most hazardous to reduce that standard. On the part of Canadian refiners, it is proposed to raise the fire test of their oil from its present point of 105° to 120° Fahrenheit. That will compel the manufacture of a superior quality, and much of the objection now urged against Canadian oil will be obviated. I am not at all afraid that, by keeping up the standard of American oil and raising that of ours, American oil will be excluded from the Dominion, but it will place the Canadian refiner under the necessity of preparing a purer and more deodorised fluid. His material is, in many respects, superior to the American, and especially its rich illuminating power and lasting qualities. Canadian oil should be protected in the way which is indicated by the refiners themselves. It will thus compel all of them to produce a satisfactory quality, the additional cost of which is too trifling to warrant an increase of price to the consumer. If there is an increase, it will be owing to the retail dealers, and it should be understood that the present price of crude oil is but \$1.25 a barrel at the Canadian wells, and that the best refined is selling at wholesale or by the barrel at

11½c. to 12c. a gallon. There has doubtless been a strong prejudice raised against Canadian oil. People have been led to believe that there was a difficulty in preparing Canadian oil for the market and making it equal to Pennsylvania oil. We have reason to know that Canadian oil can be rendered entirely free from odour, perfectly colourless, quite inexplosive and still retain a higher and richer illuminating power than its Pennsylvania rival. I believe my hon. friend from Stanstead has candidly acknowledged that it is much richer in illuminating power than that of Pennsylvania. If that is the case, it is desirable that Canadian oil should find its way into full favour in the Canadian market. There is a well-known process by which the volatile and dangerous properties are expelled at a small expense. It adds but a trifle, as I have stated, to the expense to raise the fire test, and at the standard proposed there can be no possibility of impairing the illuminating power. I think the hon. member for Stanstead was a little mistaken when he said that it would add nine or ten cents a gallon to the American oil to have it just where it is. I think we should be cautious before we proceed in the direction which is likely to cause such serious disaster to our country as the sort of legislation which the hon. member for Stanstead has invoked. I much doubt, if the proposed measure is adopted, that it will produce satisfactory results. I do not think there will be any harm in trying to do for the manufacturers and producers of coal oil in Ontario, what we have done for my hon. friend's (Mr. Longley) Province in placing a tax on American, for the benefit of Nova Scotia, coal which, so far as it may be a burden, falls most largely upon the people of Ontario. I think it would be simply a very small reciprocity. The tax on wheat and flour was claimed to be such a reciprocal concession, but it is urged by our hon. friends opposite that there can be no additional charge imposed upon the hon. gentleman's constituents, and the people of the Maritime Provinces, through the duty upon wheat and flour, and the farmers are assured that they cannot benefit by it to the extent of a penny, because the English market rules the price. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has dealt with the

subject in his accustomed manner. He has drawn a fearful picture of the dangers attendant upon the use of American oil, even at the high fire test of 180° required by the laws of some of the Western States. A frightful accident, occasioned by breaking a lamp, somewhere in Wisconsin was his theme, but it turns out that the accident did not occur in that State or any other having a high fire test, but in a New England State where the test is comparatively low. His excellent conclusions, therefore, fail for want of premises. I trust the proposition, which is suggested on behalf of the Canadian refiners, will meet with the consideration of this House, rather than that urged by my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby). The Canadian oil at a fire test of 120°, I believe to be safer than the American oil at 130°. The Canadian oil is considered safe at 105°, the refiners are willing to raise that test, and I desire that the test shall be raised, because I wish to compel all the refiners to come up to the proposed standard, and produce an oil which will be acceptable to the public. We possess in the oil producing region of Enniskillen and Dawn, in Lambton County, a mine of riches of untold and practically inexhaustible value. It can be further developed by receiving proper care from the Government, without compelling the public to pay an additional price for its useful and almost indispensable product, which is one of the most important resources of the country. I think the proposition I have advocated will be acceptable to the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, and will be in the right direction both for the producer and the consumer, whose interests seem to be identical. I beg to say again, Mr. Speaker, that I trust the House will not accept the proposition which has been made by my hon. friend from Stanstead, but will agree with me in thinking the matter should be left largely to the discretion of the Government who are fully acquainted with this subject, and upon whom the responsibility of dealing with a matter in which human life is at stake, and who have full opportunity and means of testing the question at issue, should be permitted to remain.

MR. MACDONALD (Kings, P. E. I.): So far as the Province from which I come is concerned, I may say that merchants

never yet succeeded in bringing Canadian oil on the market equal to, or that was to be compared with, oil from the United States. Under these circumstances I for one shall have great pleasure in supporting the Bill brought in by the hon. member for Stanstead. While we are quite willing to afford any reasonable protection to the oil producers of this country, I think they should be prepared to put oil on the market that will compare favourably with the oil from the United States. When we find that we can get as good oil from Canada as from the United States we shall be prepared to give due credit for it. In the meantime the people of the Maritime Provinces are united on the question, and wish to have the test the same on American as on Canadian oil. It is easily seen that the legislation of last year is generally admitted to have been a failure. I believe it would be advisable to put the test on both oils at 115°.

MR. BABY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following Motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Order of House—Return showing the number of actions of seduction tried in the Courts of the different Provinces composing the Dominion during the past six years; stating the number in each year, namely, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878 and 1879.—(Mr. Furrow.)

Order of the House—Copies of all petitions, correspondence and documents which have passed between the Department of the Interior and Mrs. Maria Wood, wife of Melville Burke Wood, of Winnipeg, a clerk in the Land Office there, or her solicitors, and the said Melville Burke Wood, in reference to the claim of the said Mrs. Maria Wood, for the maintenance and support of herself and child.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 22nd April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROMISSORY NOTES DUTIES ACT EXTENSION BILL.

(Mr. Baby.)

FIRST READING.

Resolution considered in Committee and reported.

MR. BABY introduced a Bill (No. 108) For extending the Consolidated Act of 1879 respecting duties imposed on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange to the whole Dominion.

Bill read the first time.

QUEBEC TIDAL DOCK COMPLETION BILL.

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed Resolutions respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

(In the Committee.)

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: This is a proposition to advance to the Harbour Commission of Quebec \$250,000 in addition to the sums authorised by the Act 34 Vict., cap. 62. It appears that, in 1875, contracts were entered into by the Commissioners for the completion of the work of improving the harbour and the construction of a tidal dock. It was found that \$250,000 would be required more than the amount authorised under this Act, and it was understood at the time that this authority would be asked for by the Government when the sum was required. It is now applied for, for the purpose of completing the contracts entered into and approved at that time by the then Minister of Public Works.

MR. MACKENZIE: Has the hon. gentleman received any communication from the Commissioners to the Government on the subject.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: What is the position of the Trust at present? I think Quebec has had already, in advance, three-quarters of a million.

MR. LANGEVIN: More than that. There was a vote of \$1,200,000, by law, \$750,000 of which was to redeem an equal amount of old debentures. Besides, there was a vote of \$500,000 for a graving dock under the control of the Commissioners. They pay 5 per cent.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: So there will be a total charge of nearly \$2,000,000. What are the revenues?

MR. LANGEVIN: The revenues have increased, but they expect that when this work, under contract, is finished, and the additional work, the wet basin, is complete, they will have a large revenue from these docks, but till then they can-

not load and unload easily, on account of the high tides; but if they make a wet dock they will be able to load and unload at all times.

MR. MACKENZIE: What are the revenues now received?

MR. LANGEVIN: I do not recollect at present the revenues now received. I may read, however, for the information of the hon. the leader of the Opposition a letter written on the 16th April, 1877, signed by the Secretary of the Department, and addressed to the hon. Mr. Chauveau, Senior:

"SIR—I am desired by the hon. the Minister of Public Works to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th inst. in which you call the attention of the Government to the tenders recently received for the Harbour Works at Quebec, pointing out that the lowest tender which you propose to accept is over \$600,000, while the money at your disposal amounts to \$470,000, and also stating that the Harbour Commission will in consequence require an additional loan of \$250,000 for the completion of the contract, upon which additional sum you express the belief of the Commission that the revenue will suffice to meet the interest as well as the interest on the previous loans.

"I am directed to inform you that, as it appears that the means available in the Commissioners' hands are more than enough for the works this year, it does not seem necessary, at present, to ask Parliament to assent to the additional guarantee. But, looking at the statement of accounts accompanying your letter, which shows that there is sufficient revenue to meet the interest upon the additional sum required, I am directed to say the Government will, during the next Session, ask the assent of Parliament to guarantee the additional sum necessary.

"You will thus be enabled to proceed at once with the execution of the works, according to the plans, estimates, and tenders which have been submitted.

"I have, etc.,
(Signed) "F. BRAUN,
"Secretary."

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

MR. LANGEVIN said there was a discussion between the two Boards about the dues on ships going to or from Montreal, and not loaded or unloaded at Quebec. It was considered unjust to pay dues there, as if the vessels were loaded or unloaded at Quebec; and now it is only on vessels loaded or unloaded there that the dues are charged, or if they are only loaded or unloaded there in part a proportion only of the dues are charged, but there is not the slightest difficulty between the two Boards.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

MR. LANGEVIN.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 109) To authorise the raising of a further sum to enable the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to complete their tidal dock.

Bill read the first time.

MRS. JOHN YOUNG ANNUITY BILL.

(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed Resolution to make provision for a life annuity to the widow of the late Hon. John Young, in consideration of his services as Chairman and member of the Corporation of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal during more than nine years.

(In the Committee.)

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Resolution is full, so that I need not occupy the time of the House by expatiating upon its subject. All know the services of the late Mr. Young for the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and indeed for the promotion of the development of the country, generally. The Montreal Harbour Commissioners adopted a Resolution, setting aside a thirty years' bond, giving the interest on \$10,000 at six per cent., for the support of his family. That was beyond their power as mere Trustees for the Harbour. The Government, however, have considered it well, to a certain extent, to carry out the views of the Harbour Commissioners, and therefore, have decided to ask the House to adopt this Resolution.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is there any salary attached to the position of Chairman of the Harbour Commissioners?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Mr. Young received a salary as Chairman for some time before his death. But, for the nine years mentioned in the Resolution, he considered himself a wealthy man, and preferred to act gratuitously.

MR. MACKENZIE: Under the Act of 1874, they were allowed to give a certain sum to the Chairman, as was the Quebec Trust by the Act of 1875, not more than \$2,000.

Resolution ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolution reported.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced a Bill (No. 110) To enable the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to pay a life annuity to the widow of the late Hon. John Young.

Bill read the first time.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—

[BILL No. 70.]

(Mr. Masson.)

THIRD READING.

Order for third reading read.

MR. MASSON: I would request the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) not to press the amendment he spoke of when the House was in Committee. The Government are quite alive to the importance of adopting means to secure the easy and prompt discharge of members of the Volunteer Force who, by their general behaviour, have rendered themselves obnoxious to the Force. But we shall have to consider very carefully whether that power should be left to the Commanding Officer. It would be a grave thing to give that power to one single man. Although our officers are generally reliable, and actuated by the best motives, circumstances might occur to cause them to be carried away by feeling and act too severely. The Government will carefully consider the matter, and probably propose an amendment in this direction next Session, and therefore, I hope the hon. gentleman will let the subject rest until that time.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): I do not object to this Bill as a whole, but I think the Government is making a mistake in introducing Clause 4, which provides for the opening of canteens in connection with Regimental Camps. By the Army Regulations, canteens are established in connection with the army to provide for the exclusive use and convenience of the troops, to provide for the supply of beer, wine and other articles for the time being. I think we should make a mistake if we placed, within easy reach of our young men on the Force, the facilities for purchasing and using intoxicating liquors which the Bill provides. It is difficult enough to maintain the discipline necessary to keep the Force under proper control when intoxicating liquors are removed as far from the camp as possible; and it is usual to place the camp at some distance from

the business and active part of the town, to keep those temptations as far away as possible, as well as for other reasons. Facilities for the purchase of those liquors would likely be attended with demoralising effects to the Force. I must protest against any arrangement whereby, within easy reach and access of the Volunteers, any facilities would be provided for the sale of liquors. I am aware that the sale of liquors within the camps is expected to prevent Volunteers from straying to distant places for liquor, but I think the tendency of furnishing even a moderate supply at the camps would be to dispose the men to go to excess, by which the discipline of the Force would be broken down, and injurious personal habits formed. If we are going to keep our Volunteer Force up to that degree of respectability, influence and moral power desirable, we must not, in any way, diminish the popularity of the Force in the estimation of those who are to maintain it. I am aware that, in many parts of the country, particularly in the Province of Ontario, it is held to be a great strain upon the wholesome restraint on young men to join the Force under present circumstances, but if this additional temptation is placed in their way, I think the strain will be greater, and the dangers which I have already pointed out will be considerably increased. Besides, I would call the attention of my hon. friend the President of the Council to the fact that the sale of intoxicating liquors in Ontario, as well as in the other Provinces, is under Provincial jurisdiction; and I think this House has no power to authorise the sale of liquor of any kind upon any camp ground, inasmuch as such sale is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. I feel convinced that any person entering a complaint against the officers of volunteer companies for the sale of liquor on camping grounds, would be entitled to recover against them, and that these officers would be liable to be fined in the same way as anyone else who sells liquor without a license.

MR. MACKENZIE: We might have to fine the hon. the Minister of Militia.

MR. ROSS: If he opened a canteen in a camp ground in the Province of Ontario, I think he would have some

difficulty in escaping the law. I call his attention to this matter because no doubt he knows that no liquors can be sold in the Province of Ontario without a license, and I believe the authority of this Bill would not be construed as a license within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature. I hope the hon. gentleman will consent to the withdrawal of this Clause, and I believe he will be doing himself credit if he does consent, and will be conferring a favour upon the Force. I move that the said Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by striking out the 4th Clause.

MR. MASSON: I need not say that I entirely sympathise with the efforts made by the hon. gentleman, and others who agree with him, to promote the cause of temperance in this country. It is exactly because I think it necessary to help the hon. gentleman, and those who act with him, in the course they have adopted, that this Bill has been introduced by the Government. I can tell the hon. gentleman—if I may be allowed to refer to what has occurred in another place—that this Bill has received the unanimous approval of all the temperance gentlemen in the other branch of the Legislature, because they understand that by this Bill you will curtail the use of spirituous liquors by our Volunteer Force. If the hon. gentleman will look at the clause against which he is contending, he will see that in any locality, where the Temperance Act is in force, it will not be allowable for an officer to establish a canteen in camp, but in localities where the Temperance Act is not in force, where spirituous liquors can be sold, the Government thought it conducive to the morality of the Force to have the canteens under the control of the officers, instead of allowing the members of the Force to go to taverns and other places of that kind.

MR. MACKENZIE: Won't they do both?

MR. MASSON: They will not have any inducement to go to taverns if, in the camp itself, they have the means necessary—for after all there must be some liberty allowed on this score to obtain these stimulants. I may state that it is the intention of the De-

partment to make very stringent rules in regard to this matter, and that nothing stronger than beer will be allowed in the camps. I submit to the House whether it would not be conducive to the morals of the whole Force to allow them to have beer in the camps, instead of going into taverns and indulging in brandy, whiskey and gin. I think the hon. gentleman should not press the motion in amendment.

MR. PLUMB: The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) never loses an opportunity to improve an occasion of this kind, and I may say that he never in any case, so far as I remember, was—if I may be allowed to use the expression—more *blatant* than he has been just now. If he had read the Bill he would have seen what was pointed out by the President of the Council, namely, that the liquor laws now in force would not be superseded by the provisions of the Bill, but he was anxious to show his ardent desire to catch a temperance vote, and he therefore endeavoured to help his cause by reckless statements; but it is clear that he never read the Bill through.

MR. ROSS: I read it through long ago.

MR. PLUMB: The hon. gentleman now hears that the Government have placed proper restrictions upon canteens, but one would imagine, to hear the hon. gentleman's objections, that he was in the interest of the booths and liquor shops outside the camp, because he does not desire that there should be any other provision made, and that the men should be allowed to go where they please for that which they cannot be prevented from obtaining, instead of the officers of the camp being authorised to control the sale of liquor which it is impossible to prevent. He knows perfectly well that the young men who join the Volunteer Force are young men of the highest respectability, young men who are to be perfectly trusted, and yet he objects to the salutary measure proposed to be adopted. I was surprised at the hon. member for West Middlesex pressing an amendment to this Bill, merely for the purpose, for it was evident that that was his only idea, of making a temperance harangue to the House.

MR. ROSS: You need it.

MR. PLUMB: The hon. gentleman

MR. ROSS.

will find it better to leave this matter in the form assumed by the Government. He will see, to use a common expression, that he was barking up the wrong tree; and I fancy that this House will not permit any such interference with the measure proposed—an interference which, I think, would be entirely in the wrong direction, and an interference which would show that the gentleman who has for a long time taken the initiative in the general temperance movement—a movement with which no one sympathises more than I do, if it was properly directed, has failed entirely, because his course is narrow and proscriptive, and because he does not understand the feeling and temper of the country.

MR. SCRIVER: It is strange that no member of this House can rise to express his views on any subject without exposing himself to the imputation, by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, of having acted from some unworthy personal motive. I think the hon. gentleman might, in charity, have supposed that the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross)—known as he is for the active and consistent interest which he has taken for many years past in promoting the cause of total abstinence—might view with suspicion and alarm the movement which is proposed to be made by the Militia Department in this matter. At the risk of subjecting myself to the imputation, from the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), of acting from some unworthy motive, I will state that I sympathise with the views of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). I regret exceedingly that the Department of Militia has been induced to adopt such a course. I believe, in my heart, that it has not originated from the commanders of the Force throughout the country, but has been suggested at head-quarters by those who know very little of the peculiar temptations to which our young men are subjected. I know that this proposal does not meet with the approval of the commanding officers in that part of the country in which I reside, and that they would much prefer that matters should remain as they are. The hon. member for West Middlesex has very rightly said that the battalions are generally encamped at a distance from any place where these

temptations are likely to be found, and I think it would be very unfortunate if the facilities were increased for the volunteers when in camp to obtain—even as the hon. the President of the Council says—beer, which, though comparatively unobjectionable, is still an intoxicating liquor. There is no doubt that the granting of these facilities would be against the views of the parents of many of these young men. I did not understand the hon. the President of the Council to meet the point raised by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), as to the legality of establishing these places. It is true, as he says, that the Bill provides that this power should not be given where the Temperance Act prevails; but in places where that Act is not in existence, a license is required to sell even beer, and I cannot see that we have the power in this House to give the military authorities, forming camps in any part of the Dominion, power to sell liquor without infringing on the Local Act. I would like to know how that difficulty is to be met. In any case I protest strongly against the passage of any such law as this. I regard it as not calculated to promote those habits of morality which we desire to see prevail among the young men who constitute the bulk of our Volunteer Force.

MR. MASSON: I would rather give my opinion on a point of discipline connected with the Force than on a matter of Constitutional Law, but it does appear to me that if we could pass the Temperance Act, to which the hon. gentleman has referred, we must also have the power to pass a measure of this kind.

MR. MACDOUGALL: I hope the late Minister of Militia will find it consistent with his duty to act upon the suggestion which has been made, and withdraw this clause from his Bill. I have very great doubts that the Scott Temperance Act will bring about all the good results it is expected to achieve. I am opposed on principle to coercive legislation, in regard to the habits of the people, as to what they shall eat and drink; but it is pretty well known that the moral sentiment of a very large portion of the people of this country is in favour of discouraging by all legal and proper means the too common indulgence in intoxicating liquors. The Scott Temperance Act is now in force in some localities, and

may soon be extended to many more. The highest legal tribunal in this country has declared that it is within our competence and that this Parliament has jurisdiction over the subject matter, because it relates to trade and commerce; therefore, I apprehend there can be no question as to the constitutionality of a provision of this kind in the Militia Law, for that subject is also within our jurisdiction. There can be no doubt as to the power of Parliament to deal with this subject, but what is the necessity for this legislation? Colonel—now General—Wolsley, in his report on the expedition to the Red River, points out clearly the great benefit which he believed was experienced by the troops under his control—both the regulars and the volunteers—in being deprived of all intoxicating liquors. He declares that they were more efficient, that they were in better health, and that the *morale* of the force was much improved by total abstinence from strong drink, and he recommended that a similar rule should be adopted in other parts of the Queen's Dominion. It appears from the accounts we have had of atrocities committed by the troops in South Africa, they must be attributed to over indulgence in intoxicating liquors. What harm, Mr. Speaker, can there be in requiring the Militia Forces, when assembled under the law for the purpose of drill, to abstain from the use of intoxicating liquors? It is true that you cannot prevent them from procuring beer or whiskey when out of camp, and off duty, or from indulging in other vices, but do you prevent this in any way by stimulating their appetites with strong beer while in camp? You only, in fact, keep alive that appetite, and induce them to go elsewhere for stronger drinks. I do not see that any beneficial result can flow from this provision as to canteens, and while we have a Temperance Act on the Statute-book, I do not think it can be justified. Seeing that the Government in the other House are carrying through amending provisions to make that Act more effective—we presume with the concurrence of their colleagues in this House—seeing that they have recognised the utility of that Act, and that the highest legal tribunal in the Dominion has recognised and affirmed its constitutionality, we can only regret the appear-

ance of a section in the Militia Bill which practically repeals *pro tanto* the general law. Our Militia Force must be maintained; we do not know how soon we may have to use it; but, while we are endeavouring to make it efficient, we ought to look at the testimony of men who have regarded this question from the practical military point of view. I believe that testimony is that the supply of intoxicating liquors of any kind to troops in the field, in hot countries or in cold countries, is an evil and not a benefit. I hope the President of the Council will allow this clause to drop.

MR. LONGLEY: I also, for one, hope the hon. the President of the Council will consent to withdraw this clause. I think it is against the sentiment of the people of this Dominion, and, perhaps, against the sentiment of the best portion of them. Are we to assume that the men upon whom we are chiefly to rely for defence, in case of invasion, cannot get along without intoxicating liquors? All history proves that men are infinitely better soldiers without than with intoxicating drinks, and that nothing so demoralises men, when they are assembled together for drill, or for the defence of the country, as the use of intoxicating drinks of any sort. It is contended that it were better to have these liquors sold under the control of the military authorities, than to have them sold without these restraints. My education, in regard to this question, is exactly the reverse of that assumption. The mischief all comes in consequence of the recognition given by the law to this infamous traffic. If intoxicating drinks must be sold it were better, in the judgment of temperance men, that they should be sold without the sanction of law than with it. I think in connection with the Volunteer Force, all over the Dominion, any excesses which may have taken place are almost entirely attributable to the use of intoxicating liquors on the ground. I do not think it is fair to assume that, because provision is made in this Bill that the liquor shall be sold under the control of the military authorities, the influence will be any better than if the liquor was sold in some other way. In the name of reason let the law be against and not in favour of the recognition of this traffic. Let us try the experiment of drilling our volunteers.

without the use of intoxicating liquors. It destroys their morals and unfits them for the duties of the hour and those which might lie ahead of them. I do hope that, in view of the public sentiment of the country, this clause will not be urged. I might offer an additional reason. From the recent decision of the Supreme Court, it is assumed by some that the License Laws of the different Provinces are abrogated, that the Scott Act, and it alone, will be in force as it is brought into operation in the various Provinces. Under the License Law of Nova Scotia it seems to me the authorities could not be permitted to sell intoxicating liquors in counties where no licenses are granted, and if they did it would be overriding the local law and the sentiment of the people. I hope the sentiment of this House will be expressed in such a way as will lead to no mistake in regard to this matter. I hope the hon. the Minister of Militia will consent, in view of the sentiment of the House, to waive this obnoxious clause.

MR. MASSON: As it seems to be the general wish of the House that this matter should not be pressed, at least at present, I think there will be no harm in withdrawing the clause. I adopted the Bill from the Senate as it came to me, and I assume the responsibility of it. My opinion is not changed; and what I know of the necessities of the service, and the temptations to which young men are generally exposed, induces me to believe that the clause should be maintained, but in deference to the expressions manifested in the House, I consent to its withdrawal.

Motion in amendment *agreed to*.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee to consider said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Bill, as amended, *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

(In the House.)

Bill *reported*, *read the third time* and *passed*.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill (*from the Senate*) was introduced and *read the first time*:—

Bill (No. 111) To provide for the winding up of La Banque Ville Marie.—(*Mr. Desjardins*.)

INLAND REVENUE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL .]

(*Mr. Baby*.)

THIRD READING.

Bill again considered in Committee, amended, reported, *read the third time* and *passed*.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 83.]

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading *read*.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron): I suppose the hon. gentleman proposes that the first part of the clause shall apply to principals, and the second part to those assisting. It seems to me the clause places an extraordinary amount of power in the hands of Justices of the Peace. We know the class of men of whom the Magistracy of the Province is, to a large extent, composed, and that, though there may be some able men, and men who render justice, to a certain extent, according to the laws of the land, yet the great majority are not of that class. The hon. gentleman authorises a Justice of the Peace to impose a fine of \$100, to imprison for twelve months, or to inflict both punishments. I am rather inclined to the opinion that that is putting too much power into the hands of a class of men from whom the Justices of the Peace are manufactured. If the power were given to the Court of Quarter Sessions, or the Recorder's Court, or the Superior Court, I would support the proposition.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): It has been found by gentlemen interested in securing the observance of the law in towns and cities, that the penalties were largely inadequate. It must be remembered that these trials will be almost altogether before Stipendiary Magistrates, or men of a much higher class than the ordinary Justices of the Peace, and I do not think there will be any danger whatever of an undue exercise of authority.

MR. CAMERON (South Huron): I am not aware of any case in which such extraordinary powers are conferred upon Justices of the Peace, except in regard to the Revenue Laws, and that is an excep-

tional case, and great injustice has been done in connection with it without any chance of revision by the Courts, except at very great expenses. Offences of this kind are committed in country towns as much as in cities.

MR. BLAKE: Of course the general question of how far it is proper to expose the subject to be penalised, at the discretion and judgment of a Justice of the Peace, is what the hon. Minister has to consider. I do not profess to be familiar with the extreme limit to which we have gone in former times, in allowing Justices of the Peace to sentence persons, but I am certain that the general run of extreme sentences allowed to Justices of the Peace are infinitely lower than the maximum given in this case. It is true that in Revenue cases a very high penalty is allowed, but there are obvious reasons why it is not likely that that will be abused when the Government is the prosecuting party; and what I venture to suggest to the hon. Minister is, to consider how far, if it be an innovation on our whole system to give such extensive primitive powers to a Justice of the Peace, it should go. I do not say that the sentences might not be quite right. I quite sympathise with the feeling which induces the hon. gentleman to propose a power to punish, much more severely than by imprisonment for thirty days, those who are guilty of the atrocious and deliberate acts of inhuman cruelty in the name of sport of which we sometimes hear. The question is, if we decide now to trust to the discretion of a Justice of the Peace, as to whether twelve months' imprisonment and \$100 fine shall be awarded to one class of crimes, how far we are not remodelling our whole system, and how far it may not be proper to give a general increase of power to the Justices of the Peace concerning many of these crimes which are deserving, sometimes, of a more severe sentence. We have, in Ontario, a tolerably rapid system of trying persons under the Summary Jurisdictions Act, and it seems to me that when the hon. gentleman proposes an increase so serious as this in the maximum quantity of punishment, it will be not improper for him to consider whether we should not alter the jurisdiction and provide for a higher class of magistrates.

MR. CAMERON.

MR. McDONALD: (Pictou) I think there is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and I will consider this matter before the Bill reaches its next stage.

Bill read the second time.

ONTARIO BOYS' REFORMATORY BILL.

[BILL No. 98.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I move the second reading of this Bill. It is confined to Ontario and provides for the confinement of boys under sixteen years of age, under certain circumstances, in the Reformatory provided by that Province. The principle of the Bill is, that although a boy may only be sentenced for one year, if, in the opinion of the Judge, it is for the moral and material welfare of the boy that he should be kept in the Reformatory for any longer period after the expiration of the sentence, the Judge may so extend his detention for as long a period as he deems proper, not exceeding five years. The Bill has been introduced at the suggestion of the Attorney-General for Ontario, who informed me that the circumstances of the country, and particularly of the institutions of that Province, rendered a provision of this kind necessary.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. CAMERON (South Huron): The Bill of the hon. the Minister of Justice is a good one as far as it goes. The difficulty about it is that its scope is not wide enough. The principle of the Bill is a good one, but the hon. gentleman has not carried it far enough to embrace just the class of the criminal population, that, above all others, should engage the earnest attention of the hon. the Minister of Justice, whose great object, when dealing with this kind of legislation, should be the prevention, as well as the punishment, of crime when committed. The Bill proposes to deal with that portion of the male criminal population under sixteen years of age, but, unfortunately, it only undertakes to deal with that small part of it which has passed the initial stages of moral depravity—fairly entered

in a career of crime, violated, openly violated, the law of the land, and passed for trial before the authorities. In fact, it only deals with, and its provisions only apply to, that part of the criminal population who are under sixteen years of age, and who are convicted delinquents. The seething mass of depravity and crime in the country, which the strong arm of the law has not been able to reach successfully, is untouched by this Bill. The Bill deals with one class of criminals—at three stages in the lives of these juvenile delinquents: First, It provides that a boy under sixteen convicted of any offence for which an adult could be sentenced for three months and not more than five years, and where the Court is satisfied that a due regard for the material and moral welfare of the boy requires that he should be committed to the Reformatory, the Court may send him there for five years. Second, Where a boy is, on summary trial, convicted of any offence, and where the first sentence is fourteen days imprisonment, the Court as a judge, if satisfied that the boy's material and moral welfare requires it, may send him to the Reformatory for a period of five years. Third, If a boy is sent to the Reformatory for less than five years, the boy may be detained for a further period not in all to exceed five years. So far the provisions of the Bill are in the right direction. My object is to endeavour to induce the Minister of Justice to carry its provisions still further. Now, if the hon. gentleman's object is to restrain the criminal and prevent the commission of crime, if he desires to rescue from degradation and shame the classes who are entering on a life of crime, he must extend the provisions of this Bill. The hon. gentleman knows how much can be done by dealing with juvenile offenders just on their downward career, before they are hardened in crime and become outcasts from society. The hon. gentleman has only to read Peirce on juvenile offenders, to see what can be accomplished by legislation in this direction, and by the work of philanthropists under the protection of the law, and having them in reformatories protected by law. The work that has been accomplished by these reformatories in England, the United States and on the

Continent, is perfectly marvellous. The numbers rescued, through the instrumentality of these institutions, from lives of shame, degradation and crime, borders on the fabulous. The first minds in the State, the leading philanthropists, the great orders in the Church, the leading and most intelligent and cultivated of the men and women of these countries, have lent their best energies to the noble work of reclaiming the waifs and abandoned of society from lives of degradation, and making them useful members of the State. The success has been simply wonderful; so wonderful that the sympathy and assistance of the Government of Great Britain and other countries has been secured to these reformatories. The work has not been limited to restoring to society and to useful places in the world, the convicted juvenile delinquents. The best efforts of these institutions has been directed to the prevention of crime; to prevent the fatherless, the motherless, the outcasts, the waifs, the abandoned, the street arabs and gutter population from sinking lower and lower in the social scale; rescuing them from the career in which they have entered, and uplifting them from the filth and degradation in which circumstances have placed them; educating and Christianising them and giving them a fair start in life, and thus saving them from a career of crime, and the State the cost of convicting and punishing them. And it is because this Bill only reaches a limited class, and is intended to punish the criminal rather than prevent his becoming a criminal, that I venture on the suggestions I am about to make, and I hope the hon. the Minister of Justice will consider these suggestions, and incorporate them, or at least some of them, into his Bill. It will be observed that this Bill only reaches juvenile offenders who have been convicted. There is another class of delinquents to which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Justice, and to which I think he ought to extend the provisions of this Bill, namely, the class of offenders who are brought before the Courts charged with crime, who are notoriously degraded, notoriously associating with the criminal classes, notoriously vagrant and notoriously living the lives of vagrants and thieves, but who escape conviction from various

causes. These children, freed from the grasp of the law, melt away into the mass from which the criminal convicts are recruited, and in their turn become convicts. The Bill provides no safety for this class, and holds out no hope that the country will be saved the costs of ultimately convicting and punishing them. To cover this class of cases, and to give the Courts before whom these juveniles, charged with crime, are brought, and to enable these Courts to have a restraining power over these offenders, I propose that the first section of this Bill be amended by providing:

"That where a boy is brought before a Court of competent jurisdiction, charged with any criminal offence or when, during the sittings of any such Court the boy is in gaol charged with any such offence, and the Court or Judge is satisfied that the material and moral welfare of the boy requires it, the Court or Judge may commit such boy to the Reformatory for five years."

But my hon. friend may say that such an amendment is carrying the power of the Courts too far; that when a criminal is placed on trial and acquitted, that the Court should still have the power of restraining him. But the hon. gentleman will see that this very principle is recognised by himself in the third and fourth sections, and is quite unobjectionable. The principle acted upon by Parliament, and recognised by the Courts is, that the material and moral welfare of the boy and the peace and good order of society is of the first importance. There is still another stage at which the strong arm of the law should reach these offenders. The hon. gentleman will find in the Code of the State of Maryland, ample provision made for bringing juvenile delinquents within reach of the restraining power of the law. That Code provides:

"That if a minor renders his control beyond the power of his father, by reason of his own incorrigible conduct, and if it is manifestly requisite that, from regard for the moral and future welfare of the minor and the peace and order of society, that the minor should be placed under restraint, the Courts have the power of sending such minor to the State Reformatories."

The Code of that State further provides for the commitment to the House of Refuge of incorrigibly vicious minors, whose parents, by reason of their own moral depravity or otherwise, are incapable or unwilling to

exercise any proper care or discipline over them. The hon. gentleman might, with propriety, and in the interest of society as well as the interest of the class he is now dealing with, introduce the provisions I have referred to into this Bill. I find that, in the State of New York, the law provides that children deserting their homes or keeping company with dissolute or vicious persons, are deemed disorderly, and liable on conviction to be sent to the Reformatory. All these laws are intended to reach a class of cases not covered by this Bill. They are restraining provisions, their object is to prevent rather than punish, to save the criminal and to save the State, and are, therefore, of essential importance in dealing with the criminal classes. I trust the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill will see his way to adopting these suggestions, or at least, some of them, and thus make his Bill as full and perfect as possible.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): With reference to the subject referred to by my hon. friend, I quite agree with him that it would be very desirable, indeed, that the class of offenders, to which he alludes, should be got at in some way or other; but I think my hon. friend will agree with me that it would not be desirable, for two reasons, without further consideration, to adopt his suggestion, at present. The first reason is, that however desirable the change may be it is a change which ought to be adopted—only after full consideration, and after provision being made for efficiently dealing with the boys, after being thus taken hold of and drawn into a reformatory school. There is another reason why I think it would be unwise to press that just now. There might not be the accommodation in the reformatories and they would be sent there under that provision. I think it desirable that my hon. friend should not press his amendment for the present, but in another Session we will be able to give this very important subject our attention.

MR. MILLS: There is another matter which requires consideration. It is not until a crime is committed that the authority of this Parliament attaches to the liberty of the person. So far as the anticipation of crime is concerned, any legislation in that regard belongs rather to the Government that has control over the education of the community, and over

civil rights, than the Government that has the power to punish crime. This is one of the functions of reformatories in dealing with persons who have not committed any crime. This is the view taken by the Local Legislature of Ontario, and those measures which the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) has referred to, have been considered by that Legislature during the past Session. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the measure entitled, "An Act respecting the Ontario Reformatory for Boys," which was enacted during the past Session. This provision of the Ontario law is taken from the law relating to Industrial Schools, of the State of Wisconsin; so that the Ontario Legislature and Government have legislated under the powers possessed by them relating to the personal liberty of the various citizens of the Province.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:

Bill (No. 91) Respecting Dorchester Penitentiary.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 92) To continue for a limited time the Better Prevention of Crime Act, 1878.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders, in Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Industrial Refuge for Girls of Ontario.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 103) To amend the Act, intituled an Act respecting Offences against the Person, and to repeal the Act intituled an Act to provide that persons charged with Common Assault shall be competent as Witnesses.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

THE HULL FIRE—RELIEF GRANTED.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

MR. SPEAKER read the Message, and it is as follows:—

"LORNE.

"The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons a copy of an approved Report of the Privy Council, recommending that an application be made to Parliament for a vote for the sum of \$7,000, for the immediate relief of the sufferers by the destructive fire which yesterday, consumed a large part of the City of Hull, and rendered some 4,000 people houseless.

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

"OTTAWA, 22nd April, 1880."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: By the unanimous consent of the House, and only by unanimous consent could I do so, I ask for a Committee to consider this Message from His Excellency.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Message.

(In the Committee.)

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: As we were all spectators of the awful sight yesterday, I need not dilate upon it. I believe that 4,000 people, if not more, are left houseless and homeless by the disastrous conflagration yesterday at Hull. Upwards of 400 houses were destroyed, and these houses were occupied, in most cases, by more than one family, so that, in fact, some 800 residences were destroyed. The people thus rendered homeless are all hands employed about the mills of the Chaudiere, and the works of that kind around. In this city and at Hull, a great amount of sympathy will be felt, and no doubt here, and from various parts of the country, substantial aid by private charity will be forthcoming; but it is a matter which brooks no delay, and it is thought that we could not do better than adopt a Resolution to carry out the suggestion of His Excellency for affording relief to the sufferers by this awful accident. I move:

"Resolved, That there be granted to Her Majesty the sum of \$7,000 for the immediate relief of the sufferers by the destructive fire, which on the 21st instant, consumed a large part of the City of Hull."

MR. MACKENZIE: I am sure we shall all concur very heartily in the proposition made by His Excellency in the usual way. The fire was all the worse, because the population are of the poorer class. Of all the fires that have taken place in Canada, of which there have been a great many, this was, indeed, one in

which there is a necessity to assist those who have suffered by it. I am glad that the Government have brought down the Resolution they have brought down, and we, on this side of the House, shall all second the proposal made by the Government.

Resolution agreed to, and ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

MR. WRIGHT: I should like to return thanks to the Government for the kindly, generous and timely way in which they brought down this grant of \$7,000 in aid of my poor, suffering constituents in Hull. I am empowered by my constituents to return to the Government and the House their hearty and most grateful acknowledgments; and we have to express our thanks, in addition, to His Excellency and Her Royal Highness for the kindly interest they have taken in our great calamity, and the substantial way in which they have aided us. Likewise, I beg to return my personal acknowledgments to all the members of the House for the great sympathy manifested under the deep affliction which has befallen us; and also thanks to the citizens of Ottawa for the kindly manner in which they came to our assistance last night, when some 4,000 people were without food and shelter. I shall never forget their friendly aid on that occasion. After a most careful examination of all the statistics connected with this great calamity, we find that about 4,000 people have been rendered homeless and deprived of food. We have, through the kindness of our neighbours, been enabled to supply their wants, and afford shelter to the sufferers during the past night; and we have organised an Executive Committee, which, I think, will do its whole duty under the circumstances. With the assistance afforded us, I am in hopes that we shall do much in the way of relieving this great calamity. Much requires to be done. We can hardly realise the extent of the calamity; some 800 or 900 tenement houses destroyed, and 4,000 people rendered homeless, everyone will admit, is a more important matter than many would imagine.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. CURRIER: I beg to express my thanks and gratitude, also, to the Government and the House for the manner in which they have generously come to the aid of the suffering people in the neighbouring city of Hull. I have been interested, more or less, in that city for a long time, and my immediate friends are still interested in it, and I feel, as to anything transpiring in Hull, much the same as if it occurred in our own city of Ottawa. I think the amount granted by the Government is very fair and liberal, and it will be of very great assistance to the sufferers, as they get it immediately. It is worth double the amount received a month or six weeks hence. The distress and poverty is very great, indeed. It is now ascertained there are 486 houses, different holdings, destroyed, many having been occupied by two and three families. Between 3,000 and 4,000 people are left homeless and houseless. I thank the House for the generous manner in which they assisted us.

SUPPLY.

XII. RAILWAYS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway.

76 Extension to deep water at St. John.....	\$30,000
77 Repairs and improvements on the line between Rivière-du-Loup and Hadlow.....	116,000

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said that of the \$375,000 that would be expended by the 1st of July, the total amount to be voted was \$116,000, which would complete the work. The item included extra land for station purposes at the Chaudiere Junction, \$1,500; ballasting, \$41,000; four first-class stations, \$6,000; three second-class, \$3,000; repairs to thirteen stations, \$5,850; two coal sheds, \$6,000, etc. The amount already expended was \$102,478. The balance of the vote of last year would be required before 30th June next to pay for the new steel rails now on the way out.

MR. MACKENZIE: That will make a total cost of about \$2,000,000?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE: Has all this work been done by tender?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Most of it. The ballasting, the principal item, is now let in the same way.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: What is the total quantity of steel rails required?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Eleven thousand tons. About seventeen miles were laid with steel rails last year; the balance is expected here on the opening of navigation.

MR. MACKENZIE: You will use some of the old rails for sidings?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes.

Vote agreed to.

78 Legal Expenses..... \$3,000
Canadian Pacific Railway.

79 Canada Central Extension (subsidised.)\$570,000

In reply to MR. MACKENZIE.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said that that was the balance of the appropriation for the subsidy to the Canada Central Railway. The contractors expected to be able to finish the road to Nipissing within the time for which the vote was taken, and therefore he had embraced the whole in this vote.

Vote agreed to.

(Fort William to English River	\$35,000
(English River to Eagle River.	1,600,000
(Eagle River to Keewatin. . . .	2,500,000
(Keewatin to Selkirk.....	680,000
(Pembina Branch.....	86,000
80	West of Red River, including temporary bridge.....	1,450,000
(Telegraph Lines and Roadway Station and Terminal Accommodation.....	60,000
(Rolling Stock.....	150,000
(600,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said it had been found necessary to construct a temporary bridge at Winnipeg for the purpose of at once carrying the emigrant and other trains into that city, pending the construction of the bridge which was being constructed by the city of Winnipeg.

In reply to MR. MACKENZIE,

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said it was not intended to proceed with the bridge at Selkirk at the same time, the question of crossing the river having been postponed.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) enquired what provision had been made for the passage of steamers through the temporary bridge.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said he was afraid some little inconvenience would be involved to the steam communication by the construction of this bridge, but he thought the hon. member for Selkirk would see that the great convenience of the bridge would fully compensate for any inconvenience to the steamers. There would be an opening of twenty-nine feet under the bridge for barges, so as to interfere as little as possible with the navigation.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): Would it not be possible, at a little additional expense, to give a passage to steamers. The hon. Minister is aware that the distance from Point Douglass to the west end of the Sound is very considerable, and that, during wet weather, it is almost impossible to transport heavy loads. It would be a great inconvenience to those living in the body of the town. Now, if for a small additional cost, this change could be made, it would prevent great inconvenience and heavy expense to the merchants and traders. The height of a steamer is thirty feet.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I suppose that by having a hinge in the chimney it might be arranged so that the steamer could go under it. To put a draw on the bridge would involve a large additional expense.

MR. SMITH: I hope the hon. Minister will endeavour to have that carried out.

MR. ANGLIN: The proposal will cause great loss and inconvenience to all those doing business by those steamers.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The hon. gentleman will understand that all the steamers from the United States will reach their accustomed landing before they come to the bridge. It is only the Hudson's Bay Company's steamers from the lake that come up to Winnipeg that will be interfered with, as I understand it.

MR. SMITH: There are many steamers besides the Hudson's Bay Company's. All the steamers trading between Winnipeg and Selkirk take that route. There were, last year, four or five steamers.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Providing railway communication from Selkirk to Winnipeg will fully cover all the difficulty of transport in that section.

MR. SMITH: The Railway from Selkirk does not go to the water's edge; it stops at a considerable distance from the water. If the hon. Minister knew the great difficulty there is in transporting loads in the summer, he would see how desirable it is that that passage should be left open.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not propose, at the present moment, to enter upon the discussion of a very serious matter connected with the working of this Railway, although I hope to do so at a future time. We have already spent \$100,000 upon rolling-stock for the Pembina Branch. There is another vote asked for—\$600,000 for rolling-stock upon other portions of that road nearing completion. Vast preparations have been made for the purpose of working the Railway. The hon. gentlemen opposite professed, some years ago, to be strongly in favour of all such roads being worked by a company. The late Administration were of the same view, because they made arrangements for letting the Pembina Branch, hoping that, within a short time, some permanent arrangement might be made for opening any part of the new roads which might be finished. I think it is not desirable that the Government should continue to be the masters of our Railway system. It is difficult for them to do so, and it involves many considerations of public inconvenience. While I, at present, simply enter my protest against preparations for working the whole of the Government Railways in this country, I shall not take up the time of the Committee by discussing the principle now.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: If the hon. gentleman wishes to enter his protest against the Government making preparations to operate the road, I am prepared to say that I would not be inclined to agree with him that it is desirable that this matter should be put upon a strictly commercial footing, and in the hands of commercial men. But, in the meantime, the country being involved in such a heavy expenditure for the construction of the road, it is incumbent upon us to make timely preparation to secure that the road shall be as useful to the country as possible.

MR. McLENNAN: I should like to ask the hon. the Minister of Railways

whether any income was derived from the Pembina Branch during the period it was leased to a private company. We had a statement, a few nights ago, of what the road earned under the management of the Department. It would be a matter of interest, before this promised discussion comes up, to be able to compare the results of the experiments that have been already made.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The road was leased to Messrs. Upper and Company, not from choice but from necessity. It was the only means we had of operating the road at all. We found the company in existence, and gave them until the end of the year just closed to finish the road. They were obliged, under that contract, to have it ready by August 1st, for the passage of slow trains. We found it was practically impossible to have the road constructed by one party and operated by another, and, consequently, we were compelled either to let the road be idle or to enter into an arrangement with them—which I submitted for the approval of Parliament last Session—and under which they were obliged to give us 25 per cent. of the gross earnings of the road. The gross earnings of the road, during the time it was in the hands of Messrs. Upper and Company, were about \$4,000 per month, 25 per cent. of which is due to the Government. The road was not pushed to completion. Differences arose among the contractors, and the progress of construction was very unsatisfactory. Under these circumstances, the time having expired for the completion of the road, the Government terminated the contract and took the road into their own hands. We are now engaged in finishing the road ourselves. Under the contract the road is to be finished at the cost of the contractors.

MR. BLAKE: With reference to the suggested comparison asked for by the hon. member for Glengarry, it is, as the hon. Minister said himself, that the returns he brought down to us the other day of the receipts during this last month, furnish a fair index of the gross monthly returns for the twelve months on that road.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It would be impossible for me to say that that is the case. There is, of course, a large amount of freight business going over

that road now, and there are also the spring importations. But the hon. gentleman and I differ so widely as to the business that the rush of emigration into that country will produce, and will continue for some time, that I am afraid we should hardly agree as to our estimate of what the monthly returns will be. I am sanguine that the road certainly will be in charge of the Government, that in fact we shall receive some return over and above all expenditure. I would not like to say that I believe the return we have received from the 1st March would be maintained throughout the year.

MR. ANGLIN: I think it is very improbable it can be maintained throughout the year. The number of passengers, in the aggregate, seems very large. I was much amused at the tone of exultation of the hon. the Minister of Railways when he made the announcement. Yet, if we look more closely into the matter, the number is not so large. This Pembina Branch road is the only inlet, at present, into that country. There are many persons passing in and out, just now, in connection with the contracts that have just been let. The period for which the hon. gentleman made that report extended over forty-three days, and 5,000 passengers were found to have passed over the road. This would make, taking Sundays, 125 passengers a day, which, counting returns on a railway of sixty-five miles in length, is certainly not so very enormous.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The number of passengers was 7,000. I drew the attention of the House more to the figures with reference to the net earnings, because the House will see at once it was not simply a question of how much business was done in that time, but the cost at which this business was done. Hon. gentlemen familiar with the North-West will bear me out in the statement that, for a great many years no such stormy winter has occurred as the winter through which we have just passed. The difficulties on this line of railway from St. Paul to Winnipeg being enhanced; the cost of maintenance has been more during the past year than during any other year for ten years back. We have no snow-plough. We have been obliged to employ large numbers of extra men to keep the track clear, and yet for all that, from 1st March to 10th April, there was a net revenue of

\$21,000. I think that was an extremely encouraging condition of things.

MR. MACKENZIE: How much of this represented Government property carried over the road?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I have no doubt that a considerable portion of that 12,000 tons of freight was in connection with the Government works that are being carried on—not exactly the property of the Government, but the property of the contractors, the plant and rails.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): No doubt there been a great traffic over that road apart from that belonging to the Government. But it is also the case that the storms have been much more severe this last winter than for fifty years back, and, consequently, the expense has been greatly increased. In reply to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), the hon. Minister might have added that, notwithstanding, the completion of that road was very tardy indeed. It would have been infinitely more so had it not been for the great assistance that was rendered by the contractors in working the road.

MR. ANGLIN: I would ask the hon. the Minister of Railways how much of this large amount of \$7,791,000 we are now asked to vote, does he think will be expended during the twelve months commencing on 1st July next; and whether he could tell us whether the money to be so expended is now provided?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am happy to say that the hon. the Finance Minister says they can furnish the money required. We are, of course, obliged to allow a little margin in our estimate. I do not think all this money will be expended.

MR. ANGLIN: This is an important question considering the present financial condition of the country, and I think we ought to have some idea as to how much it is expected to expend within that time.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It is a serious question, and I am disposed to consider it seriously. It is of the utmost importance that every dollar of the vote for the British Columbia section should be expended within the year, for the reason that the country is already committed to this very large expenditure. A great expenditure has already been made for

several years past in connection with these works. For that money we are paying interest, and the works must be unproductive until it is completed. Therefore, it is of the greatest possible moment that we should proceed vigorously with the work and endeavour to get it into a position in which some return will be made. We believe it is of the greatest possible importance to the country that the road should be opened from Lake Superior to Red River at the earliest possible moment. We are determined that the road shall be opened by the day stated in the contracts. These contracts require that they shall be completed, with the exception of sixty-seven miles of Section B, by July 1st, 1881, and that the rails shall be laid over the remaining sixty-seven miles by July 1st, 1882.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then I understand the hon. gentleman has no intention of spending \$1,000,000 in British Columbia.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I do not expect \$1,000,000 will be expended in British Columbia.

MR. BLAKE: Has the hon. gentleman any idea of expending any more than \$500,000 in British Columbia during the next year?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It would be impossible for me to say any more in relation to this than what I have already said.

MR. THOMPSON: Does the hon. member for West Durham attribute to the Minister of Railways the spirit of clairvoyance? The first sod of the new line is to be turned on May 24th, and, I understand, that the contractor means to go on from that time and push the work forward. I presume the hon. the Minister of Railways intends paying the contractor and not repudiating the indebtedness when it becomes due.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does the amount to be expended in British Columbia depend entirely on the contractors? If they are able to spend \$1,000,000, \$1,000,000 will be paid.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: If the contractor does work to that extent within that period, he will, of course, be paid.

Vote agreed to.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

Slides and Booms.

126 { To pay to T. B. Normand for services as Acting Superintendent St. Maurice Works, from October, 1875, to October, 1878, as per account..... \$1,095

Telegraphs.

127 { Land and Cable Telegraph lines for the sea coasts and Islands of the lower rivers and Gulf of the St. Lawrence, B.C., and the Maritime Provinces, namely:
Extension of the Coast Telegraph System of the lower rivers and Gulf of St. Lawrence, from Baie St. Paul to Bersimis and branch to Chicoutimi..... 10,000
Proposed new Submarine Cable route between Vancouver's Island and mainland via Nanaimo and Point Grey..... 26,000
Transfer of the Western Union Telegraph Company's lines and cables to the Government of Canada..... 24,000

In reply to MR. MACKENZIE,

MR. LANGEVIN said, in reference to the cables across the Gulf of Georgia, that these telegraph lines in British Columbia cost a very large sum of money and were not self-sustaining, the expenditure every year being very largely in excess of the revenue. The cables between Victoria and the American Sound were constantly out of order, the bottom of the straits being, in certain places, rocky. The cables had, therefore, been frequently broken, and the cost of repairing them was very great. It was now proposed to purchase the land lines of the Western Union Telegraph Company, which had previously been rented by the Government, and some of the cables would be utilised for the purpose the Government had in view of laying a cable from Nanaimo to Point Gray, and thence to New Westminster. By this means they would save a large annual expenditure for the maintenance of cables. Under the contract that existed previously to Confederation, between the Government of British Columbia and the Western Union Telegraph Company, whenever the Government would desire to adopt a new system they would be bound to put in perfect order the cables as well as the land lines in our Territory. They alone would cost a very large sum to this Government; but by the proposed change they purchased the line, and by purchasing the line, which was to a great extent in good

order, they obtained the property which they would have had under the present system to give up to the Western Union Telegraph Company, after putting it in perfect order. If they had not adopted the new system, instead of having a capital of \$50,000 invested, the capital would be \$35,000. He would, while on this subject, explain to the hon. gentleman about the tariff of rates. That tariff had been changed altogether: they found it not to be defensible. As the tariff existed previous to the late change, the rate for ten words from Victoria to Ottawa was \$2.75; under the new tariff, for ten words, it was altogether \$1.25; this was a reduction of \$1.50, more than half of the old rate being taken off. For ten words, from Victoria to San Francisco, under the old system, they paid \$2; under the new system it would be \$1 during the day and 50c. at night.

MR. MACKENZIE: How are the rates within the Provinces?

MR. LANGEVIN: They have been modified considerably, but altogether the tendency has been to reduce the rates, and we believe that, under the new system, we will have a greater revenue than under the old system. I do not know whether the collections—the revenues—will be as large as the expenses, but we are trying to make both ends meet.

MR. MACKENZIE: Last year the expenditure was \$48,000, and the revenue \$5,000.

MR. LANGEVIN: Yes; but the repairs to cables were very heavy; the repairs will be very small indeed, we expect, under the new system.

MR. DAWSON: The cost of sending telegraphic messages to Thunder Bay and in that direction is very large, and it will be until we have a telegraphic system connecting us with British Columbia. I suggested an easy way of overcoming this inconvenience, and it was that we should lay a submarine line through Lake Superior. There are about 100 or 120 miles now open with which we could thus connect. This would give us a good line on our own territory. I merely mention this *en passant*.

MR. LANGEVIN: That may engage your attention.

Vote agreed to.

Miscellaneous.

128	{	Miscellaneous Works, not otherwise provided for.....	\$10,000
		Surveys and Inspections.....	25,000
		Arbitrations and Awards.....	5,000

Dominion Steamers.

129	Maintenance and repairs of Steamers <i>Napoleon III</i> , <i>Newfield</i> , <i>Druid</i> , <i>Glenlon</i> , <i>Sir James Douglas</i> and <i>Northern Light</i>	\$125,000
-----	---	-----------

MR. ANGLIN said he was surprised to find that the *Glenlon* was one of the vessels included in this vote. Considering what was said of her last Session, it was reasonable to expect that she would be got rid of as soon as possible. As she was employed in the service, he was glad to see that she was not considered quite so worthless as she had been thought to be at one time.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he was glad the hon. gentleman opposite was so proud of the vessel he wished they had her at one-third of what she cost. The Government had her on hand, and they had to make the best of her. She was not a vessel that would capsize, but she could go ashore in a gale of wind; she was as broad as she was long. The Government could only wait, and keep the vessel on hand until they could replace her, and, in the meantime, use her for such work as she could perform.

Vote agreed to.

Mail Subsidies.

130	Steam communication between Halifax and St. John <i>via</i> Yarmouth.....	\$10,000
131	Steam communication on Lakes Huron and Superior.....	10,000
132	Steam service between San Francisco and Victoria, British Columbia.....	25,000
133	Steam communication with the Magdalen Islands.....	7,800
134	Steam communication between Grand Manan, N.B., and mainland.....	1,500
135	Subsidy to steamer between Campbellton, N.B., and Gaspe and intermediate ports.....	9,000
136	To provide for one year's subsidy, to be granted at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, to line of steamers to trade between Canada and West Indies and Brazil, provided a like amount be paid by the Brazilian Government..	50,000

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT enquired what was the position in which this scheme stood?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said

the Brazilian Government had intimated that they would subsidise a line as liberally as Canada. The Bill had not yet passed the Cortez, but, doubtless, would. Contracts had been entered into by the Post Office Department, at Ottawa, provisionally, subject, for completion, to the action of the Brazilian Government. Now, the arrangement was made for a monthly trip between Canada and Brazil.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked at what points in the West Indies was it proposed to touch.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: At St. Thomas, Porto Rico, stopping also at Batria and Marinam, and perhaps at another point. The contract is for one round trip for the month.

MR. MACKENZIE: You will miss the West India Islands.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The vessels will go to St. Thomas.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is a mere station of call. The vessels will miss all the main points of business in the West Indies.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: By subsidising a line that would attempt to do too much, we should lose both our objects. We could not have a line of any value that would run from Canada to the British West Indies and then to Brazil and back again in the month. The voyage would be too long. If we are even to have direct West India Trade, we must have a line for intercolonial trade. We must have the Brazilian line, if it is to be of any value, running direct. It is well worth the trial. I think the enterprise will be highly successful. In Brazil the people have entered into it with great spirit. The Government of Brazil have placed at the disposal of the Government and merchants of Canada, a building for the display of specimens of all we have to sell, and are preparing now a collection of specimens of all the articles Brazil imports from England and the United States. The trade between Brazil and the United States is not very large. They are about to send some iron articles to some point in Canada, and we have suggested Montreal as being most convenient, where specimens of the articles usually imported into Brazil can be shown, so that our manufacturers can enter into competition.

MR. BURPEE (St. John): If this

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

service can be effectually established and carried out, I think this is one of the best items in the Estimates. I would ask the hon. the First Minister if he has decided on any port in Canada, and what ports he will touch at, if any; and also if there has been any communication with the Government from the Provinces, particularly the Maritime Provinces, as to carrying freight and cattle between New Brunswick and Cape Breton; if there has been any subsidy offered.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No, there is no subsidy offered for that object. Of course this trade is altogether experimental, and it is not quite certain whether Halifax, St. John, or Quebec or the St. Lawrence would be the best port of departure; or whether it should be the St. Lawrence in summer, or Halifax in winter. It is quite experimental so far. It has not arrived at that point at which we can definitely say. The contract is entered into provisionally only.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: With whom is the contract entered into? With what Government?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The contract is entered into with an English Company, represented by Mr. Bentley, who has the confidence of the Brazilian Government.

MR. KING said, as the line of steamships from St. John to Liverpool was of great importance to New Brunswick, he regretted that the return called for by the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) had not been brought down. The trade between Canada and the markets of Great Britain was one which had been rapidly developing, and in which the farmers of New Brunswick had been unable to participate in consequence of the absence of steam communication. Something had been done in the way of exporting cattle to Great Britain from that Province, but the House would be surprised to learn that, in part, it had been carried on by way of Quebec. That steam communication would also be important in reference to other kinds of farm produce. In consequence of the high prices in the United States in 1878 and 1879, the farmers went into the cultivation of farm produce more than they had before, so that in the fall of 1879, they had more than they could dispose of in their own Province.

Some enterprising gentlemen in the city of St. John loaded their vessels with farm produce, but in consequence of the delay in crossing the Atlantic they had some loss, so that the experiment was not likely to be repeated unless by other means than sailing vessels.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said communications on this subject had been received from the Mayor and Corporation of St. John, and, since the Estimates were brought down, from the Agricultural Societies of New Brunswick, and the matter was now before Council.

MR. JONES said he was very glad to see a vote for a line of steamers to Brazil. Within the last few years a large quantity of lumber had been shipped from Montreal to Brazil, and also a quantity of manufactured goods. The trade in the latter might be small at first, but he was satisfied it would increase every year.

Vote agreed to.

137 For steam communication between Halifax, Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island.....	\$4,000
138 For steam communication between Nova Scotia and St. Pierre.....	4,000

MR. ANGLIN said the Government should enquire whether there was any justification for this expenditure. St. Pierre was a French Island, with a very small population, and a very large amount of smuggling was done thence into the Dominion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this small boat had existed for some years. He did not suppose this steam communication increased the smuggling, but there must be a good deal of interchange of French goods and Canadian goods by its means.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said there was a large trade with St. Pierre, and, instead of the smuggling being increased by the steamer, the latter afforded some facilities by which the Department was enabled to check it.

Vote agreed to.

139 To provide for the examination of masters and mates.....	\$4,250
140 For purchase of life boats, life preservers, and rewards for saving life.....	3,000

MR. ANGLIN enquired what had been done during the past year, and what the hon. Minister's intentions were for the next year.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said the hon. gentleman would see what had been done if he looked for the Returns for the past year. The sum of \$2,823 was expended last year in this service. The cost of the service included not only what appeared, but the freight and charges on watches brought from England, as rewards, and so on, the amount could not be estimated exactly.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT : Are there any actual stations as there are in England?

MR. POPE : No. In Ontario there are some stations in which life-boats are kept, and, though I do not know whether they are necessary there more than anywhere else, they are still continued.

MR. ANGLIN : Then the grant is for the purpose of maintaining life-boats in the Life-boat Service?

MR. POPE : A large amount is paid for rescuing crews, although there is no organisation.

Vote agreed to.

141 To provide for investigations into wrecks and casualties, and collection of information relating to disasters to shipping.....	\$1,500
142 Expenses in connection with Canadian registration of shipping.....	500
143 { Montreal Water Police. } { River Police, Quebec..... }	35,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) : This item was reduced \$2,500 last year. This year we thought it better to put the items for both cities together, as we may want a few more water policemen in Montreal. The water police in those cities is a losing service. We lost last year about \$15,000 by it.

In reply to Mr. DESJARDINS,

MR. POPE : We found the present officers of the Montreal Police Force in charge when we came into office. As soon as some of these fall out of the force they will not be replaced. Every economy will be practised, but it cannot be done in a day. A great deal has been said about the dismissal of one or two old men of the Force. I think the country will say that if you have a Police Force it ought to be an efficient one. You do not want a man seventy years of age and upwards, who may easily be knocked over by a man he is trying to arrest, or who may not be able to overtake in a run a man he

wishes to capture. It would be better to pay these old men a pension and dispense with their services. I did dismiss two old men from the Montreal force, one being seventy years old and the other nearly seventy.

MR. ANGLIN: The proper mode would be to transfer this whole matter to the Local Governments. I see no reason why the Government of this Dominion should be called upon to meddle with this matter in Montreal or Quebec, while there are no such organisations in other cities of the Dominion, where even a larger amount of shipping arrives.

MR. POPE: This service has been in existence for some years, as this Government found it, and as the preceding Government left it. It is a very important service, and these men have proved themselves very useful. The Government is just as well able to support that service as the Local Governments. Last year the Government thought the expenditure too large, and reduced it by \$2,500. The cost, last year, was \$59,000. We dismissed the agent in Quebec, and after careful consideration decided to diminish the force there from forty-four to thirty men. At one time the main object of the Quebec force was to prevent crimping, but very little of that is done at the present time, as but few ships are now being built there. I was of opinion that the number should be increased and the pay reduced. The proposition this year is to give them \$1 a day, and provided they conduct themselves satisfactorily, a further sum of 25c. a day at the close of the season.

MR. CARON: I think the present is not a good time to reduce the Police Force in Quebec. We expect a larger fleet this year than we have had for four or five years. It has been mainly through the services of this force that crimping has been almost completely suppressed. The universal opinion of the shipping trade of Quebec is opposed to any reduction of the force at the present time. It requires a larger number of men to carry on the service in the harbour of Quebec than in that of Montreal. In the latter harbour the ships lie along the wharf proper, while at Quebec the ships lie out in the stream. It is necessary to send the Water Police as far down the river as the Isle of Orleans, and beyond.

MR. POPE.

It is also necessary to send them across the river to Indian coves. Speaking, as I believe, the opinion of our leading commercial men, I hope the Government will not select the present year to reduce the Police Force in the harbour of Quebec.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre): As I understand the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is not the intention of the Government to reduce the force the present year. The same number of men is going to be kept on at Quebec as last year. There is no doubt that this force, both in Montreal and Quebec, has rendered very valuable service. As the hon. Minister has remarked, crimping in Quebec has been nearly quite suppressed. As regards the statement of the hon. member for Hochelaga, in reference to dismissals, there has been no dismissals that I know of, except two aged men. One of them, Sergeant Wilson, has faithfully served his Queen and country for the past fifty years. I am happy to say that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries intends to recommend to his colleagues that six months' pay be granted to both of these men, as a recognition of their faithful service.

MR. CASGRAIN: I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for the county of Quebec, with regard to this service. The number of river police is not sufficient. Forty-five men is the least possible number that we should have for the port of Quebec, and, although there is not so much crimping as formerly, I think the hon. Minister would make a great mistake if he were to reduce the force.

Vote agreed to.

144 Removal of obstructions in navigable Rivers..... 1,500

XVII. LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE.

145 Salaries and allowances of lighthouse keepers..... 157,456

146 Agencies, rents and contingencies 19,600

147 Maintenance and repairs to Lighthouses, Fog-Whistles, Buoys and Beacons, Humane Establishments and Provision Depots..... 255,415

148 Cape Rice Light..... 800

149 Completion and construction of Light-houses and Fog-alarms.. 40,000

MR. PLUMB enquired whether any provision had been made for the erection of a fog-whistle at the mouth of the Niagara River. He said the *Globe* newspaper, about six or eight months ago, had

charged him with a dereliction of duty, because he had not obtained from the Government a fog-whistle at the mouth of the Niagara River,

MR. POPE (Queen's P.E.I.): No appropriation has been made for that purpose, but I will take the matter into consideration.

MR. PLUMB: The *Globe* discovered that there were fog-points on Lake Ontario, and wanted to have one at Niagara en purpose to have a hit at me.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. PLUMB: I am sorry that hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to prevent me speaking. They cannot expect to hurry Estimates or expedite the business of the House by pursuing that course.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) asked if there was a fog whistle at the Straits of Belle Isle. He had come through there and had been detained for many hours. He had been informed that a fog whistle would remove the necessity for such delays, as vessels could proceed if the fog whistle was there, but that in the absence of a fog whistle the vessels might be detained sometimes for days.

MR. LANGEVIN said provision was made for another fog whistle at those Straits; there was one but another would be provided.

Vote agreed to.

150 Construction of a new Lighthouse on Sands Head entrance to Fraser River, B. C. \$14,000

In reply to MR. ANGLIN,

MR. LANGEVIN said that when British Columbia came into Confederation there was a lightship at this point, and it had been kept since. It was rotten now, and unfit for use, and the Government had to hire a schooner at \$500 a month. It was therefore considered expedient to build a lighthouse rather than incur the expense of hiring a schooner, and the cost of building the lighthouse was estimated at \$14,000.

Vote agreed to.

XVIII. FISHERIES.

Salaries and Disbursements of Fishery Overseers and Wardens.

Ontario	\$12,500
Quebec	14,500
Nova Scotia	15,000
New Brunswick	12,000
Prince Edward Island	3,000
Manitoba	1,000

151 } British Columbia	2,000
} Fish-breeding, Fishways and	
} Oyster beds	22,000
} To provide for legal and incidental expenses connected with the Fisheries	800
} Advertising	1,000

MR. GILLMOR said that the distribution of this amount had been the subject of considerable comment in the press of the Lower Provinces lately; and his attention had been more particularly called to this subject from the fact that he had applied for some small salmon, for the River St. Croix, in his county, but he had applied in vain. So far as he could gather from the Reports, some 7,000,000 of fry had been turned out of one hatchery in Ontario. This hatchery alone had cost the country \$64,000. Occasionally a few salmon had been caught in Lake Ontario. The result of three years' fishing in this lake, with trap-nets, showed a catch of 600 salmon, costing the country for hatchery alone \$106 each. He was satisfied the small salmon, for the most part, only furnished food for the black bass, the rock bass and the pickerel. There were nine hatcheries in operation—two in Ontario, three in Quebec, two in New Brunswick, one in Nova Scotia, and one in Prince Edward Island. After all those years, and the enormous expenditure, hon. members will be astonished to learn that Ontario exports of salmon only \$2,143, while New Brunswick exports yearly \$203,977; Quebec, \$42,298; Nova Scotia, \$91,171. The annual cost to the country of these fish-breeding establishments is: For Ontario, \$9,947; Quebec, \$5,810; Nova Scotia, \$2,687; New Brunswick, \$1,481. The matter in which he was more particularly interested was the unequal distribution of this fund amongst the fishery officers of the different Provinces. The salary of the Overseer of Ontario was \$2,000; New Brunswick, \$1,400; Nova Scotia, \$1,400. He was acquainted with the laborious duties of the Overseer of New Brunswick. In addition to the salmon, bass, smelt, and fresh water Fisheries, the salt water Fisheries, with which he was more particularly acquainted, he knew to be very onerous and difficult. To settle the disputes and troubles arising out of weirs, involved, in his opinion, more labour than was performed by the Overseer of Ontario. In

addition, the Overseer for New Brunswick had the spawning grounds, the gurry grounds, and numerous other duties to attend to, involving a great deal of travel, trouble and labour. The average salaries of Fishery Officers for the different Provinces were: 115 officers in Quebec, averaging yearly, \$246; 87 in Ontario, \$216; 285 in Nova Scotia, \$72; 115 in New Brunswick, \$104; 38 in Prince Edward Island, \$33. He (Mr. Gillmor) was unacquainted with the duties of these officers in Ontario, and there might exist reasons for this difference, but he was sure no such difference existed in Quebec, and he wanted the hon. Minister to explain the reason why it existed, and if no good reason existed, to have justice done. If the officers in the Maritime Provinces were fairly paid, which he did not believe, then Quebec and Ontario officers were largely over-paid.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said that the hon. member from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) in 1874 had removed an officer in his county and put several others in, thereby increasing the expense.

MR. GILLMOR said the hon. the Finance Minister had made an unfortunate reference for his Government. In 1872 he was a candidate for a seat in this Parliament. At that election a Fishery Officer, B. Cunningham, had supported him. He was defeated, and Cunningham was removed, for political reasons only, as no charge was ever preferred against him. He had at that time a salary not exceeding \$50 per annum. Mr. Andrews was appointed to fill his place at a salary of \$200 a year, with travelling expenses, which, he thought, amounted to \$50 more. In 1874 he (Mr. Gillmor) was the successful candidate and advised that Mr. Andrews should be removed and Cunningham reinstated, which was done, but he did not receive the salary which Mr. Andrews got, but went in at his old salary, since raised somewhat. The removal of Mr. Andrews was not a pleasant duty, but justice to Cunningham demanded it.

MR. MCKAY said he wished before the item for Fish breeding, Fishways and Oyster Beds was carried to refer to the lease of an oyster bed in his county. It was leased in 1867 under certain conditions, and the terms of that lease were

MR. GILLMOR.

never carried out. Ever since this lease had been granted, the farmers had been deprived of the use of the mussle mud which they used to get there, and which was very valuable and much sought after, being carried many miles inland whenever it could be got. The person holding the lease had never expended any money on the cultivation of oysters; and this mud was thought of so much importance by the people of Prince Edward Island, that application was made for reduced railway rates to carry this mud inland. Yet, the people of his county were deprived of the use of it, simply because the holder of the lease, like the dog in the manger, will not use it himself nor allow any person else to use it. The people of his county thought it a great injustice that the lease should be continued.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: For what term is the lease?

MR. MCKAY: It is for eighteen years. There is no reason why it should be continued. The papers were laid on the Table three years ago, but nothing has been done. An examination of these papers will show that the lease should be cancelled.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said the lease on the property referred to was granted by the Local Government, and therefore he could not see how the Dominion Government or the Department of Marine and Fisheries could deprive the lessee of such a lease.

MR. MCKAY said it was leased before Confederation by the Local Government, but, after Confederation, it was found the lease was valueless, and required the sanction of the Federal Government, and so the necessary form was gone through to make it a lease from this Government.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he would make enquiries.

MR. BORDEN said four officers in the Fisheries had been dispensed with in King's County, without a word of explanation as to why they were dismissed.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said they were discharged because they were reported as thoroughly useless, and would not attend to their duties.

MR. ANGLIN: They voted on the wrong side, perhaps.

MR. BORDEN: On whose report were they discharged?

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said if

the hon. gentleman would call for the reports in the usual way they would be brought down.

MR. BORDEN said he thought he was entitled to know why these changes had been made. He had understood that these gentlemen were dismissed on the score of economy, but this could not be so, as new appointments had been made. It was only a convenient way to get rid of gentlemen supposed to be opposed to the present Administration, and of substituting their own supporters. It was only fair that he should see the report.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend, but the hon. gentleman ought to have given notice, and he would thus have got the information he desires.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is very common to raise a question of grievance in going through the Estimates. When I was sitting over there I heard similar questions asked.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: And I have no doubt they were objected to.

MR. BORDEN: This is a vote for Salaries of Wardens and Overseers of Fisheries. There are three Wardens and one Overseer dismissed, and I want to know why. I have repeatedly known questions of this kind asked on such a vote. I have given notice of a question—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Then the hon. gentleman is clearly out of order to bring up a subject on which he has given notice.

MR. BORDEN: I do not see why the right hon. gentleman should take such a course as this towards me, particularly as I have been compelled to be away a large portion of the Session, and could not put motions or give notices. I have given a notice certainly, but since the notice has been given, the right hon. gentleman has notified us that he will take Wednesday, the only private day, and I shall have no other opportunity of asking the question. I would, therefore, request the hon. gentleman, simply as a matter of courtesy, to furnish me now with the information required, that is, to let me know whether the Government has received any report in relation to the subject of my question, and what course is intended to be taken in this matter; also, that he will lay the

report on which the officers were dismissed on the Table.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: After the remarks made by the hon. gentleman, I shall not object to his bringing up matters which he could not strictly bring up now; but with reference to his question, if the hon. gentleman will put it to-morrow we will attend to it.

In reply to Mr. SMITH,

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said the increase of the item for Fishery Overseers in Manitoba, from \$200 to \$1,000 this year, was to secure greater protection to the fish. Last year it was insufficient.

In reply to Mr. BORDEN,

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said his instructions to the Fishery Inspectors were to report every officer, no matter what his politics, who did not discharge his duties, with a view to his dismissal.

MR. PLUMB said the fish-breeding establishment at Newcastle, Ontario, was a great success, as was apparent from the fact that fish bred there had been caught at the mouth of the Niagara. Recent experience showed that shad could be hatched and successfully bred in Lake Ontario. Mr. Seth Green, a famous pisciculturist of the United States, had recently let loose large shoals of shad at Rochester, and Lake Ontario was now being stocked with that fish.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question, order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he must protest against such disrespectful treatment of his hon. friend from Niagara, one of the most distinguished members of the Conservative party. Such disturbance was a disgrace to the Opposition, and if persisted in would evoke retaliation upon that party from the leaders downwards. The Opposition had been well treated by the majority, and it made a bad return.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said he must object entirely to the language of the right hon. gentleman. The gentlemen interrupting the hon. member for Niagara were not members of the Opposition but of the Government party. The Opposition desired to expedite the Estimates, but not to obstruct business. The hon. Premier's threats were not justified on this occasion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said

the member for Centre Huron had not eyes in the back of his head, or he would see that the noises did proceed from the hon. gentlemen who usually acted with him, some of whom he could name and felt inclined to name.

MR. ANGLIN denied that the Opposition desired or were responsible for the interruptions to the hon. member for Niagara, though members of this party were often disturbed by unseemly noises from supporters of the Government.

MR. PLUMB said that the vote for fish-breeding had been well spent; the work had been efficiently done, and the results were gratifying so far. This last year large shoals of white fish, bred at Newcastle, had found their way to the Niagara River. He would like to know whether the hon. the Minister of Marine would direct an examination to be made of the Niagara River, with a view to deciding whether some small expenditure should not be made for the purpose of continuing the supply of a very important article of food taken from the Lakes—whitefish? He (Mr. Plumb) thought it would be in the best interest of the public to consider favourably his application, for Niagara furnished a large supply of this fish to Toronto, Hamilton, and St. Catharines. He thought he might claim some little favour for his district in this respect, when it would result to the general advantage of the country.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said that the wishes of the hon. gentleman would be fully considered; but, out of this vote, it was not possible to give anything for the purpose. It simply provided for the payment of salaries and disbursements in connection with the Fisheries, as at present arranged. The small increase was for opening up additional fisheries. In reply to the hon. member for Centre Huron, he might say the \$800 mentioned were to provide for legal expenses in regard to suits taken against the Department during the late Government. Those cases were still before the Courts. Why did not the hon. member make enquiry during the five or six years his friends were in power? Many of the salaries were fixed by the late Government, and the present Government would be charged with extrava-

gance if they increased them. If an officer was efficient and attended to his duties, he should be well paid, but the way in which the work had been done, and the fact that most of these fishery wardens were themselves the greatest poachers, led him to believe they were very well paid.

MR. GILLMOR disclaimed any intention of making any charge against the Government, but said he would like to know why the officers in Quebec were paid so much more than those in the Maritime Provinces, though their duties must be much lighter.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said a reduction must be expected if an efficient warden, appointed in 1875 to a position in the hon. gentleman's county, at \$150 a year, was displaced, and a number of other men appointed to do the work which he had performed.

Vote agreed to.

XIX. SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS.

Observatories.

152	{	Observatory, Quebec	\$2,400
		do Toronto	4,500
		do Kingston	500
		do Montreal	500
		do N. Brunswick	1,200
153		Grant for Meteorological Observatories, including Instruments and cost of telegraphing Weather Warnings	37,000

XX. MARINE HOSPITALS FOR SICK AND DISTRESSED SEAMEN.

Marine Hospitals.

154		Marine and Immigrant Hospitals, Quebec	20,000
155	{	St. Catharines Hospital, Ont.	500
		Kingston Hospital, Ont.	500
156		Hospitals in the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia	35,000
157		Expenses of Shipwrecked and disabled Seamen	8,000

XXI. STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

158		To provide for the expenses of this Service	15,000
-----	--	---	--------

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): We have three Inspectors at present. There are many wooden vessels altogether unseaworthy, and the Government must take measures to prevent these vessels carrying passengers. The Inspectors must have a thorough knowledge of all ships. This service has produced a sur-

plus of receipts since Confederation of \$24,685.

MR. ANGLIN: I think, in that case, the fees ought to be reduced. There is no excuse in taking more from the owners of vessels than is necessary to pay expenses.

Vote agreed to.

XXII. INSPECTION OF INSURANCE COMPANIES.

159 To meet expenses in connection with the inspection of Insurance Companies \$6,000

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at
Ten minutes after
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 23rd April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADIAN TELEGRAPH COMPANY INCORPORATION BILL.—[BILL No. 54.]
(Mr. McCarthy.)

RECOMMENDED TO STANDING COMMITTEE.

MR. MACDOUGALL: I desire to call the attention of the House to a Report of the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, presented to this House yesterday. It was with reference to a Bill sent to that Committee entitled, "An Act to incorporate the Canadian Telegraph Company." The Bill was referred to a Sub-Committee for consideration and amendment. It was reported upon by that Sub-Committee, and was afterwards ordered by the General Committee to be reprinted as amended, and I hold in my hand a copy of the Bill as reprinted with those amendments. The Report states no reason for negating this Bill. The ordinary mode is, of course, to find that the preamble has not been proven but that finding is not stated in the Report. Now, I think when this House refers a private Bill to any of the Standing Committees for report, it must be taken for granted that the House affirms or approves of the object for which that Bill has been introduced, and it is referred to

a Committee for the purpose of examination and amendment, if the Committee think proper. This Bill is simply a Bill to incorporate a number of gentlemen who apply for the authority of Parliament to enable them to construct a telegraph line or telegraph lines in this country. It was the policy of the Government of Canada, as it has been the policy of this Dominion, to give every encouragement to persons who may choose to invest their capital in the improvement or extension of telegraphy. In fact, under the General Act for the incorporation of joint stock companies, persons may associate themselves and obtain a charter without coming to Parliament at all, for the purpose of establishing telegraph lines. No one, I apprehend, will stand up and say that it is not in accordance with public policy, and the public interest, to promote competition in matters of this sort. There can be no public reason given, it seems to me, why a company who may choose to invest their capital, and are ready to afford facilities for communication of this kind, should be refused the privilege without any reason. We hear, every day, of startling improvements in the system of telegraphy, and we do not know what new discoveries may be made, what new patents may be taken out, and what new organisations, therefore, may desire to invest their capital for this purpose. I think it has been the practice of Parliament to afford facility to every enterprise of this kind. There is no good reason why these gentlemen should be denied the privilege which they have asked. They have given notice; they have paid the necessary fees; the Bill was prepared and submitted to this House; it was read and referred to the Committee, and it now comes back to us with a report that the fees be repaid. I believe, when this report was made, there was not a quorum of the Committee present. I happened to be in the Committee at the moment, and was much surprised at the statements made and some of the arguments used by members of the Committee in favour of the rejection of this Bill. I do not think those statements or arguments should prevail in this House, and, therefore, I desire to take the sense of the House upon the question: whether we are about to adopt a new policy and

hereafter prevent any persons or companies from engaging in telegraphic enterprises, in competition with those lines which exist to-day. It is well known that one of the companies that received its charter under the law I referred to, has been, to use a common expression, "sold out." It now belongs to that great Wall street operator in New York, Jay Gould. The directors of the company in Canada are simply his servants, whom he simply pays so much a year for carrying out his orders. As long as the public is served by existing companies, and telegraph messages are transmitted at a cheap rate, I suppose it does not greatly concern us where the capital comes from, or where the management resides. But the fact that a company is in foreign hands ought not to be a reason why we should prevent other persons, residing in this country or elsewhere—whether their capital is to be obtained in New York or in England—from establishing telegraph lines in Canada if they choose. It seems to me the public interest requires that this matter should be open and free, that we should have competition, especially in view of the fact that a great struggle is going on between two rival telegraph companies in the United States to obtain a monopoly. We are not much concerned in that; but when we find gentlemen prepared to come forward and engage in competition with them, in case events should show that a profit may be derived from it, I cannot see why we should say: "there shall be no more Telegraph Companies in Canada," and that the people of Canada should submit to whatever treatment the two companies now in existence may give us. I think that is not in accordance with the opinion or sense of Parliament, and therefore, I move:

That Bill No. 54, entitled an Act to incorporate the Canadian Telegraph Company, be committed to the Standing Committee on Railways and Telegraph Lines, with instructions to reconsider the Bill and report the same to this House.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria): I raise the question of order, as to whether notice of this motion should not be given. My reason in raising the question is, that the gentleman on whose motion the preamble was declared not to be proven, is not in his place at present, and I think it is only right that the reason upon which

the Committee thought fit to act should be stated to the House

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not think, in a matter of so much importance, it would be fair at this stage of the Session that the Bill should stand for the convenience of any member whoever he may be. I quite agree with the ground taken by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall). The House has not hitherto been in the habit of considering, as a first principle in a Bill, whether it was to promote undue competition or not. I took that objection in the Committee myself. It has been our practice to allow free scope to competition in railways, telegraphs or any other object of this kind. The fact that we had already passed a Bill, this Session, to incorporate a telegraph company seemed to me conclusive that no ground for objection should be taken to another similar Bill. It is not, of course, proper to refer to what took place in the Committee, or I would refer to the reasons given, which could hardly, in my opinion, be called reasons.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman might state what he, generally, has heard of objections to the Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE: I heard, for instance, in another place, respecting this Bill, that the names given were not of sufficient weight to justify us in considering any measure upon which they proposed competition. I differed entirely in that opinion; I think some of the best names in the country were there. It was also alleged that this Bill was sought for the purpose of forming a combination, which they could not do without having that Bill in their possession, as a threat to compel others to agree to their terms. That was the chief allegation, and, in fact, the only thing that could be called a reason that I heard against the passage of the Bill. The feeling, however, was so very strong in that quarter that it was found impossible to get more than two or three to express an adverse opinion. If Parliament had been in the habit of considering the question of competition, except incidentally, it would place the matter in a different light. I believe myself that there has been undue competition in railway building, and that, in some instances, it has prevented capital from being invested in more useful enterprises. Still

we have not refused to permit the increase of such enterprises. The hon. member for Halton remarked that this company could obtain a charter without coming to this House. It can, but of a limited character, under chapter 66 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, but that would practically be of no use, as the power only extends to Ontario and Quebec. In the meantime, I shall support the motion of the hon. member for Halton, on the grounds I have stated, for referring the Bill back to the Committee, but the hon. member should strike out the instructions to the Committee.

MR. BLAKE: I do not want to express any opinion on the merits of this Bill, but it seems to me such a course is not possible under our rules, except that this Bill should be referred back to the Committee. Unless upon the assent of the promoters of the Bill, I apprehend it is not possible for a Committee consistently with the rules and their duties, to make a report of that description.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria): The hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill made the motion in the usual way, and it was upon his request that it was done.

MR. BLAKE: We do not find any statement that this was done upon consent. In reference to this matter Rule 65 provides:

"When the Committee on any Private Bill report to the House that the preamble of such Bill has not been proved to their satisfaction, they must also state the grounds upon which they have arrived at such decision; and no Bill so reported upon shall be placed upon the Orders of the Day, unless by special order of the House.

"2. Private Bills, otherwise reported to the House by such Committee, shall be placed upon the Orders of the Day following the reception of the Report, for consideration in Committee of the Whole, in their proper order, next after Bills referred to a Committee of the Whole House."

If there was assent it ought to have been reported to us. Unless by assent, there were but two ways of dealing with it, either to report the preamble proved, and the clauses adopted with modification, or without, and to report the preamble not proved, and in that case to give the reasons why the preamble was adjudged to be not proven. Upon these reasons the House would have an opportunity of acting, and to decide whether, notwithstanding the Report of the Committee,

the Bill should be again placed upon the Orders of the Day. It seems to me, therefore, that the Report is irregular, and that the Bill should be referred back to the Committee, in order that it may be disposed of in accordance with the General Rules of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: There was a motion made in Committee that the preamble was not proved, and that was declared correct by the chairman. So the Report, as recorded in our Minutes, is not accurate.

MR. LANGEVIN: The statement made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is correct. The action of the Committee ought to have been reported here. As they have not drawn up the Report as it should have been drawn up, that may be a good reason to refer it back in order that the proper Report may be made. I do not agree with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) in the opinion that the Committee cannot take into consideration the policy of passing a Bill of this kind and throwing it out. We do that every day. The hon. gentleman was present when we had under consideration a Bill about a new charter for a railway through the counties of Huntington, Chateauguay, and another county. What was done in that case? The Committee said it was not a proper thing to have two competing lines there. We must see if the existing company conforms to its charter during the next year or so. The other day we had another charter asking for a railway from Emerson to the west. We found there were reasons why we should not pass that Bill, and after discussing the matter, if the promoter had not withdrawn the Bill we would have declared that the preamble was not proven. That is strictly within the rights and privileges of the Committee. We would not be a Committee if we could not state whether it was expedient to grant the prayer of the petitioner. I do not say that the hon. member for Halton may not be right in his way of construing the matter. He thinks we should have another company. A large majority of the Committee, however, considered that that was not expedient. They urged that we had already two companies in Canada, and that those two companies were working side by side in opposition to each other, that there was

perfect safety for the public service ; and I have heard also that there is not business enough in Canada to have another line in competition to the two others. Therefore, we could not grant the new charter. As to the motion itself, I believe the Report should have been fuller than it has been made, and I do not suppose the hon. the First Minister will object to a motion that will refer the Bill back to the Committee.

MR. CASEY : I think, in reference to the contention of the hon. member for Halton, that the practice is pretty clearly laid down in Todd's book on Private Bill Practice. The whole question of expediency has been left to the Committee, and I think it would require, for such a motion as the hon. member has made, that he should adduce very strong reasons why the action of the Committee should be reversed, because his proposition involves a rather startling change in our practice in these matters.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) : The motion of my hon. friend from Halton is, that the Report be recommitted to the Standing Committee on Railways, with instructions to reconsider the Bill and report the same to this House. That motion, in the form in which it now stands, coupled with the reasons my hon. friend adduced in support of it, amounts to a direct reproof of the Committee for its action in this matter, and if we have to discuss this question on the reasons adduced by my hon. friend, a great deal can be said why the decision of the Committee should be upheld. With regard to the ground taken by the hon. member for West Durham, I understand his view to be that, under the General Rules when a Committee reports a preamble not proven, they should also report the reason why they think it is not proven. That Report was presented yesterday and received by the House, and I submit that it is too late now to send it back to the Committee, and that, in fact, it is not necessary to send it back for any such purpose ; because the only report they could make, judging from what we are led to believe occurred before the Committee, would be that they find it is not expedient to grant the prayer of the petition. There can be no doubt that the Committee came to the conclusion that it was not expedient to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. LANGEVIN.

MR. BLAKE: That is what we want to know.

MR. CAMERON : I submit that it is not necessary to report any more than that they found the preamble not proven, because it was not expedient to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. BLAKE : They have to state the grounds.

MR. CAMERON : It was never intended by that Rule that a Committee should enter into an elaborate statement of the *pros* and *cons* which induced them not to grant the prayer of a petition. All the Committee have to report, for the information of the House, is as to the part of the preamble which they think is not proven. The principle laid down by my hon. friend from Halton is, that there should be Free-trade in charters for telegraph companies. I think it is a very vicious and dangerous principle to lay down that we shall have Free-trade in any kind of charters, because the result will be that charters will be applied for and obtained without any intention of organising a company, but with the sole object of making money out of the sale of the charter. We have seen some legislatures granting charters indiscriminately, and then a regular set of men springing up who are promoters of companies and charter-sellers. They obtain a charter and then offer it for sale in the money markets of the world, or go to other companies established for like purposes and say : " If you do not buy this charter we will establish a company in opposition to you." They levy blackmail by using the powers Parliament has thought fit to give them. I trust that will be a practice we shall ever be reluctant to adopt, and that we will never grant a new charter to a company unless we are satisfied that it is in the public interest that the company should be established, and that the persons asking for the charter have a *bonâ fide* intention of organising their company under it. In this particular case we may presume, from what has been said here, that the Committee was of opinion that there were already sufficient telegraph companies chartered and in existence, that we have already chartered another company to carry on business in Manitoba and the North-West, and to extend their line to British Columbia, and that the telegraphic

wants of the Dominion are amply served by existing organisations, and that it was not in the public interest that another company should be chartered. My hon. friend has thought fit to make some remarks about one of the companies in existence, which he says has already been sold out to Jay Gould. His statement is entirely incorrect. Having some professional connection with the company I am in a position to state that the company has not been sold out to Jay Gould. Jay Gould's connection with the company is simply his subscription for some \$230,000 worth of stock, which is less than one-quarter of the whole stock. There were \$230,000 odd of stock not subscribed for. Mr. Gould subscribed for that stock at a certain price, paid in the money and is now, unless he has disposed of it, a stockholder for less than one-quarter of the capital stock of the company. He paid that money in cash and it was used, so far as necessary, in paying off its floating debt and in extending its lines throughout the country. Since that transaction the company has negotiated a lease with one of those companies which my hon. friend describes as "one of the gigantic companies in the United States now carrying on a telegraphic war there." The Dominion Company, under that lease, works in connection with the American Union Company, in just the same way and with just the same arrangement that the Montreal Company works in connection with the Western Union Company. No one, I think, can say that the public of Canada have not ample telegraphic facilities provided for them. In fact, many believe that we have too much telegraphic facility, and that our cities and towns are too full of telegraph poles; and there has been a good deal of discussion in the Committee this year, as to the propriety of allowing the telegraph companies that are now in existence, to extend their connections any further through the cities and towns of the Dominion, because it was felt that they were actually becoming a nuisance instead of a public advantage. I do not know what position we would be placed in if we had another company chartered. I suppose the new company would have to put their posts down the middle of the road, as the existing companies have their posts down each side of

the roads in every city and town throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. My hon. friend from Lambton is in error in saying that the financial standing of the gentlemen, whose names appear in the petition, was impugned. What was questioned was the *bonâ fide* intention of organising a company and of using their own money in the creation of a new telegraph company. The Committee have not had their eyes closed to a series of newspaper articles that have been going the rounds of the Press, from one end of the country to the other, raising the bugbear of the proposed or intended amalgamation between the existing companies, and saying: "Oh, you must grant this charter to the Canadian Telegraph Company, because if you do not, you will find yourselves placed at the mercy of Jay Gould, or some other capitalist who is going to buy up the existing companies." It has been stated by an officer of one of the companies that the rumour of the intended amalgamation had not the slightest foundation whatever, and that there was not the remotest possibility, in view of the existing state of things, of any amalgamation or union, or policy, or anything of the kind between the two companies. My hon. friend has said that two companies are carrying on a bitter and an active warfare in the United States, and that one of these American companies controls and is connected with one of our companies, and the other with the other, and that the said warfare is being carried on here. It is admitted that we have all the telegraphic facilities we want, and that we have no occasion to be alarmed by the idea that we are going to be at the mercy of any capitalist, or any one of those two companies; and unless we are prepared to admit that another company is a public necessity, it seems to me Parliament would be only exercising a wise discrimination in declining to grant this new charter. For these reasons I think the motion in this shape should not be adopted. As to the objection of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I think it is a technical objection as to form, and should have been raised at the time the Report was presented.

MR. MACDOUGALL: I have no objection to alter the motion in any way so as to get the matter before the whole

Committee. It is important that it should be fully discussed before a full Committee. There was not a quorum.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) : It was insisted on, the Committee going on without a quorum.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : As the House knows that there was no quorum, I think that settles the question. I think the point taken by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) that the grounds ought to have been stated in the Report, is correct. I do not suppose the Committee should be compelled to enter into full reasons, but there must be some general ground stated, and the ground for the declaration of the Committee that it is expedient, will satisfy the Rules. I think that it must be held that the reference should be, as my hon. friend from Halton says, a general reference back to the Committee, as if it had never been sent there before.

Motion agreed to, and Bill recommitteed.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill (*from the Senate*) was introduced, and read the first time :—

Bill (No. 112) To explain and further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—
(*Mr. Bousell.*)

SUPPLY.

XXIV. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

160 Geological Survey.....	\$50,000
161 To meet probable expenditure in consequence of the transfer of Museum from Montreal to Ottawa.....	5,000

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the Government had, subject to the decision of Parliament, arranged to purchase the old Clarendon Hotel for the purpose of using it as the office of the Geological Survey Department here. It was proposed to move the head-quarters of the Survey to Ottawa, in accordance with the power given under the late Government, and the expressed intention of the Government last Session. The premises had been obtained at a reasonable price, and the removal was intended to take place this summer. It was not intended to deprive Montreal of a Geological Museum.

MR. MACDOUGALL.

There would still be a Museum there as well as at Ottawa. It was thought that the Department could afford to have a Museum in each place.

MR. MACKENZIE asked if the right hon. gentleman could say if arrangements had been made for the work of the present season, and where the officials were to be chiefly engaged.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that perhaps the information could be given in concurrence.

Vote agreed to.

XXV. INDIANS.

Ontario and Quebec.

162 {	Annual Grants :—	
	For Indians of Quebec.....	\$3,200
	For purchase of blankets for aged and infirm Indians of Ontario and Quebec.....	1,600
	For Indian schools in Ontario and Quebec.....	5,000
	For Annuities under the Robinson Treaty.....	14,000

MR. SCRIVER asked what was the present position of affairs in reference to the annuities under the Robinson Treaty, an amount of which there had been a large arrear due from the Province of Ontario to the Dominion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought it stood very much as it did last year. The Government had certain means of paying themselves, but was not desirable to press that course except in case of absolute necessity. He hoped the Boundary question and this would be settled together.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said a portion of the land included in the Robinson Treaty was within the claim set upon in reference to the Boundary ; but it was only a very small portion of that land—not so much as to make it material.

MR. DAWSON said that the claims of the Indians of Lakes Huron and Superior formed, in fact, a lien on the land, and that as the Government of Ontario received the revenues of the land, that Government should be called upon to meet the arrears due to the Indians. On a fair consideration of the circumstances it would be found that there was a considerable sum still due, in the way of arrears, to the Indians, and it was unfair to keep it from them. Ontario should

be brought to a sense of her obligations in this regard. He was confident that if the matter was understood the Indians would be waid.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Government would endeavour to do this.

MR. SCRIVER asked if the Government had under consideration the case of the Oka Indians, with a view to the settlement of the difficulties existing for many years past. He had, when the late Government were in power, suggested a mode of settlement which was more feasible and reasonable.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What was that?

MR. SCRIVER said his suggestion was that a portion of land in the unoccupied territory in the North-West should be set aside for those Indians, and that they should be assisted by a reasonable grant of money to aid them in removing, and to enable them to construct dwellings for occupation. The gentlemen at the Seminary were willing to give them a considerable sum of money if the Indians would remove, but the sum offered was not sufficient to warrant their friends in concluding that they should accept it; it was not sufficient to aid in their removal, to enable them to erect comfortable dwellings and obtain agricultural implements and other things necessary to give them a fair start in life. He trusted the present Government would take the matter into their consideration, and that some good settlement would be made which would be satisfactory to the gentlemen of the Seminary and to the Indians themselves.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is right in stating that this important question, which has caused so much heart-burning, should be settled. One mode of settlement suggested was that a tract of land should be given to these Indians on the Upper Ottawa. The gentlemen of the Seminary agreed to contribute \$20,000, as they would have the lands, the money to be used in transferring the Indians from one locality to another. The Indians declined that, as being altogether insufficient. The case is still pending in the Courts, though Mr. McLaren, who has been acting for the last and the present Government, has been continually urged to lose no opportunity of pushing the matter forward and

obtaining a final adjudication as fast as possible. The gentlemen of the Seminary, standing on their rights, are defending the action which, hitherto, has not been brought forward in the Courts successfully, or in a way to secure a judgment on the question of the title of the Seminary and the right of the Indians under the grant. It is to be hoped a judgment will be obtained ere long. I can give no assurance that the matter will be settled early. As to sending the Indians to the North-West, it would be expensive, and I am not sure it would be received with favour by the whites or Indians already there. The Oka Indians would be strangers, and, scarcely, improving settlers.

MR. SCRIVER: I am afraid that the suit now pending before the Courts will not settle the question of title. I am so informed by Mr. McLaren himself, and that he is eager to bring such a suit before the Courts as will settle that question. There are some technical difficulties, which I understand, can be removed only by the action of the Government, which action has been solicited so far in vain.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government, through the Department of Justice, have pressed for the settlement of a special case between the Seminary and the Indians, for the purpose of a decision by the Supreme Court. That action has not yet resulted in a settlement of the case. The gentlemen of the Seminary have expressed their willingness to have a case submitted for adjudication on the question of title.

MR. DAWSON said it was at one time intended to send the Oka Indians to Algoma, but he could assure the House that they would be unwelcome guests in that district. There were already numerous bands of Indians there who were their hereditary enemies. If they were sent there the Government would have to support them, for he (Mr. Dawson) knew of no way in which they could earn a living. They knew nothing of fishing in such an open sea as Lake Huron, as their lives had hitherto been spent on sheltered streams and little inland lakes. There was a demand for their labour here as raftsmen and voyageurs. At Lake Huron, or at Lake Superior, there was but little going on in the lumber trade,

so that they would have little or no employment in the service with which they were best acquainted. It would be better to keep them in Lower Canada.

Vote agreed to.

Nova Scotia.

163 Indians of Nova Scotia generally.. \$4,500

New Brunswick.

164 Indians of New Brunswick generally..... 4,500

MR. ANGLIN said those Indians were making no progress towards civilisation. Nothing had been done, except in one or two places, to induce them to settle down to habits of industry, or engage in agricultural pursuits. Only one or two attempts were made to establish schools, the Indians being, on the whole, illiterate. The present mode of distributing the money was unsatisfactory, and it did little good, being doled out in small sums. The salaries and travelling expenses of the two Indian Commissioners absorbed nearly one-third of the grant. The old system of gratuitous distribution, under the Catholic priests, was far more beneficial to the Indians, who are Catholics. He would ask, in behalf of those poor Indians, for a better management and distribution of their Fund. Much more could be done to civilise them and train them to industry.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Has the Report respecting Indians affairs yet made its appearance?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It has been ready for some time, with the exception of a Return from the North-West, for which it has been waiting.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: It is difficult to discuss these items without the Report or sufficient information. There is none in the Estimates.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The vote is merely a repetition of that of last and the preceding year. The Department was so well managed by my predecessor that I have continued the old practices and votes.

MR. MILLS: The right hon. gentleman made a speech in Ottawa lately, in which he expressed a different opinion, speaking disparagingly of its management under myself, and highly of its management under my successor, the present Minister. I do not know whether he is now forming a less unjust opinion of the late and

MR. DAWSON.

a lower opinion of the present Minister's management or not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Perhaps a little of both.

MR. MILLS: It is not creditable to the present Minister that the Report is not yet produced. It used to be submitted at the beginning of the Session. These delays in the furnishing of information should not be tolerated.

Vote agreed to.

Prince Edward Island.

165 Indians of Prince Edward Island generally \$2,055

British Columbia.

166 { Indians of British Columbia generally 26,788
{ Surveys and Reserve Commission 24,140

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: How is it proposed to dispose of this sum? It is the same amount as voted last year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It will be applied after the same fashion as the previous votes. There will be a change, however, in the system of management. The Superintendency of the Indians was divided into two branches—the Mainland and the Island Agency. We have thought it better to have the Indians under one Superintendent. The late officer will be retained under him. Mr. Trutch, who was long Commissioner of Public Lands in that Province, and has had a great deal to do with the management of Indian affairs, has been appointed in the place of Mr. Sprout, who has resigned. Mr. Trutch will have the management of the railway lands to be assigned by the Province to the Dominion for the construction of the Pacific Railway. He will be charged by the hon. the Minister of Railways with the supervising of any portion of the Railway built in British Columbia.

MR. MILLS: Will the right hon. gentleman say, whether the amount taken last year to pay for surveys, is likely to be expended before the expiration of the present year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It will cover the year to the 1st July next.

MR. MILLS: There was a small appropriation last year. How has it been

expended? Is it adequate or more than adequate?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It has not all been expended, but I am informed it will probably all be expended by the 1st of July, of this year.

MR. MILLS: We do not know the extent to which the reservations have been surveyed. It was expected that those amounts were required for the purpose of surveying the Indian reservations. If the sum has been absorbed in the expenses of the Commission, and the surveys are not made, it will require a much larger sum to complete the operations, and it would be very desirable to know whether these reservations have already been let out by the surveyors accompanying the Commission, or what remains to be done, and what further expenditure will be required in connection with the surveys of the Reserve.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The surveys are now going on. The Commissioner has a regular staff of surveyors under his control for that purpose. I believe the reserves have been for the most part blocked out. I must say that I was horrified to see the amount asked for, and this is a case in which there has been a waste of money, not only last year but in previous years, and a stop must, I think, be put to it. This is one of the instances in which the practical knowledge of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will be of service to the Government and the House, in order to prevent unnecessary expenditure. It is proposed, as the Indians are to be put upon the Reserves, instead of sending expensive resident local agents, to employ practical farmers who will clear the reservations, and to whom a small pecuniary sum will be paid, and who will assist the Indians generally in their new life—which I believe they are adopting to a very considerable extent—that of cultivation of the soil.

MR. MILLS: Our whole system of Indian Administration for the past half century has, I think, been one tending to make the Indians a dependent population, instead of civilising them and making them self-reliant. Mr. Duncan, in British Columbia, has been very successful in leading the Indians under his charge to be self-supporting. I think some effort should be made to diminish our Indian expenditure. It is out of all proportion

to what it ought be, and there is no indication of any diminution in the expense for the future. I think the policy of the Government should be to so far throw the Indians upon their own resources as to make them a self-reliant and self-supporting population at an early day. Our policy has been in the past not to secure a survival of the fittest, but a survival of everybody, to put the industrious and enterprising upon an equality with the careless and the idle. I have no doubt but that the Indian Administration in the older Provinces can be very much improved. I do not know a settlement in those Provinces where the Indians do not stand in antagonism to the white population; they are certainly not a favourite class with the people in their immediate neighbourhood. Another matter which should be considered is, whether it is right and proper that they should be released from meeting their obligations, particularly contracts for necessaries with the white population. I think the result of that immunity has been largely to demoralise the Indians, and I am of the opinion that the whole of this matter should be carefully reconsidered by the Government, and that the subject should be dealt with afresh. I have no doubt that if Municipal Government were, to some extent, introduced among them, if the Indians of each reservation were required to elect some sort of Council, and bear some amount of taxation, not as a part of an ordinary municipal Government, but as a separate and distinct municipality, if they were required to provide for their roads and bridges, and for the maintenance of their schools, a great deal would be done in the way of making them self-reliant and industrious. I know many instances where Indians have left their reservations, and gone among the white population, where they have been taxed in the same way as the other citizens; and I have seen that while those Indians were no way superior to the rest of their race, they have become much more prosperous than those who remained on their Reserves. I think our past system has had a tendency to put the Indians in a worse, instead of in a better position. In the North-West, where we have such a large Indian population, if they are led to look to the community for their sup-

port, and are, therefore, degraded, it will be a source of a great deal of future mischief. Not only should this question be considered, but the whole should receive the careful consideration of the Government, for I feel certain that, if the Indians were subjected to a larger extent to the responsibilities that devolve upon the white population, they would be benefitted to a proportionate degree. At present the course is a downward one, and the degradation will be sure to go on very rapidly.

MR. BLAKE: I think the subject to which my hon. friend has adverted cannot too early or too seriously engage the attention of the Administration. Whatever we may think as to the policy which has guided the management of the Indians in the older Provinces, there is really a very grave question, both socially and financially, as to the Indians of the North-West. You are expending about \$550,000 annually upon the Indians, and \$300,000 for the Mounted Police, the principle cause of which was to protect the settlers and overhaul the Indians, peaceable though they generally are. You are thus approximating to the expenditure of \$1,000,000 a year for the management of the Indians in the North-West. Their food supplies, as hunters, are diminishing yearly and rapidly. The buffalo does not come to the prairies as he formerly did. The hon. gentleman opposite has had to ask for a special vote of \$200,000 to feed the starving people, not only from motives of humanity, but because the Indians will not starve so long as they can divide among themselves the grain of the settlers. We are in a very serious condition in regard to this matter. We may be subjected to this serious charge for an annual fund, and, in that case, we are training the Indians to look to us for aid. They know that to this wealthy Dominion, if the buffalo does not arrive, they are to look, to supply the food which they would obtain if the herds of buffalo were accessible, and that impression will grow. I am, of course, not complaining of what has been done in the past by either Government, but I think it is not too late to endeavour to retrace our steps, and at the earliest moment to implant in the minds of the Indians a spirit of independence and

responsibility—to endeavour, as far as we can, to point out to them the opportunities open to them for earning a livelihood in other ways, and substituting that for the spirit of reliance upon the Government. At present they believe that if they fail in their endeavours to get their own living, there is an inexhaustible fund from which the Great Mother will supply them with food. This is not a hopeless task. I had a conversation with Mr. Maurice, the late Lieutenant-Governor, in which he told me of an Indian who imported direct from Great Britain what he required, and not deal with middlemen at all. This may be an exception, but it shows that there are instances of self-reliance among Indians, which may be more numerous than we are aware of. I have read accounts of the degree of independence shown by the Indians in British Columbia, and of the power of trading and acquiring property, which have been developed among them. I think we should turn our attention more than we have in the past towards making the Indians more responsible and self-reliant, instead of teaching them to rely on us for everything, otherwise we shall have an increasing expense and a more degraded, instead of a less degraded, population.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo): I agree, to a great extent, with the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), but I do not agree with the observations of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in reference to giving the Indians municipal government for themselves. Within two years there was a chief of a tribe in British Columbia, who was getting too old, and the Indians wished to elect a younger man in his place. I met the young man, and asked him if the tribe were going to make him chief. He said they would if he desired it, but he did not want to work for nothing; if they paid him, he did not mind being the chief. He told me he had been interpreting for the Indian Commission for some time, but he did not want to be a "tyhee" and not get pay for it. The Indians of British Columbia are, to some extent, a self-sustaining class. They work industriously; they fish in the rivers they work in the mines; they hunt in the forests; they cut cordwood for

the steamers; they drive ox teams to Cariboo, and are in fact indefatigable in the summer season. Of course, as soon as they have \$200 or \$300 in cash coming to them, they will go back home. We have made a mistake in this Indian Commission business, which I believe was inaugurated when the hon. member for Bothwell was Minister of the Interior. We have given them more land than they can cultivate. If an Indian is kept in a moderate space he will cultivate his land very well, but if he is given too great a number of acres he will ask for more, and a great deal of dissatisfaction is now felt in British Columbia about the reserves which have been given to Indians. I do not advocate the American idea of driving the Indians to the reserves and telling them to stay there. That system would not be tolerated in our Province. The Indians are the most independent class that I know of. Forty or fifty of them will go at a time to the mines with their horses during the summer season, they will work very hard, and, as a rule, make more than the white man in packing over the mountains. The trouble is that sometimes they get in with Chinamen who supply them with whiskey. We have had no case but one of an Indian murderer in the upper country since the Chilicoten outbreak of 1864. The Indians are peaceable, and they know that if a white man steals an Indian's horse, or breaks into an Indian's house, the white man is amenable to the law as much as the Indian is; and they also know if they commit a breach of the peace they are also amenable as much as the white man, and that, in fact, they are in the same position, except as to voting, as the white men who rule the country. They are satisfied with their lot, if you do not bring too many Commissioners among them, and tell them they are to rule the whole country. Last winter an unfortunate outbreak occurred in British Columbia, in which some half-breed boys, the youngest of whom was sixteen, and the eldest twenty-four years of age, murdered a constable, then murdered another man who was herding sheep, and wounded two persons who were sent in pursuit of them. The oldest of those half-breeds was married to the daughter of an Indian chief. There are several Indians and half-breeds

scattered along the border who are ready to make an outbreak. They steal horses on both sides, and then run across the border. One of these Indians went to the head chief of the Nicola tribe, and said: These half-breeds have gone out on the war path. We have plenty of Indians here now to clean out all the whites. What did the old chief say? "Suppose we kill off all the white men, who can make the flour, the tobacco, the tea, sugar, and the blankets which we need?" This mode of reasoning silenced the warlike Indian. That is the class of Indians we have amongst us.

MR. ORTON: I have received a letter from a friend in British Columbia, making complaints in reference to the management of Indian lands. I will just read an extract:

"Mr. Sproat, the Dominion Land Agent here, has been making great havoc with the settlement of the lands, giving to Indians all the land that was of any good for settlement and that was not previously preempted. His decisions have caused universal dissatisfaction among the whites. To a white friend in this valley he gave 500 acres of pasture land in exchange for about six acres of meadow for some Indians."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: These complaints are very natural. The whites think the Indians get too much and the Indians think they do not get enough. Government have to hold the balance and see that the Indian is protected. In fact, Government is the guardian of the Indians. It is quite true, as has been said, that the Indians are too apt to throw themselves upon the Government, and the more they receive support the less self-reliant they will be. It is a choice of two evils. We cannot allow them to starve, and we cannot make them white-men. All we can do is to endeavour to induce them to abandon their nomadic habits, and settle down and cultivate the soil. The Crown is continually obliged to resist the pressure to deprive the Indians of their lands. I have no doubt my predecessor has found that civilisation and improvement in the vicinity of an Indian Reserve, have been much retarded by the fact of the Indian Reserve being there, and by reason of the slatternly and slovenly mode of farming by the Indians. It is a great injury to any portion of the country to have an Indian Reserve in its midst. They have no municipal institutions.

They cannot be expected to be weaned away suddenly from the habits of their ancestors. But there has been considerable progress made, and chiefly among the prairie Indians of the North-West. I think that, from the evidence we have, the Indians are impressed with the idea that their former supply of food has disappeared, and they must take up the habits of the white men in order to supply their wants. As to the question of my hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), as far as I can see Mr. Sproat tried to see that the Indians got the full allowance of land, and perhaps, in some cases, an excessive allowance, for all I know. It is his duty to see that they get the full and fair allowance of land, and that it should be fit for cultivation. It would be wrong to sell these poor people, whom we are trying to induce to become agriculturists, lands unfit for cultivation. However, these matters have come up, and it is proper to discuss them.

Vote agreed to.

169 Grist Mill \$3,000

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This is for the purpose of erecting a grist mill. There is a good deal of grain grown there now, and they have no means of grinding the wheat which is raised. It has been thought well to put up a mill for the purpose of helping the inhabitants who have gone in there to get their ground. It will be used as a grist mill and saw mill. We have secured the services of a man from Ontario, who will, it is expected, purchase the mill as soon as he is able to do so.

MR. BLAKE: I am wholly opposed to the notion that we are to supply facilities to the settlers up there in the way of building grist mills and running them. It will form a bad precedent for similar operations in other parts of the North-West. It would be better to subsidise a private individual.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There are two very good farms up there which have been cultivated for some years, and which would be almost valueless unless there is some means of grinding wheat. The population is too sparse for us to expect a person to go there and invest his money in building a mill on his own account.

Vote agreed to.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

170 Provisions for Indians assembled to receive annuity payments for destitute Indians, etc. \$130,686

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: This is an enormous increase on the vote of last year. I suppose it is partly in connection with the destitution which arose. I would like to know if there is any possibility of getting rid of the wasteful practice of sustaining large bodies of Indians at the public expense.

MR. SCHULTZ: Of course, Mr. Chairman, any discussion upon this item is had with disadvantage, in the absence of the Report of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Department. That Report, it is to be hoped, will contain some scheme which will save to the country the enormous amount of money which is now being expended for this purpose. I agree with the hon. members for South Huron and Bothwell in their expressions of alarm at this continually increasing expenditure, but, at the same time, I hardly regard it as fair in the hon. member for Bothwell to attempt to throw the responsibility of this heavy expenditure on his right hon. successor in office. That hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the necessity for this expenditure commenced with the sanction, by the late Administration, of one of the vicious conditions of Treaty No. 6, made when that hon. gentleman held office, and the result of the clause—agreeing that the Government should furnish food in times of scarcity—was followed by a vote for that purpose at the very next Session of Parliament, and we have found the constant occurrence of a similar necessity at every Session since, till the vote has reached its present alarming proportions. Of course the gradual disappearance of the buffalo has acted to some extent in this direction, but I am afraid the main cause has been the belief of the Indians, that they might henceforward depend upon the Government, and they ceased to make those exertions, which, in former occasions of temporary absence of the buffalo, had been found to be sufficient to sustain them. I believe, however, that the question: of what shall be done to provide food for the Indians of the plains, will have to be grappled with at once. The buffalo which, hard pressed as they have been on all sides, have

sought refuge on the other side of the line, return so infrequently as to make them no longer a factor in the problem of food supply for our prairie tribes. I have no faith in the present efforts, in an agricultural direction, being likely to save us to any great extent from the necessity of feeding the Indians with imported food; and I believe that I am supported by most of the Roman Catholic clergy, and ministers of other denominations, who labour among them as missionaries, in the view that it is practically impossible to convert the adult Indian from his habits of the chase to the peaceful tillage of the soil at one step, and if this is the case, we have seriously to consider whether, in going on to locate and improve the present reserves, we are not making a serious mistake. I believe that, in view of the possibility of the right hon. Minister not having decided upon any definite scheme, a discussion of this nature, calculated as it is to elicit the opinions of those who have made the subject a study, it is the duty of everyone to express an opinion upon this difficult subject, and in offering my own, I commence with the assumption that the buffalo has ceased to exist as a source of certain supply of food to the Blackfeet and plain Crees. Roughly speaking, the Indian population of the whole of the prairie country, between the boundary line and the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is destitute of winter food, who now haunt the Mounted Police Stations and Indian Agencies, with all the consequent demoralisation, of which we have heard so much. While it is a fact that this starving condition exists among our plain Indians, their brethren of the wood are living in comparative plenty, and the difference is especially noticeable in the Crees of the prairie and the wood Crees. These two sections of our North-West population are the same people, speak the same language, and yet, while the horseman starves, he of the snowshoe, the trap, and the paddle, thrives, and is living in peace by some lake or stream, whose waters yield him fish when other food fails. Now, it so happens that north of located line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the confines of our fertile belt, and at the commencement of the immense wooded area, which, extending to the

Arctic Sea, is the last remaining haunt of fur-bearing animals on this continent, there exists the conditions whereby we may allow the Indian of the plains to indulge his love of the chase with profit to himself and relief to us in the matter of expenditure in the winter, when agricultural operations are impossible, without interference with such efforts as are at present being made to teach him the arts of a farmer. Believing as I do, Sir, that the attempt to suddenly convert the horse-riding, buffalo-hunting, plain-Indian suddenly into a farmer, I am opposed to the plan of making reserves in the region I have mentioned. This region is one which will be soon wanted for a white population, and the attempt to make its Indian population self-sustaining in the next ten years, by their efforts at agriculture, will fail, and the failure will entail a constant recurrence of the present expenditure, with probably a still larger increase. I believe the only available solution of the problem to be the transference of all our plain Indians to the district I have mentioned, located near the great fishing lakes of that region, where there would be absent none of the conditions necessary for successful agriculture, while the advance in the science of pisciculture would enable us to abundantly stock these lakes, which are not already supplied, with whitefish, thus forming for him a basis of supply which is found to be sufficient for all the different tribes of wood Indians. I believe, too, that physically and morally, this change would benefit the Indians, and the removal of all of our Indians from the neighbourhood of the boundary line would be to effectually prevent the possibility of collision with the American tribes, and, in part, the necessity of our very expensive Police Force. It must be remembered that our Blackfeet, peaceful and quiet as they have been as yet, are but another branch of the powerful, warlike and treacherous "Dakotah" nation to which the Sioux belong. With their removal north of the line of Railway we clear ourselves from the danger of their contact with the refugee Sioux, and we place them beyond the power of aid from the American branches of the same nation, and where the Railway gives us the power to strike hard in case

the good relations which now exist should ever be disturbed. To civilise the Indians you must begin with the young; and while I am in favour of every effort that will bring him within the pale of Christianity and civilisation, I do not go the length of my hon. friend from Bothwell in his view of municipal institutions for the Indians. Danger commences with the Indian when he gets in council, and I am afraid that we must take a good many preliminary steps first before he is ripe for this luxury of civilisation. I desire to call attention, however, to the pernicious and expensive practice of paying the Indians away from their reserves. This is done generally to suit the convenience of the agent, and is expensive to the Government, without being of any advantage, but, in many cases, a very great disadvantage to the Indians, and the Department should insist on a rigid performance of this duty by its agents. Again, there is no doubt but that the practice of paying to the Indians bank bills of a large denomination has had the effect, in many instances, of exposing him to fraud by unscrupulous traders, and I would urge that, in future, no bill of larger denomination than one dollar be used at any of the payments. I trust that the right hon. Minister will receive these suggestions in the spirit they are offered, and that by a careful consideration of the means by which we can raise him to the condition of a self-sustaining citizen of our common country, Canada may continue to merit the praise justly bestowed upon her for her treatment of this race, whose destinies we hold in our hands.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I agree with very much what my hon. friend has just said, and I am exceedingly obliged to him for his interesting statement. He opens up a large question when he suggests the moving of the whole of the Indians from that portion of the country where their ancestors lived, to another portion. Unless the Indians would consent to that course, a pressure, almost hostile, would have to be employed before they could be induced to leave the regions where they and their forefathers had roamed for a more northerly part of the country. However, if they could be induced to go it would be a great

advantage, and it would relieve the whole of that region from the disadvantage of an Indian population. It is a subject that is worthy of all consideration, and I shall endeavour to give it my best thought. I am glad to inform the hon. gentleman that we have anticipated his last proposition, that the Indians should be paid in bills of small denominations. It has been decided by the Government that all payments made either to Indians or the Mounted Police shall be made in bills of \$1, so that the Indian, when he gets a piece of paper will know exactly what its value is. I cordially agree with my hon. friend in his statement that the agent should go to the Indians, and not the Indians, in a large body, to the agent. Orders have already gone forth that agents shall pay the Indians on their reserves.

In reply to Mr. MILLS,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, as the agents had been instructed to pay the Indians on their reserves, the expenditure for food would be but trifling. They could not abandon the custom of giving the Indians food when they were paid. He supposed they would get some food on the day they were paid, and that would be an end of it, consequently there would be a wonderful saving. The estimated expenditure for feeding Indians was \$21,000.

MR. TROW: I fail to understand why such a large expenditure should be incurred in feeding Indians yearly after the Treaty is made. I can readily understand that when a Treaty is pending or negotiations are going on, several days are employed, invariably taken up in discussions, and then food must be allowed to the Indians. It is the custom of all nations to do so. I know at times there is unnecessary waste and lavish expenditure in this respect. During my tour in the North-West, I visited Q'Appelle. Probably from three to four thousand Indians were assembled to receive their pay under Treaty No. 6. They had a regular jollification, and the paymaster had to feed them for five days before they would accept of their pay. Generally speaking, at such gatherings, the Indians have numerous imaginary complaints to make: such as provisions, tobacco, blankets or ammunition, was not as represented. All such complaints are

made through an Interpreter, occupying much time. I believe there was an understanding that, from the moment the paymaster arrived at the place appointed for payment, he should feed them a day or two days, but they will not accept their pay so long as they get fed for five or six days; and after receiving their paltry pittance, they immediately purchase useless trinkets, such as brass rings, pipes, beads of little or no value, etc., from traders.

MR. MILLS: I think if the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Schultz), looks at the Returns brought down, he will see that he is not accurate in his assertion as to the cause of this large expenditure. Treaty No. 6 was not negotiated, but it was ratified, while I was Minister of the Interior. It contained a provision declaring that the Indians, during a period of great scarcity or unforeseen misfortune in famine, should have their wants supplied by the Government. I thought it very objectionable, and the Government thought so too; but they were obliged to consider whether more serious difficulties might not arise by refusing to ratify the Treaty. The Indians could not be made to understand that anything further was necessary to confirm the Treaty. They regarded it as being completed when it received the signature of Governor Morris and the signature of their Chief. That was the state of affairs; and very serious complications might have arisen if the Government had refused to ratify the Treaty, because the Indians would certainly have misconstrued such a refusal. There was the possible danger of their construing this provision of the Treaty, as a license to indulge in idleness; although subsequent events have not shown that that danger has yet arisen. The expenditure of the year, however objectionable it might be, arose partly from the actual wants of the Indians, and largely from the supplies not being forwarded soon enough to pay the Indians at the time fixed. Difficulties will occasionally arise in that country, so long as the present state of things exist. The rainy seasons will sometimes prevent the rapid forwarding of supplies, and serious expense will be incurred for feeding the Indians until they are located upon reservations. It seems this was the case during the past

year. I do not see how the hon. the First Minister can account for these extraordinary expenses as being occasioned by the Indians having remained in idleness, and made extraordinary demands through a misinterpretation of this Treaty. The Returns show that this is not the case.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I did not.

MR. MILLS: I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that he agreed with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Schultz) in what he said.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I said I agreed with much of what the hon. gentleman said.

MR. MILLS: I think, then, that the House must understand that the right hon. gentleman did not agree with the hon. member for Lisgar on this point.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am not able to say whether the conclusions of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Schultz) were correct or not on that point, because I have not the information to enable me to judge.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): The provision in Treaty No. 6, referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for Lisgar, is certainly a most unfortunate one, and ought never to have been agreed to by the Indian Commissioners; but once authorised by them, and the Indians believing it to be final, and equally a part of the agreement as any other portion of it, it became practically impossible for the hon. the Minister of the Interior, or the Government of which he was a member, to disallow it. The dissatisfaction, not only of the Indians included in that Treaty, but of those throughout the Territory generally, would have been so intense as to have caused far greater difficulty than that arising from allowing it to pass, bad as it was. The hon. member for Lisgar recommends, as the best mode of getting rid of the Indian difficulty, and of the necessity for supplying them with food during periods when the buffalo fail them, that they should be removed bodily further north to the district bordering on the wooded country, where, he says, they would get an ample supply of fish from the lakes. Now the hon. gentleman ought to know, that, even were it possible so to change the habits of the Indians, in a moment, as to

fit them for removal for the north, the conditions of life would be entirely different from what they are in the plains. He must be aware that the plain or prairie Indians are horsemen, who never dream of walking even a mile when they can ride that distance, and have lived by the chase of the buffalo as far back as we have any knowledge of the country, while the wood Crees and other Indians living in the more northern parts, necessarily use the snowshoe, only during the winter, the country there being entirely unfit for the use of horses, and a change to a fish diet, even were it possible to obtain a sufficient quantity of this latter food, they would not willingly be brought to adopt. But we have the best means of knowing that scarcity of food is felt quite as much, or even more, in the district so highly spoken of by the hon. member, as in that at present occupied by the Indians he proposes to remove; and the only reason that this does not come so markedly before the public is, that the natives in the Athabaska and adjoining districts are, comparatively, few in number, and have the benefit of being very largely assisted by the Hudson's Bay Company. And yet, notwithstanding this, and all the aid the Hudson's Bay Company can give them, we know that many cases of death by starvation occur year after year, and this, unfortunately, has been the case during the past winter to a far greater extent than hon. members have any idea of. Starvation throughout the whole of the Saskatchewan is no new experience, as the Hudson's Bay Company, for many years back, have, from time to time, been obliged to give largely for the support of the Indians; and in that particular district of country, instead of realising a profit from their trade, they have frequently, during one year, sustained an actual loss of from \$50,000 to \$80,000. It is, therefore, to be hoped that the Government will not attempt to carry out the recommendation of the hon. member, as, even could the change be made, the result would not be otherwise than disastrous in the extreme. It is not desirable that the Indians should be collected in large numbers in any one place, for the purpose of being paid their annuities, as these payments can be made more conveniently and at much less expense on the several

reserves, and the agents can have no difficulty in carrying this out. The question of paying these annuities in small bills of one and two dollars may, perhaps, be an improvement, as the smaller notes would be found more convenient for both Indians and traders; but when the hon. member for Lisgar says that the Indians would as readily give a four or five dollar bill as a one or two dollar note for an article of small value, he certainly does not give them due credit for that amount of shrewdness and intelligence which he and all others who have had any dealings with them know them to possess. Still the small bills are good enough in their way, and the trial will do no harm, although it will hardly have the effect of adding greatly to their means of supporting themselves.

Vote agreed to.

171 Triennial supply of clothing for chiefs and headmen, Treaties 4 and 7.....	\$2,806
172 Salaries of school teachers and cost of school buildings.....	11,000

In reply to Mr. MILLS,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the same policy, in reference to the subject matter of this vote, was in practice, as under the late Administration.

MR. MILLS said he understood that the Inspectorship over the Agencies had been done away with altogether, Mr. McColl being the superintendent.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said Mr. McColl was still the Inspector, besides having assumed the general superintendence. Things were otherwise kept exactly as they were under the late Administration, and would continue so until a better organisation could be put in operation.

MR. MILLS said that, under the system of the late Government, the inspector's duty was not to make any purchases, but simply to inspect or supervise what was done by the superintendents or agents, and make his Report accordingly, showing what supplies were forwarded and the condition in which they were received; and it was considered that, having nothing to do with the purchases himself, he would be in a position to exercise a proper supervision, because he would have no possible motive or interest in mitigating any mistake committed by any of the officers purchasing the supplies. Mr.

MR. SMITH.

McCull, however, who had been put in an office at Winnipeg, being in the double position of superintendent and inspector, could hardly inform the Government that he had made any mistake with reference to the supplies, as to whether they were as good as they ought to be, or according to sample, or whether they were forwarded in proper condition and in good time. Certainly the present practice was not a proper one. It did not appear possible that the superintendent at Winnipeg, who had to attend to the purchasing of supplies, would be in a position to leave the office and spend several months visiting the various agencies to report to the Government upon the condition of the various bands, the efficiency of the agents, the character of the schools and all such matters as effect the general well-being of the Indians.

Vote agreed to.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 64) To authorise and provide for the winding up of the Consolidated Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 79) To incorporate the Souris and Rocky Mountains Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulbee.)

Bill (No. 63) To extend the powers of the South Western Colonisation Railway Company, and to further amend the Act incorporating the said Company.—(Mr. Schultz.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bill was considered in Committee and progress thereon reported:—

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway.—(Mr. White, North Renfrew.)

SECOND READING.

The following Bill was read the second time:—

Bill (No. 111) To provide for the winding up of La Banque Ville Marie.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

The following Bill was, with leave of the House, withdrawn:—

Bill (No. 74) To incorporate the North-West Colonisation Land Company.—(Mr. Schultz.)

SUPPLY,

XII. RAILWAYS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Maintenance and Repairs.

195 Intercolonial Railway.....\$1,400,000

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It will not be, perhaps, inconvenient to the House and Committee if I give some general explanations with reference to the vote now proposed. I do not anticipate any very serious difficulty with this vote, as it will be seen, taking the amount asked for the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railways together—\$1,586,000—that I am asking for a vote of \$647,496 less than the sum expended on this service in 1878-9; and, with that reduced amount, I intend, not only to cover the same service, and on which was expended in 1878-9, \$2,233,496, but also to operate 126 miles more Railway than were covered by that expenditure. Now, I may say that the question of the large amount of money that was required to be expended in the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, has attracted the attention of this House for a number of years past. We all feel that it was very unfortunate that, having invested so large a sum of public money in the Intercolonial Railway, the country should be compelled, in addition to that expenditure, to supply practically, something like an average of half a million dollars per annum to operate the road. There was no question that the construction and operation of the road had tended largely to the development of the country, and that it was a great service to trade and business. My attention had been called to that subject very strongly before the change of Administration, as will be seen by reference to the discussions that have taken place in this House; and, when called upon to discharge the duties of administering that Department, I held that it was necessary to make the most exhaustive examination possible, to see if we could maintain the efficiency of the road and rolling-stock, and at the same time largely reduce the expenses. I satisfied myself that it would be quite practicable to do that, and adopted the best means in my power to inform myself as to how far it would

be possible to reduce the expenditure in connection with the operation of the Government Railways. I have the satisfaction of knowing that those efforts have been attended with very marked success. I may be asked how it is that the deficit in the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, which had been something like half a million for several years preceding, was increased during the year ending 30th June, 1879, beyond that of any former year. I may remind the House that I am not responsible for that increased expenditure to any large extent. I may remind the House that the management of the Intercolonial Railway remained practically in the same hands from 1st July of that year down to, I think, the latter part of February, 1879, and that the large increase of expenditure was for works that were undertaken previous to the change of Government, to a very large extent. I will now briefly glance at the revenue of the road which, as the House is aware, was considerably decreased during the year, 1878-79, as well as at the large increase in expenditure, which accounts for a deficit which occurred at the end of that fiscal year of about \$716,000. In doing so, I will endeavour dispassionately to do justice to my predecessor, who had the management of the Department. My colleague, the then Minister of Public Works, in 1873, came to the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary, for the economical working of the Intercolonial Railway, that there should be a responsible officer, thoroughly acquainted with everything, in connection with the management and operation of the work, whose head-quarters should be in the Public Works Department. Hon. gentlemen are aware that Mr. Collingwood Schreiber was appointed, previous to the change of Government, in 1873, Chief Engineer of Government Railways in operation, for the purpose of having close and accurate surveillance from head-quarters over all expenditures, and everything connected with the management of the Intercolonial. A change of Government ensued, and, although that gentleman was retained nominally in that office, as is well known, his services were devoted mainly to the completion of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not think my hon. predecessor at all carried out the

design that the former Government had of having the control and management of the Intercolonial Railway conducted from head-quarters. We satisfied ourselves then, and I am more satisfied now, that it is practically impossible to continue such a vigilant supervision for such enormous expenditures as the management of these Government Railways involve, without having the head of the Department here in immediate communication with the Chief Executive officer, in order that the Minister may be from time to time advised of everything that is taking place, and have an opportunity of giving, or withholding, his sanction to the expenditures. Well, we reverted to that system, and Mr. Schreiber was instructed to assume the management at head-quarters, and the staff was reorganised in such a way as to give us the benefit of the service of the best men we could find in the Department. I am glad to be able to say we found nearly all the men that were necessary for the management of those works in the Department as it was then constituted. Mr. Pottinger, who was appointed Chief Superintendent when the management was changed, was a gentleman who had been some eighteen years in the Intercolonial Railway service, and who had risen step by step, until, I think, he was regarded by his predecessor, Mr. Brydges, as undoubtedly the ablest man there was in the service at that time. The other officers entrusted with leading positions we found in the service of the Intercolonial, in fact I may say all those in charge of the management and direction of the Railway at its headquarters at Moncton. I will now glance at the results, and show the expenditure of that year, which has attracted, naturally, a good deal of attention. I am not at all prepared to question the judiciousness or propriety of a large amount of the increase of expenditure. It was for works which were found absolutely necessary, and they were entered upon previous to the change of Government, and it became my duty to see that they were carried to completion. The revenue for 1877-8 on the 714 miles then in operation, was \$1,378,946.78. I am contrasting that with the year following, which closed on 30th June, 1879. The revenue for 1878-9 was \$1,294,099.69, over the same length

of road, showing a falling off in the traffic of no less than \$84,847.09. Now, it would be discouraging to encounter such a decrease in the traffic of the road if we were not able satisfactorily to account for it, and to show that it arose from the natural falling off in the business of the road, and from circumstances that were exceptional at the time. It was largely due to the depression in trade and business which existed all over the country, and which culminated about that period. This depression was shown to be general. Every way station on the road indicated a falling off in the traffic, that is to say, as a general rule, the through business was not materially affected; it was largely due to the reduction in the local business. The extremely low prices to which iron fell in Great Britain caused the competition to be so keen as to close the Londonderry Iron Mines, which furnished a large volume of traffic. The blast furnace was blown out, and this had furnished a large volume of traffic in carrying coal to the Londonderry Iron Mines, and of carrying the product of those mines over the line into the Upper Provinces, but all that now ceased.

MR. MACKENZIE: When did it blow out?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It was blown out a year ago; I do not remember the date at this moment.

MR. MACKENZIE: It was after you had your blow out.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: After the change of Government, I suppose the hon. gentleman means. I should say that we were blown in, and the hon. gentleman was blown out. It is also well known that a large source of traffic on the Intercolonial Railway was the carriage of lumber and deals, but the low price to which deals fell in England, entirely stopped the traffic. That which was giving us a large return for the road was lost, owing to the depression in the lumber market in England. The price to which lumber had fallen, made it absolutely impossible to carry on the traffic with any success. Then the competition between the Great Western and the Grand Trunk Railways cut the freights to so low a figure as entirely to stop a large amount of the flour trade that came previously over the Intercolonial

Railway, and sent it by water from American ports, cutting off a large source of supply in that direction. This deprived the road of a considerable amount of traffic which we had relied upon. It was the local passenger and freight traffic that was mainly affected. So far as the other traffic was concerned, it was not so seriously influenced, with the exception of the items to which I have referred. I am glad to be able to say that, although this depression in business and falling off in the receipts was so great as to make the monthly returns less for several months after the Rivière du Loup line was obtained, the expenditure was actually less over the 840 miles than it had been in the corresponding months of the previous year over the 714 miles. I am glad to be able to say that a marked change has taken place in the trade and business of the country and in the revenue of the road. I do not suppose that it would be easy to find any better indication of the trade of the country than the Intercolonial Railway affords. You have, at every point along the road, by the traffic returns, the evidence as to what the condition of the trade and business of the day is. During the past eight months, we have the gratifying results of an increase in that period, from the commencement of the current fiscal year, of \$49,082.69, as compared with the receipts of the corresponding period of the previous year. It is quite true that there were but 714 miles in operation in 1878-79, and there are 840 miles in operation now. But as I have explained, we were receiving, up to a recent period, a smaller return over the 840 miles than we were receiving in the corresponding months of the previous year for 714 miles. We have now, I think, turned the corner, and we have a steady and gratifying increase in the traffic. The train mileage for this period was, in 1878-79, 1,763,408; and in 1879-80, 1,957,489 miles, or an increase of 194,087. The receipts per train mile, for these eight months, in 1878-79, were 50.04c.; in 1879-80, they were 48.45c. The volume of traffic has largely increased during the current year, and the cause, as I have stated, is the improvement in trade, and the alteration in the Tariff to meet the exigencies of the trade. Now I come to

the question of the operating expenses of the road, and there I shall be able to say that the efforts which have been made to practice the most stringent economy in connection with this work, have been eminently successful. The working expenses for 1877-78, for the 714 miles, were \$1,811,273.56; the working expenses for 1878-79 were \$2,010,183.22, or an increase of \$198,909.66 for the year ending 30th June, 1879, over the year ending 30th June, 1878. That would be a startling exhibit if it could not be satisfactorily accounted for. I think it can be. I am throwing no blame upon my hon. predecessor in connection with the large increase during the year 1878-79. I merely drew attention to the fact, and I will show the House that the causes which mainly led to that increase, and for which I was not responsible, were owing to the management of the late Government, who were responsible for them. This increase in the cost of working the Railway was chiefly for work commenced in the early part of the year, namely:—

MR. ANGLIN: What is the object of giving these figures?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am showing what largely contributes to the excess of expenditure of 1878-79 over that of the previous year. The figures are: additional ballasting, \$2,841; additional sidings, \$9,949; additional buildings, \$27,614; renewals, repairs to bridges, culverts, etc., \$38,195; renewals on turn-tables, \$4,078; improved water supply, \$18,808; renewal of sleepers, \$18,381; gas and water at Moncton, \$11,504;—making in all \$131,372. These works were necessary to put the road in a proper and efficient condition, with the exception of the cost of the gas and water service at Moncton, which could have been dispensed with. There was no necessity for that; it was no doubt adopted by the late Government under the impression, and with the belief, that it was in the interest of the service in that connection. I hold the late Government responsible for the increased expenditure over the previous year. There is a very considerable expenditure that I was obliged to incur in consequence of the change of the law during the last Session. It will be remembered that there was an Act introduced

which provided for the raising of overhead bridges, so as to prevent persons—brakesmen, conductors, and others—going on the top of cars, from being killed or injured by coming in contact with such bridges in passing under them. The Act originally provided only for the raising of such structures as were in a dilapidated condition, or in a bad state of repair; but it was amended in the Senate so as to absolutely require that all structures, whether requiring repairs or not, should be changed as indicated. We were, therefore, as my hon. predecessor knows, obliged to raise these overhead bridges at a considerable cost. These overhead bridges and the snowsheds also contributed towards this over-expenditure, involved in complying with that Act, for which I am not holding the late Government responsible. The rest of the expenditure incurred as stated—the locomotive and car expenses, \$58,180—in excess of the previous year, was mainly due to the wages of a large number of workmen, previously charged to Capital Account, being charged to ordinary working expenses. The investigation, as I have stated, into the whole of this matter, led me to the conclusion that it would be possible, without impairing the efficiency of the road, to introduce reforms and economies that would bring about a more satisfactory state of things in reference to the great excess of expenditure over income; and in pursuance of that conclusion, I endeavoured to obtain the best information I could, as to how far that idea could be carried out, so as, while properly preserving and keeping unimpaired the permanent way and rolling-stock, to accomplish a large reduction in the expenditure. I need not ask the House to imagine a more unpleasant duty than setting about the reduction of expenditure. It is a very easy matter to appoint parties to office, and pay them liberal salaries, and it is extremely popular thus to dispense the public money in a manner agreeable to the recipients, but I know how very different is the duty of dispensing with public officers, many of them deserving men, discharging faithfully the duties of their office, and I know how very different is the duty of reducing the salaries of other such men remaining in the service. Still I felt bound, in the interest of the country, to ascertain

whether it was possible to relieve the Treasury from the large amount of expenditure required over and above the receipts of the road; and availing myself of every possible source of information, I satisfied myself that large economies could be effected. I therefore set about effecting these economies, not, as I can sincerely assure the House, in a partisan spirit—for I could produce voluminous correspondence to prove that I have been assailed for showing too little regard to the claims of friends of the Government—but without favour or affection, without reference to the political views or opinions of the parties affected. Many officers, supporters of or holding the political views of hon. gentlemen opposite, were retained, while, on the other hand, the services of gentlemen who supported the Government have been dispensed with, and in a great many instances the salaries of men who were strong supporters of the present Administration, were largely reduced. I am glad to be able to say that in the main, these reductions of salaries have been met in the most cheerful spirit that could possibly be anticipated by the parties affected; and I assure the House that no more agreeable duty will I ever be called upon to perform, than to restore these discharged officers to their positions, and to restore those who have been reduced, to the positions and salaries they occupied and received before, so soon as the result of the operation of the road will enable us to do it, without imposing additional taxation on the country for the purpose. When the result is obtained, with the cooperation and efforts of those officers, who, with reduced salaries, are devoting themselves to the public service, and assisting in effecting these economies, who are faithfully discharging their duties upon reduced salaries, so as to enable the Government to balance revenue with expenditure, it will not only be a pleasure, but a duty incumbent upon me to deal in a most liberal spirit with the parties thus entitling themselves to the consideration of the Government. I may say in connection with this, that although this subject was taken up at a very early period, it was late in the season before any great advance could be made, or before these economies could be brought into operation; but hon. gentlemen will find, by reference

to the figures of the current year, that the revenue has already gone very far towards restoring the balance between the revenue and the expenditure of the road. The House is aware that, in addition to the Intercolonial Railway as it stood before, we have, under the authority of Parliament, purchased from the Grand Trunk Railway Company the Rivière du Loup branch, 126 miles of road, extending our road from Rivière du Loup, where it formerly terminated, to Point Levis; and this branch was in a very dilapidated condition. In the winter season it is exceedingly rough, and I may say that, in reference to some charges and complaints which have been made, they have arisen from the difficulties experienced in the operation of this portion of the road. We have laid down seventeen miles of steel rails upon it from the time we purchased it, and on the rest of the track the old iron rails still remain. I need not tell the House that for many years, since 1872, no such difficulty has been encountered in connection with the road in the winter season as during the past winter. Not only have there been storms of a severe character, far exceeding anything encountered for years back, but intense cold succeeding warm weather, and *vice versa*, has very seriously affected the wheels, and, in fact, the whole of the rolling-stock. Not only have we had stormy weather, and remarkable changes of temperature, but we have had 126 miles more road to run, and we have not been able to obtain the rolling-stock to run it. We have had some half dozen engines from the Grand Trunk Railway, but they were continually breaking down and giving trouble. It was a very noticeable circumstance that while on the rest of the road the rolling-stock remained in good order, that which went over the Rivière du Loup branch was continually coming to grief, and with a great deal of it we have had much difficulty, many broken wheels, and so on.

MR. ANGLIN: Was it all on that section?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Not altogether on that section; but there was this noticeable fact, that there was scarcely a wheel that broke which had not been over that section. There was a difficulty in obtaining the rolling-stock at the

time we wanted it. The most timely provision was made that we could make; but the parties contracting being behind time, the Grand Trunk having taken their engines, and the necessity of sending four locomotives from the Intercolonial Railway for the traffic of the Pembina branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when it became necessary to assume that portion of the road, placed us in very considerable difficulty in operating this increased road with decreased rolling-stock.

MR. ANGLIN: Will the hon. gentleman say when the contracts were let for the additional rolling-stock?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The moment the Rivière de Loup Section was obtained, the Department set about preparing the plans, specifications and drawings necessary for the locomotives, in order to obtain them of a uniform character, and a considerable time was spent in that way. We were extremely anxious to have all the locomotives of a uniform construction, so that if any particular part gave way it could be readily replaced.

MR. ANGLIN: And that is how the delay was caused.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am now speaking of the delay incidental to making the contracts. We asked for them at the earliest moment after we could obtain the plans and specifications, so as to have various items of rolling-stock that was uniformly constructed, in order that the parts might be interchangeable, and, in case of any giving away, repairs might be more easily effected. Although placed under contract at as early a date as possible, considerable delay has occurred, and is occurring now. It is impossible for me to carry all the dates in my mind, but I can show the hon. gentleman, by figures, that the delay has occurred owing to the failure on the part of the contractor to supply the rolling-stock at the time required by their contracts. It is only fair that I should show the House the difficulty we have encountered, so as not to have this delay appear as a shortcoming on the part of the management of the road. The hon. member for Gloucester asked for a return of the number of locomotives and cars in the shops. Of course, the question was a very pertinent one, but while the number of locomotives under re-

pair will compare very favourably with that of previous years, there was a larger number of cars undergoing repairs in the shops. The hon. gentleman will see at once that it is reasonable, with 126 miles more road and an increased train mileage, that there should be a larger number of locomotives and cars undergoing repairs than when they were performing a smaller amount of train mileage. I am glad to be able to show hon. gentlemen, in relation to this, that the operating expenses for 714 miles of road in 1878-79 were \$1,386,999.04. With this I am going to compare eight months of the present year, and I deduct \$168,396.03 for renewals from that amount, a charge not required to be made in the corresponding months this year. Deducting that sum, we have \$1,218,602.97 as the cost for operating 714 miles of road for eight months, from 1st July, 1878, and the operating expenses of the eight months of 1879-80, since 1st July, 1879, amounted to only \$1,026,358.55 or \$192,244.42 less, showing a great reduction. The operating expenses per train mile for the above eight months of 1878-79 were 69.10c., and those for 1879-80, 52.43c., showing a very marked and gratifying reduction on the whole expenditure.

MR. MACKENZIE: Is that calculating the whole expenditure?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes. Everything has been done to maintain the rolling-stock in the greatest possible condition of efficiency, subject, of course, as I have already stated, to the great strain which the hon. gentleman will admit has to be taken into consideration in the calculation of the larger amount of work the rolling-stock is called upon to perform. I have availed myself of every possible source of information to satisfy myself that the economy I have exercised has not affected the efficiency of the road, or the condition of the rolling-stock, or the high standard of efficiency in which I frankly admit I found the roadway when it became my duty to administer the Department. The working expenses of the road in 1877-78, during the eight months corresponding with the period I previously referred to, were \$1,189,678.13; the receipts for that period were \$920,285.88, showing a deficiency of

\$269,392.75. In 1878-79 the working expenses for the corresponding period were \$1,386,999.01, and the receipts \$890,395.21, showing a deficiency in the eight months of \$496,603.78; while for the same period in 1879-80, the working expenses were \$1,026,358.55, and the receipts, \$939,478., or a deficiency of only \$86,880.55. I desire now to call the attention of the Committee, although the vote is not before the House, to the adoption of a similar policy in Prince Edward Island. Hon. gentlemen know that, with reference to the Prince Edward Island Railway, we have the same difficulty of an enormous deficit every year. In 1877-78, the revenue from that road was \$135,899.60; in 1878-79 the revenue was \$125,855.91, showing a falling off in the traffic of \$10,043.69. This falling off was due, to a considerable extent, to the same causes which affected the Intercolonial Railway. The operating expenses were slightly increased. The working expenses for 1877-78 were \$221,599.49; for 1878-79, \$223,313.12, or an increase of \$1,713.63, making a total deficit of \$97,457.21. Hon. gentlemen, I think, will see that it became essentially necessary to make an effort at all events to reduce that annual deficit, and I am happy to say that the adoption of the principle of cutting down salaries to the lowest amount possible, compatible with proper performance of the services required, and dispensing with every office that could possibly be dispensed with without impairing the efficiency of the road, has had the result of effecting a very marked economy in the operation. I may draw attention to the fact that the renewal of sleepers exceeded by some 31,000 the number of the previous year, which will partially account for the increase in the operating expenses. A comparative statement of the operating expenses for the nine months ending 31st March, 1879-80 with former years, will also give a gratifying evidence of what has been effected by these economies in regard to the Prince Edward Island Railway. The working expenses for the nine months ending March 31, 1879, amounted to \$176,393.21, while the working expenses for the same period of this year was only \$120,740.58, or a reduction of expenditure of \$55,652.63. The working expenses per mile for the nine months of

1877-78 were \$85.49; for the same period 1878-79 they were \$79.96, and for the corresponding nine months of 1879-80 they were only \$53.65. I have the assurance of all the parties who are responsible to me for the maintenance of the road, that everything is being maintained in a thorough state of efficiency, and that the present condition of both the roadway and the rolling-stock will compare favourably with that at any previous period. The receipts for the nine months ending March 31st, 1879, were \$96,561.97, while for the same period down to 31st March last, they were \$84,252.71, or a decrease of \$12,309.26. Hon. gentleman will, therefore, see the indispensable necessity of reducing the expenses of the operation of the road. I believe that for years no such difficulties have been encountered in the operation of the road, as during the present winter, owing to the severity of the storms, and, of course, that could not occur without great interruption to the business of the road. The result of my efforts, in the direction of economy, I think, are gratifying. The figures I have submitted to the House speak for themselves, and all I can say to the Committee now is, that I have exhausted every means in my power to satisfy myself that neither the condition of the road nor of the rolling-stock has suffered. Assuming that to be the case, the Government, I think, may feel greatly gratified at being able to present to the House the state of things exhibited in this vote—asking for the operation of 126 miles more road, with \$647,496 less than was expended in 1878-9. I am very sanguine that, with the increased trade and business of the country, of which we have the most gratifying evidence in every direction, and all along the Intercolonial, we shall see the most profitable results from this road. While asking for a considerable amount for this service, I believe that, after the present year, we may fairly hope, with the experience of the past year, that we shall reduce the deficit on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways to a comparatively insignificant sum. I believe we may confidently anticipate that in a year the country will be entirely relieved from any charge over and above the amount of money received from the operation of the roads. After

the most careful study of the matter, I feel warranted in stating my belief that the period of any material deficits, or of any deficits at all, is at an end. I am quite satisfied that the hon. gentlemen opposite will feel that, instead of deserving any censure, the Government are entitled to the fullest consideration for their efforts in regard to those Railways. If the apprehensions of hon. gentlemen opposite are well founded, and any reductions in expense are made at the cost of maintaining this Railway stock, or the road itself in thorough efficiency, instead of deserving credit, we should deserve only censure. Those economies were entered upon with the full knowledge that no more mistaken policy could be adopted than one that would expose the Government and Department to condemnation on this vital point. I have done all that was possible to assure myself that we were running no such risk, and to satisfy myself that I am safe in saying that in the coming year the receipts from those Railways will nearly, if not actually, balance the expenditure upon them.

MR. ANGLIN: Will the hon. gentleman give us a statement of the car mileage?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I shall get that statement in a few minutes.

MR. MACKENZIE: If the hon. the Minister of Railways has succeeded in saving as much money as he claims to have saved, of course we shall give him every credit. Nothing would give me more gratification than to be able to give him abundant credit in that respect. But I must say, that the statement he has presented is exceedingly fallacious. In the first place, I have knowledge of the state of the stock. He assures us that the Railway stock is as good as when he received it at our hands. He admits the road was handed over to him in the most admirable order, including Railway stock and all appointments.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE: During the entire period in which I administered the affairs of the Public Works Department, we never got the road up to proper condition till our last year of office. He claims credit for saving a great deal where there was no saving at all. The stores published in 1878-9 amounted to

\$415,985. I give him credit, for the whole of that year, as purchasing the stores. We had three and a-half months of it, no doubt, but still the hon. gentleman must be responsible for whatever was purchased outside those three and a-half months. We purchased for \$485,859, there being a decrease in the purchase of \$69,063. Then we had stock in hand, in 1878-9 \$345,452. The hon. gentleman had stock in hand at the end of the year of \$243,758, or \$110,643 less. This accounts for over \$170,000 of the amount he claims to have saved.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Not a dollar of it. In the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, you charge it with every dollar's worth of stores in use. That is a mere matter of account. It does not touch the question of the operation or expenses of the road.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will not escape me in that way. He sold a great deal of those stores, and put the proceeds to Revenue Account.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Not a dollar. Every dollar from the sale of stores goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund; not a dollar is used for the road.

MR. MACKENZIE: The amount of stores on hand must be accounted for, and there is no way of accounting for that deficiency but this—that the hon. gentleman did not buy as much as we bought, and has left less on hand than we left. Of course it had all to be charged. Then, during that year, no less than \$105,000 was charged to Revenue which was really expended, practically, on Capital Account, for buildings and various other objects. Then there is a sum of \$210,674 for permanent renewals, which the hon. gentleman gave as \$168,309; he has thus to account for the difference of \$42,278.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I gave the hon. gentleman the \$168,000 as the total amount for renewals charged against the eight months mentioned. I was comparing the total charges, and gave every dollar.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will observe in his own report that the sum is stated at \$136,000, in addition to which \$42,378 was expended in the first half of this year, making the total of \$210,674, expended, too, from revenue. The number of workmen we left in the va-

rious workshops, employed wholly in building new, or repairing old stock, was 589. The hon. the Minister of Railways has reduced the number by 127. The reduction in wages I am not able to compute. All this was to be deducted from the active, recuperative power of the road. Those men were employed in keeping up the stock. Despite the hon. gentleman's assurances, from the newspaper and other accounts, I am convinced that the stock, and particularly the engines, are reduced very materially in comparison to its condition when the present Government entered office. I see frequent accounts of accidents in consequence of the deficient power of the engines, and this must be so. I saw in a return that while there was a considerable addition to train mileage, there was an actual deficiency in car mileage. This proves that each engine was able to take a less number of cars that year than formerly, meaning decreased power and efficiency of the road. Then there is a remarkable fact about the passenger traffic—that, although there was a larger number carried by 21,144, there was an absolute decrease of over \$23,000 in the amount received. The freight traffic also shows a decrease of 11,849 tons. The stock on hand of stores of various kinds, at the close of 1878-9, was \$243,758. Now, in order to give the hon. gentleman an idea of what this means, I may tell him that the stores on hand, when I took charge of the Public Works Department, of the Railway, for the 334 miles, was \$350,255. Then, Sir, for this last year, the report for which we have now before us, the gross receipts were \$1,294,000, about \$80,000 less than the previous year, while for a considerable portion of the time there was a larger mileage; but the working expenses are put at \$2,110,356, showing an increase of some \$209,000 over the previous year in working expenses, and for this year, or at least nine months of it, the hon. gentleman was accountable. He has given us to-night a statement of the various works for which we are responsible. I admit that we are responsible for some of them, but for others I do not admit the responsibility. No doubt we are responsible for taking the gas and water into Moncton, though the works were not completed when we left office. I

was very much surprised, when the proposition was made to me in the first instance, to get the water in common with the people of Moncton, from the local waterworks. My reply was, that we had waterworks already arranged of our own; but Mr. Brydges, to my surprise, reported that, as the country was being cleared round, he had no doubt the source of supply would soon fail, and as it was impossible, with the great shops and the charging of engines and that sort of thing at Moncton, to run the risk of a loss of water. I entered reluctantly into the engagement with the waterworks company to bring the water into the yard. I am surprised to hear that this was not necessary. I would like to know from the hon. Minister if he has that upon authority from his engineers? If he has a report from his engineers to say that there is no necessity for a supply of water at Moncton?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I did not say that, I think.

MR. MACKENZIE: He said we entered upon that without the slightest necessity.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: No; I said it was the only thing which did not appear to be absolutely necessary, and the report of the engineer went to show that the expenditure for gas and water might have been dispensed with, as we had independent arrangements for the supply of water. It was a new thing for me to hear that there was any danger. The hon. gentleman's own Government went to a great expense to supply water to the shops, and I thought before bringing it two miles they understood what they were doing.

MR. MACKENZIE: We took the best means to get it where we could; but when it was reported to me that the water supply would fail, I made the best arrangements I could, submitting the matter afterwards to Parliament, as the hon. gentleman will remember. As to the gas, I have always held that in great workshops, gas is safer than oil, and it was to ensure greater safety, and at no greater expense, except preliminary expenditure, that this arrangement was entered into. My colleague (Sir Albert J. Smith) reminds me that we are not bound to use the gas unless we choose. My impression is the price is not larger

than \$3, but we are not to pay any more than the citizens do.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes, there is a contract.

MR. MACKENZIE: That was my impression. As to the saving the hon. gentleman claims to have effected, in regard to the workmen of the line, the employes proper, I can only say that I cannot conceive how it is possible that the former chief manager, Mr. Brydges, would have employed more men than were necessary. With an experienced railway manager like Mr. Brydges, I never supposed it necessary to inculcate the necessity of not employing more men than were necessary, and I cannot conceive how it was possible to do it if it was done. I can understand how it is possible to dispense with men for a year or two while the road is running down; but it is necessary to keep up a proper supply of manual labour. As to reduction of wages, my idea was that our men should have, at least, as good wages as were paid by any corporation in the country; and it was a universal complaint to myself, from men all over the line, that they were not obtaining such wages as were paid by private parties. I think the wages ranged from 80c. to \$1 for labourers, and I would ask what they are now getting?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am glad the hon. gentleman has asked that question, because, while I have largely reduced the salaries of office-holders with large salaries, the labourers have never been reduced. The amount paid by the hon. gentleman was \$1 or \$1.10, and that they are getting now. With the exception of a few parties, who have been reduced from \$1.20 to \$1.10, the labourers have not been reduced at all.

MR. MACKENZIE: The mechanics have been reduced.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes. In round numbers I have dispensed with the services of 400 men. I am operating the road to-day, and have been for the last eight months, with 400 men less than it was operated by the hon. gentleman, and I am paying over \$200,000 less for wages and salaries.

MR. MACKENZIE: How much were the wages reduced?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It de-

MR. MACKENZIE.

pended altogether on the position the men occupied.

MR. MACKENZIE: Iron finishers and carpenters.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: No reduction at all in them.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then there was no reduction whatever in the mechanics.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I said I had saved in salaries and wages over \$200,000 a year.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman said he had reduced the mechanics.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: If I said so, I am now informed that it is not the case, but that they receive the same wages as before.

MR. MACKENZIE: Of course there were 125 less in the shops alone, according to this return, at the beginning of the year, and that is accounted for by doing less work, or only work that is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the road. The sum and substance of the saving then is, that the hon. gentleman has allowed the stores to run down; he has purchased less and left less; then he has employed less men in building up the stock of the road; the ballasting that was going on before has ceased, comparatively little has been done of repairs of that sort, and the road is not in anything like as good a condition as when I left office. This will show itself in good time, and I venture the prophecy that unless the road is taken better care of, when we come next to discuss it there will be a different tale to tell. I am willing, however, to do the hon. gentleman ample justice in his efforts at economy, and I have no doubt he has, in many instances, effected a judicious saving. I am willing to give him credit for all he claims as to intentions and motives, but I am disputing the manner in which he is endeavouring to take credit for what he is not entitled to credit. With regard to the Island Railway, the position of the road is this:

Year.	Income.	Working Expenses.
1876	\$118,060	\$214,930
1877	130,664	210,329
1878	135,899	221,599
1879	125,815	223,313

This last year was much the worst. The hon. gentleman had no special works on hand, that we left him, so that he is

entirely responsible for this heavy expenditure, heavier than the year previous.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I gave the hon. gentleman a statement of the works that were being carried out, and which had involved that increased expenditure.

MR. MACKENZIE: On Prince Edward Island?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes building the wharves, and a variety of things.

MR. MACKENZIE: My recollection of the filling in of the wharf was that it was nearly done. But I may say that for two years previous to that, we had a large expenditure in connection with the road-bed itself all the way. It was, perhaps, the worst built road ever seen in America. We had the Island Government to blame for that. They made the contract in a very loose way, and when Mr. Swinyard was sent by the late Administration to report upon the condition of the road, he reported upon its actual condition. The Island Government, however, claimed that the modifications made in the contract were made at their own instance, and that the contractors were to be held responsible for that, as it was done after Confederation took place, so that we really had nothing to do in the matter except to see whether the road was equal to the bargain as it existed at the time the Island entered into the Confederation. I presume that legal position could not be disputed. Therefore, we were obliged to send Frank Shanly to decide upon that ground whether the road was finished according to the modifications entered into by the Island Government, prior to their entering the Confederation. He made his report, and the substance of it all will remember. He did not, however, dispute the facts mentioned in Mr. Swinyard's report. We had the famous iron fencing, for instance, which was carried all over the Island by the cows and sheep who ventured to cross the track. We had a great deal of that to replace. We had a great deal of surveying to do in order to reach, if possible, some conclusion as to the character of the curves in different parts of the road. We had to lay rails afresh all the way from Charlottetown, to the junction. We had to do an immense amount of work, which properly belonged

to capital, but was included in the working expenses. It was the intention of the Government to straighten the road somewhat in various places, as large curves were made where they seemed wholly unnecessary, and steep gradients were presented where a little work would have obviated them. All these expenses fell upon us in administering the road. We had, then, to bring up the Island road from the state of utter inefficiency in which we found it, to a state of efficiency; and we had to bring up the roads on the mainland from a state of inefficiency and demoralisation into a state that the hon. gentleman admitted to-night was in a state of complete repair when they were delivered over to him. It would be an easy matter, if I were to go over all the figures, to demonstrate that, and it would be an easy matter to demonstrate that the supplies purchased during my Administration, were purchased more advantageously than they were before. It would be an easy matter to contrast the price of iron, steel, paint, wood, and almost everything that was required, and show that they cost less under our Administration. I will not trouble the Committee with a comparative statement, although I have it in under my hand. I will content myself with saying that, during our Administration, we endeavoured to keep the road in the highest state of efficiency. We also paid the men properly for attending to it. If the hon. gentleman found that some of these men were paid too high, and if he had succeeded in effecting a saving, and at the same time administering the affairs of the road as well as with the other officials and the higher salaries, I can only say that I shall be much gratified; and if he can maintain the efficiency of the road at a so much less expenditure than he now thinks was necessary before, I shall be the very first to give him credit.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am surprised the hon. gentleman should so soon have forgotten matters with which so recently he was familiar. But it shows how difficult it is for a person to keep in mind a knowledge of things when he has ceased to be directly engaged in their management. The statement of the hon. gentleman that I had failed to take into account the balance between the amount of stores purchased and those on hand is

entirely fallacious, for the reason that it is a mere matter of account. It does not enter into the operating expenses of the road at all. Stores account is charged with everything that is purchased, it is credited with everything that is sold. But the road is charged merely with that which is taken from the stores for the operation of the road for the year, so that you can buy \$100,000 worth more in a year of stores, or use that much less, without touching the question of account at all. It has no relation whatever to the subject we are now discussing. Then the hon. gentleman stated to the Committee that we had sold a large quantity of stores which we used in fact in maintaining the road. In that again the hon. gentleman was mistaken, for not one dollar of money received for the sale of stores has gone into the service of the road, but has gone into the Consolidated Revenue, just as every dollar of money received for freight or passengers is not used by the Department, but goes into the Consolidated Revenue from which is drawn all the money expended on the road. In those two important particulars in which the hon. gentleman undertook to correct the figures I laid before the House, he is under an entire misapprehension. Then the hon. gentleman said that because I had dispensed with 127 men, formerly employed in the shops, much less work was being done. Why, the hon. gentleman ought to know that he had a large staff of men employed not charged against the operation of the road at all; that he had a large staff employed in constructing cars and rolling-stock, which he did not charge to the expenses of the road, but to Capital Account. The work having been done and the account having been closed, of course these parties should be discharged. I found this great body of men being paid the public money without any necessity, when their services were not required, when there was no work for them to do, when there never had been work in connection with the operation of the road that required their services. As I said before, I have been able to dispense with over 400 men, and have been paying for the last eight months, or at the rate of over \$200,000 per annum, less in salaries and wages than the hon. gentleman was, paying when the change of

Government took place, for the same service. Then the hon. gentleman is equally unfortunate in his statement that there has been a decrease in the car mileage. I have in my hands a statement for eight months in each year, as follows:—

	Miles.
1876-77	10,084,551
1877-78	14,713,757
1878-79	15,380,688
1879-80	17,726,446

The hon. gentleman said the increased cost was without any necessity, that the road was in splendid condition. The hon. gentleman must remember that this increased cost on the Intercolonial for the year closing on the 30th June last, was an expenditure for which he and his manager were largely responsible, and I gave him credit for the service for which the increase was made. The hon. gentleman can say himself whether it was necessary or not, but in any case he was responsible for it. On the Prince Edward Island Railway there was an increased expenditure during the same year of \$2,910.62 for sleepers, and for general wharf repairs and increased accommodation at Summerside, \$7,378. The increased cost in the repairs to the bridges, fences, etc., and which were all executed in the season of 1878, amounted to \$8,106.54. I have no doubt that expenditure was all required, but it was an expenditure for which the hon. gentleman and not myself was responsible.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not know where the hon. gentleman got possession of the figures he gave when he said there was an increase in the engine mileage instead of a decrease. I find in his own report that the car mileage in 1877-78 was 2,499,080; in 1878-79, 2,531,791, or an increase of 32,070; while the car mileage in 1877-78 was 22,164,816 against 21,855,441 the succeeding year, or a decrease of car mileage to the extent of 309,375.

MR. BRECKEN: It was not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to have troubled the Committee with any remarks were it not for what has fallen from the hon. member for Lambton. The hon. member has been pleased to characterise the Prince Edward Island as one of the worst and most wretchedly constructed Railways in the Dominion. I happened to be a member of the Government at the

time the contract was entered into. Before the Railway was completed it subverted more Governments than did the Great Pacific Railway. I would remind the hon. member that the Prince Edward Island Railway was built at a cost of \$14,500 a mile, exclusive of land damages, so that you could not expect a very first-class road for that price. I will also remind the hon. member that, at the instance of his political friends on the Island, he sent down Mr. Swinyard, who was not an engineer, to report upon the character of the road. While I have every respect for Mr. Swinyard, I cannot say that I have much for his report; it was considered so unsatisfactory to the public, although it condemned the road to a certain extent, that Mr. Laird and his friends, although gloating over the report, found themselves compelled to send to New York for two engineers, gentlemen as eminent in their profession as any that could be found in Canada. Mr. Swinyard's report had to be abandoned. The New York engineers were Messrs. Newton and Maher, perfect strangers to the party politics of the Island, and eminently qualified to form an opinion, and after having carefully inspected the road, reported that the work was faithfully performed, and was as good as could be expected for the money. Mr. Frank Shanly was next sent down by the hon. member for Lambton, hoping that some fault might be found with the work. This gentleman also reported favourably of the work. I have neither the reports of Messrs. Newton and Maher or of Mr. Frank Shanly at hand. I did not know that this discussion would come up, but I remember the purport of them, and I tell the hon. member that there is not a word in these two last mentioned reports that warrant him in using the condemnatory language he has concerning that work. The hon. member has alluded, in very sneering language, to the sharp curves and steep grades. I ask the hon. member if, during the five years that he led the Government and filled the position of Minister of Public Works and Railways, he ever attempted to reduce those curves and grades. What he has uttered now he knew then. If he is sincere, and believed that this Railway was all that he has just now represented it, and did not stir to

remove those great evils—I repeat it, that if he knew and believed what he has just stated, he was recreant to the trust which the people and the peoples' representatives reposed in him. He did nothing, because I believe he knew well that nothing was required to be done. With regard to the wire fence, which my hon. friend has alluded to, the contract stipulated for a batten fence. A proposition was made to substitute a wire fence instead. Information with respect to wire fences, as used in Australia on their extensive pastures, was found in the *Toronto Globe*. I was Attorney-General and a member of the Island Government at the time, and I remember well that at the time I was delighted at the change. A batten fence in winter is apt to collect the snow on the track. We had then no experience of wire fences, nor do I think there was much then in the Dominion of Canada. The fence was a mistake; the wire was too light. The hon. member says that the pigs and sheep made short work of the fence; that they broke and tangled it. I have got an announcement to make which will rather astonish this House, but it is as true as it is startling, and it is this: that wherever the wire fence passed through the farms of our Grit opponents there it was much more broken and tangled than those portions of it which passed over the farms of Conservatives. The animals that did the most damage to the wire fence were not quadrupeds such as horses, cows, sheep and pigs, but bitter and mischievous bipeds known as Grits. The members of the Government made nothing out of the alteration, it was taken up in good faith, but the mistake was the wire was too light.

MR. LONGLEY: I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the claim of Mr. Wassall, a civil engineer of good reputation, who claims compensation from the Government for alleged use of his bridge patent. I fear I shall have no other opportunity of presenting Mr. Wassell's claim, and therefore, I will ask the permission of the Committee, to read a few extracts from somewhat voluminous papers which have been placed in my hands bearing upon this claim. I shall then ask to have the whole correspondence referred to some impartial tribunal for adjudication, if I can secure the assent of the hon. the Minister of Railways and

Canals to the proposal. Here are a few lines, underneath which I find the initials, "C. S.," which, I presume, represent the name of the Engineer-in-Chief of the Intercolonial Railway:—

"We have built several bridges of old rails, both on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway, but whether they are covered by the Wassal patent or not I do not know.

(Signed) "C. S."

"26th March, 1879.

This is what Mr. Wassall himself states:—

"In the first case, the chords, posts and braces are made of rails, in the same manner as described and illustrated by specifications and drawings of Patent No. 4,379; and in the second case, the piers or pile posts, and castings are exactly similar and of the same description as those illustrated and described in Patent No. 7,636.

"It requires but a glance at the structures on the Intercolonial Railway to see that whoever designed them must have copied my patent, as the bridges erected are marked specimens of efficient and strong structures—every part of them indicating a full knowledge of minutiae, which could not have been possessed by any one without actual experiments on the strength of rails for bridge-work, or a full knowledge of my experiments, which were made several years ago, and published for the information of the public, in 1875. Mr. C. J. Bridges is fully aware that these bridges were erected according to my patents; as I called his attention to the matter at the time of their erection."

It would seem that the attention of the Engineer-in-Chief of the Intercolonial Railway was again called to this subject, and reported as follows:—

"None of the designs adopted on the Government Railways for bridges constructed of old rails have any resemblance to the plans attached to the patent specifications; and I do not consider that Government Railway bridges are in any way covered by his patent.

"July 7th, 1879."

In view of the uncertainty connected with this matter, I would enquire of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, if he would consent to have the papers submitted to some disinterested tribunal for settlement? and if so, I think that would be, perhaps, the best way of settling the dispute. It seems to me that whoever is appointed to adjudicate upon this matter should have engineering skill. The plans and specifications should be closely examined and compared with the plans upon which

the bridges referred to have been constructed. I trust that an early and satisfactory conclusion will be reached in the premises.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Mr. Wassall's claim for payment for the use of his patent was referred by me to the Department, and the representations which I received from the Department satisfied me that not only had there been no invasion of his patent, but that the invention, so far as we had used it, was the invention of Mr. Archibald, an engineer in the service of the Government. Therefore, I was obliged to refuse to make any payment, but I would have no objection to take the usual course in such cases, namely, to send an official arbitrator to take testimony and report to the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: If you deny altogether having used the patent I do not see what there is to refer to the arbitrator.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: As I understand the matter, both these gentlemen claim to be the original patentees or inventors, but Mr. Archibald, who was in the employment of the Railway Department, under Mr. McRae, is the one entitled.

MR. KILLAM: That gentleman (Mr. P. S. Archibald) is well-known to me; but what I have to say is, that I think Mr. Wassall has clearly established his claim. He has shown the invention to be of practical value, by putting it into use on the Intercolonial Railway.

MR. LONGLEY: I do not wish to discuss the matter. I think I have the assurance of the Government that the matter will be submitted to an impartial tribunal. If that is so I shall be satisfied.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Testimony shall be taken and a report obtained, and the Government, if satisfied that there is a valid claim, will take it into consideration.

MR. ANGLIN: To go back to something of more public importance we should discuss two very important questions raised by the hon. the Minister of Railways. I think he has scarcely shown that he has not been guilty of great extravagance except in the amount of salaries paid to some officials, and in the number of men employed in the work-

shops and on the railway track. He claims that he has effected a considerable saving in the working of the Railway; but I am not prepared to say that he has satisfied all of us as to his assertions in that respect being well founded. In comparing his own expenditure for the last eight months with the expenditure of the previous eight months, he deals entirely with the management under his own control. It is exceedingly difficult to follow a mass of figures read off as the hon. gentleman read them off, and immediately, by some sudden operation of the mind, to test thoroughly the value of figures and calculations of that kind; they require time for consideration and digestion. There are but a few of his statements that struck me as being such as could be replied to immediately. It was strange that the hon. gentleman did not in his first statement compare the car mileage. His own report, as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) pointed out, shows that in the year ending 30th June, while the locomotive mileage had increased there was a diminution in car mileage. He asserts that during the eight months there has been a considerable increase of locomotive mileage. This, then, if it does not include the mileage on the Rivière du Loup extension, should indicate a large increase in the revenues of the road; but we do not know that during this eight months there was any increase of the revenue.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman. He complains of the report; the report does not touch the question. There is no comparison of the car mileage of the eight months of this year.

MR. ANGLIN: I point out that for the year ending 30th June there was an increase of locomotive and a decrease of car mileage.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: That does not touch the question.

MR. ANGLIN: It does; for we were naturally led from this to infer that there was some reason why the car mileage did not correspond with the train mileage; and from what was said of the condition of the rolling stock and of the road, we were led to infer that the trains and locomotives were no longer in the condition in which they ought to be, and that, consequently, it has been found necessary to

diminish the number of cars, making up each train as has been alleged.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: What possible connection has a comparison between 1877-78 and 1878-79, and 1879-80. They are two different and distinct things. I was comparing the car mileage of the present year with the eight months of the previous year. To go back to two previous years can have nothing to do with the question.

MR. ANGLIN: Until the hon. gentleman made his statement we knew nothing of the facts he then stated; and we had no other Report than that for the year ending 30th June, informing us how the road has been managed. Rather a confused impression has been left on the minds of those who listened to the hon. gentleman's figures. If we had the whole of the figures we could analyse them properly, and compare the increase of locomotive and of car mileage, and of both, with the increase of revenue, and so form a correct conclusion. In comparing this year with last year he (Sir Charles Tupper), compared the operations of this year with those of a year in which for eight and a-half months he had the entire control of the Railway in his hands. During that time a large deficit was incurred; that deficit was made up in great part by a large amount expended in those extraordinary improvements which he described. Amongst those improvements there were a large number of sidings constructed in the Province of Nova Scotia. It may be that the hon. member for Lambton decided that those were necessary.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: He did; and they were in progress before any change took place.

MR. ANGLIN: That shows what a fair man he is, and how ready he has shown himself to do ample justice to the Maritime Provinces. Well, there was that expenditure amounting to \$210,000, and there was a large sum on account of steel rails which the late Government determined to charge to Revenue Account—not to charge it to one year, but to extend it over several years, five years, I believe. If we deduct these from the whole amount it reduces the deficit very considerably, but I prefer to take the previous year, when the hon. member for Lambton controlled the road for the

whole year, We find that in that year, 1877-78, the whole deficit was \$432,326. Now, in that year, \$200,000 was charged to Revenue Account, and nothing is to be charged to that account this year or hereafter; deduct that amount and the deficit left is \$232,326. But there is another important deduction to be made. The hon. gentleman told us that, under the late Government, a large number of workmen were employed making rolling-stock, the cost of which was charged to Capital Account. He omitted, perhaps forgot, to state that there was also a large number of men employed in readjusting, reconstructing, and repairing the rolling-stock of the roads of the Lower Provinces, this having been rendered necessary by the change of gauge of these roads, and the dilapidated condition of many of the locomotives and cars. The cost of this work was not charged to Capital Account, but to the Revenue Account: \$100,000 should be credited to the hon. member for Lambton's Administration on that account; if we deduct that amount we find a net deficit of only \$132,326. The hon. gentleman has informed us that his deficit for eight months has been \$86,000; at that rate his deficit will be \$129,000 on the whole year's operations, as against \$132,000. The deficit under the hon. member for Lambton thus would show, on the face of that statement, a saving of \$3,000 on the whole year's transactions. With regard to the stores, I do not impugn the hon. gentleman's statement, but I was surprised at it in the way he put it. I was not aware that stores were charged to Consolidated Revenue, and the price of stores sold credited to the Consolidated Revenue. Of course the stores taken for use on the Railroad, are charged to the Railroad; if this is the case, we should have another account to judge of the amount of stores used by the Railroad. We are misled by the accounts as they stand at present; but at all events we know that during the last year the quantity of stores on hand has very materially decreased. However, to return to the main question, let me say, that I was myself surprised on putting these figures together to find that the saving has only been \$3,000. I thought it must be very much more than that. We know that Mr. Brydges, whose services were dispensed with by the present Government, received a large

salary, so also did Mr. Luttrell receive a handsome salary. Now, another gentleman is supposed to do the duties of both those gentlemen, and receives a much smaller salary than was given to Mr. Brydges. If he does do efficiently all the work of these two, I think his salary is lower than it ought to be. A man in his position should not only have the capacity to direct the running of the trains, and to keep the Railway in proper condition, but sufficient business capacity to enable him to increase the business of the road. A Mr. Black is employed to do some work of that kind, but what service he has ever actually rendered we have not been informed. Mr. Schreiber is also employed here at Ottawa to do part of the work formerly done by Mr. Brydges. If we add Mr. Black's and Mr. Pottinger's and Mr. Schreiber's salaries all together, their travelling expenses and other charges, we may find that a very considerable saving has not been effected in these larger salaries. Mr. Brydges and Mr. Luttrell did the work that Mr. Pottinger and Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Black now do, and did it more efficiently. The hon. the Minister of Railways did cut down the salaries of a large number of officials; and I heard of reductions that did not seem justifiable. Looking at the men employed, and the salaries paid in the Civil Service, I think it could easily be established that gentlemen employed on the Railway are not paid as well as they ought to be. We find, in some instances, the reduction perfectly astounding. A reduction in one case, as shown by the statement submitted to the House by the hon. Minister of Railways, was a reduction from \$300 to \$240. The hon. Minister, with some justifiable pride, stated that he had never reduced the wages of the labouring men employed on the road, nor of the mechanics. I would like to know why it was he thought it fit or becoming to reduce that poor man's salary to \$240, an amount on which no man can live with any degree of comfort in this country. The hon. the Minister of Railways spoke of the falling off in the business of the road, and attributed it to various causes, some of which sounded strangely enough when coming from that hon. gentleman. The revenue declined, he told us, because of the general depression of business, but

that was after the hon. gentlemen opposite entered office and put their great National Policy into full operation. In fact he admits that the depression of the country greatly increased during that period, as compared with the corresponding months of the previous year—a very remarkable admission. I wonder if he ever stopped to reflect that he was uttering what, if uttered from this side, would have been stigmatised as most unpatriotic. We want much information not supplied us. I cannot find that the quantity of lumber carried on the road diminished much—not more than 1,000,000ft. In 1877-78 it was 56,000,000ft.; a decline of less than 1,000,000ft. was not very serious. The decline in the quantity of flour was only 7,779 barrels. Altogether the decline was not so great as the hon. gentleman supposes. There was a very considerable falling off in the proceeds of passenger traffic, although the number of passengers increased; the decline in receipts was \$23,623, while the number of passengers showed an increase of 21,000. The freight traffic shows, altogether, a decrease of 11,849 tons. It is but natural that a Railway, newly constructed, should obtain an increase of business year by year, and when we find it decreasing we may well conclude that there is an extraordinary depression in business generally. But when we enquire into the character of the trade we ought to compare it, not with a period of depression, but with some former prosperous period. The hon. gentleman ought to compare the transaction of some period since their accession to power, with some period during the *regimé* of his predecessor. The number of officials was reduced by the present Minister from 119 to 104, including the chief engineers, superintendents and assistant superintendents, etc. That, after all, was not a very large reduction. But the amount saved altogether is stated at \$25,130, a great portion of which was saved by the reduction of salaries. Now, while it may be possible to reduce the number of officials employed, without any very serious injury to the road, by requiring some persons to do more work than they did previously, and by dispensing with some work or reducing its character, and thus save some money, in the other branch of the service it may be very diffi-

cult, after all, to save anything material without impairing the character of the work and service. The station masters, operators, baggage masters, etc., were reduced from 368 to 313 at a saving as is claimed, of \$20,897. I do not know that there was any station on the whole line that could have been closed without injury to the public. I think two or three were closed in Nova Scotia, but that these were opened afterwards, owing to the public clamour which was raised. I am not aware that any more hands were employed at those or any other of the way stations than were necessary, nor, indeed, do I know where any dismissals have taken place; but when you come to freight porters and baggage masters, I may say that I never knew more to be employed than one baggage master on any train. I cannot imagine where a saving in this direction could have been effected without interfering with the efficiency of the road. So with regard to engine drivers and firemen; you must have one engine driver and one fireman for every engine on the road. More were not required, and my impression was that those men were paid according to the amount of work they did. Is that not the case?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: They were partly paid by the work.

MR. ANGLIN: I do not know that much can be saved by reducing their number. We know that the work of the engine driver is very trying, and that, if overworked, he might be so exhausted as to become careless and liable to accident. There is no employé on the whole road on whom more depends than on the engine driver, or more in whom vigour, intelligence and caution are more valuable, none whom it is so dangerous to overwork. But why the number was reduced, particularly if they are paid according to the amount of work done, the hon. gentleman has not explained. We heard last year of the extraordinary amount he so saved by dispensing with the services of the cleaners of the locomotives. I could never understand why a person, having a large railway experience, should employ more cleaners than is absolutely required. It could hardly be imagined that any great political advantage could be obtained by the retention of twenty, thirty or forty

engine-cleaners, more or less. It would be the sheerest extravagance on the part of a man in the position of Mr. Brydges, who must have known how many cleaners ought to be employed, to retain a single man more than was necessary. I have heard it said by those who happened to look at the trains pass on the road, that this work of cleaning does not appear at present to be done efficiently, that everything about the cars seems to be looked after less carefully than in former years. It is very probable that, as those large reductions have been made in the number of cleaners, the statement is too true. Some labour was saved, no doubt, by painting the brass-work upon the locomotives of freight trains, and similar changes throughout. Even to deal with this matter in the spirit in which the hon. gentleman has always spoken of everything done by the late Government, I must say that this is one of the most unpatriotic acts that the Ministerial policy could have been guilty of. It is one of the strongest possible declarations that the Dominion is poverty-stricken and reduced to the direst possible straits, is no longer able to indulge any petty feelings of pride on its railways, such as keeping the brass work of its locomotives clean and bright. As hon. gentlemen opposite would say, that was a saving, but a most unpatriotic saving. With regard to the section labourers and section foremen, all experienced in the management of railways must know the number of men absolutely required to keep the track in proper order; where the work is heavy, the number employed must be larger than where it is light. Unfortunately the traffic of the Intercolonial is not so heavy as we would all like to see it, still, it is considerable, and no one can doubt that Mr. Brydges, when he organised the service, employed for exactly this work the number of men that should be employed and no more. I think it would be impossible to point to a single instance in which he employed superfluous workmen for this service. It is stated that of 624 hands employed in this service when the change of Government occurred, it has been reduced to 449. These men were taken off work which was of the greatest possible importance, it being of the greatest possible necessity that nothing should be neglected

or left to chance. Good management does not restrict itself to the smallest number possible for the performance of such work; it makes due provision for emergencies which, when they occur, require extra force. This provision has been neglected in the recent reductions, and this I cannot consider a wise course. The present condition of the track, so much rougher than was noticeable a year ago, must be attributed to the unwise reductions in the number of the trackmen. The hon. the Minister of Railways may accept what statement he pleases from the superintendents and the other officials; they may endeavour to persuade themselves first, and afterwards the hon. Minister, that the reductions were proper and economical, and that the road has not suffered in consequence of the reduction; but let me tell him that the voice of the public interested in the Railway unanimously pronounced to the contrary—that the universal opinion is, that the track of the Intercolonial is not in as good or smooth a condition as it was a year and a-half ago, when he took control of it. We come next to the number of mechanics, carpenters, and others employed in the workshops. The hon gentleman said his predecessor had a large number of men employed on rolling-stock, charged to Capital Account. The number of men employed on the rolling-stock, chargeable to Capital Account, the late Minister of Railways reduced as the supply of rolling-stock became sufficient. He did not discharge all those men at once. He did not think he would be justified in throwing some three or four hundred men out of employment at a moment's notice, but he discharged them gradually. The number was very considerably reduced, and it would have been further reduced, even if there had been no change of Government, but it would not have been reduced, I believe, to the present low standard. I find by a return furnished upon my own motion, that the whole number of men employed on these workshops, 1st October, shortly after the hon. gentleman took office, was 589. It was increased from 1st October to December to 605. The hon. gentleman may be able to explain why this increase took place in a number already too large, and after the hon. member for Lambton had been

reducing it. Since, however, the number has been reduced to 462; the result has been undoubtedly unfavourable to the road and the rolling-stock. The whole number, as given by Mr. Schreiber, was 720, reduced to 593. Although the hon. Minister knew last Session that the 120 miles of railway from Rivière du Loup were to be added to the Intercolonial, and he had ample time to prepare, he now tells us that one of the reasons why so many accidents have occurred on the Intercolonial is, that the rolling-stock has been overstrained in consequence of this additional service having been undertaken, and the impossibility of his obtaining sufficient additional rolling-stock. He leased six locomotives from the Grand Trunk Railway, which he described as not only not in good repair, but incapable of doing the proper amount of work. People do say that these are not the only wheezy, feeble locomotives on the Intercolonial, but that a large proportion of those on the road are in a very bad condition indeed. I moved for a Return showing the number of locomotives and cars requiring repairs on 1st February. I do not know if the Return for 1878-79 was then asked for. But I find the Return embraces three years. Against this nobody can have any objection. On February 1st, 1878, there were twelve locomotives requiring repair; in 1879, when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power there were, twenty requiring repair; on 1st February last, twenty locomotives, seven passenger cars, fifty box cars, eighty-seven platform cars, and sixty-nine hoppers were awaiting repair. The want of those locomotives, and, perhaps, passenger cars, is of the greatest importance. The whole number of locomotives is 108, and twenty of these were in the workshops waiting or receiving repairs. If rumour speaks correctly, there were no less than thirty or forty locomotives more that ought to have been in the shops receiving repairs. It is said that the number of cars in each train has been reduced on account of the inefficiency of the locomotives, and I believe such is the fact. The hon. gentleman complains of want of sufficient locomotive power. We might ask why those men who were dismissed were not employed in putting in a proper state of repair those locomotives

and cars which required repairs when there were workshops and machinery for that purpose? and why, at the same time, a large number of men were standing idle waiting for employment? The hon. the Minister of Railways held a similar position toward the railways in Nova Scotia several years ago. If I remember right, while he was in Opposition, he launched on the Province a project of economy similar to the one he launched upon this Dominion when in Opposition in this Parliament. He appealed to the people of Nova Scotia to put him and his friends into power on the strength of his promise to economise in all branches of the public service. They got into power, and the people expected they would make some attempt to carry out their pledges to economise. It has been charged that the hon. gentleman forgot very much, after he got into power, of what he had promised while in Opposition. During his Administration economy, as he understood it, was carried out on the railways of Nova Scotia, and the older members of this House know what the sum total of that economy amounted to. Year after year—after Confederation—several hundreds of thousands of dollars were voted by the Parliament of Canada in order to put those roads into something like fair working order. I know that while the hon. member for Cumberland managed those roads, the trains crept over them very slowly; and the rattle of the rails was something like the tumbling down of a pile of scrap iron in some old junk shop; everything was loose and shakely, and everything was thoroughly run down. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman had learned wisdom from his attempts at economy in Nova Scotia, and that he would not attempt to impose upon this Dominion a similar scheme. The hon. gentleman blamed the contractors for not furnishing rolling-stock at an earlier period. I ventured to ask the hon. gentleman when the contracts were awarded, and, instead of answering me, he proceeded to dilate at length upon the difficulties he had experienced in preparing for the letting of these contracts. There was no reason in the world why those preparations may not have been made months before; no reason why the hon. Minister should have waited until the Rivière du Loup road was actually transferred to the Govern-

ment and the deeds were actually signed, because he knew well, last year, when he took the vote, that there would be no difficulty about closing the negotiations with the Grand Trunk Company, who wanted much more to sell that piece of road than we to buy it. The hon. Minister should have provided in time a sufficient quantity of rolling-stock for that road. I think these contracts for locomotives were only given out about the end of January last. I think Mr. Fleming, of St. John, received a contract then for nine or ten locomotives. The hon. Minister knew well when he gave the contract to Mr. Fleming that the latter could not be expected to turn out those locomotives within a few months. There are, in the United States, establishments which turn out a locomotive every day, but the hon. Minister must know that no establishment in Canada could produce locomotives at that rate. I cannot imagine that Mr. Fleming would undertake to deliver nine or ten locomotives within less than nine or ten months. Mr. Chairman, I have dwelt at some length on these matters, because in the earlier part of the Session I drew attention to the fact that the rolling-stock had greatly depreciated; and I drew attention to the fact that many accidents had taken place upon the road. I am sorry to say that many other accidents have since occurred upon that road, and I doubt, if on any other road in North America which has pretensions to be a first-class road, so many accidents have occurred in so short a time.

MR. MACKENZIE: How was Mr. Schreiber paid?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Mr. Schreiber was appointed in 1873. His salary was charged to the direction of the Intercolonial Railway on which he was mainly engaged. A year ago we carried his salary into the Civil Government, and it appears in the appropriations.

MR. MACKENZIE: I notice it was not in the statement brought down last Session. All the other salaries were there, but not his.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: He was engaged in the capacity for which he was appointed in the Department in 1873.

MR. MACKENZIE: I neglected say-

ing I was not aware until this evening that Mr. Schreiber was appointed to take charge of the management and working of the Railway. I suppose it was solely an engineering appointment.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Not at all. Not at all. The appointment distinctly stated that he was Chief Engineer of the Government Railways in operation, in contradistinction to being Chief Engineer for the construction of that Railway.

MR. MACKENZIE: He has been more than Chief Engineer; he has been General Manager, but that did not appear. There was nothing in the Order appointing him, that I can recollect, that indicated anything further than engineering services.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: That was the intention at any rate.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have nothing to say against Mr. Schreiber. I believe him to be all the hon. gentleman stated—a most efficient public servant.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It will not be necessary for me to detain the Committee long in respect to any remarks made by the hon. gentleman from Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) because he was good enough to reply to them himself. The first and last part of his speech furnished the refutation to each other. He undertook to show that the economy is \$3,000 per annum. If that be true, if there is only a saving of \$3,000 per annum, it ought to relieve the hon. gentleman's mind as to the great deterioration of the rolling-stock. There cannot be any important deterioration in either the road or the rolling-stock, if there is only a saving effected of \$3,000 a year. The hon. gentleman has wasted his time in deploring that there was a depreciation of the road, or that the rolling-stock was becoming insufficient. The fact remains that, at this moment, the economy effected enables us to perform the same work with 400 men less, and a decrease of \$200,000 a year in salaries. There is no getting over that. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the number of men was increased between the time of the change of Government and the month of December, 1878. I may state to the hon. gentleman that the management of the Intercolonial Railway remained in the hands of the party in whose hands it had been placed

by the late Government, and he was entirely responsible for it. I did not interfere in the least degree with the then manager of the Intercolonial Railway, until I was prepared to release him and reorganise the whole Department. The salaries of those men I charged to the operation of the road, which had formerly been charged to Capital Account, closed before 1st July, 1878, and I found the remarkable fact presenting itself, that there was an increase in the amount paid for salaries between 1st July and 17th September, 1878, of over \$8,000. I shall not undertake to show that the then manager of the road was a very able man, as undoubtedly he was. Under these circumstances, I would like the hon. gentleman to account to the House for the increase in the expenditure between 1st July, 1878, and 17th September of the same year, of \$8,000, when the whole work of about 100 of these men, who had been engaged in the construction of cars, was completed; the work was over, but they were kept on the pay roll. That fact satisfied me that there was great recklessness in the expenditure.

MR. MACKENZIE: Did the hon. gentleman ever call Mr. Brydges to account for this particular thing?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I took the best means to show my estimate of the management by the course I adopted. I did satisfy myself that there was great extravagance in keeping these extra men employed when their services were not required; in making unasked for, increases of salaries, and when the management of the road was such as required a radical change. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat will, perhaps, be a little surprised to learn that in March, 1879, under Mr. Brydges' management of the road, there were ninety-two wheels broken, or one wheel for every 17,760 miles run.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Mr. Brydges was not manager of the road in 1879.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: He was manager of the road up to February, 1879. In February, 1880, there were ninety wheels broken, or a wheel to every 28,992 miles run. I will now take the month of January, 1877.

MR. MACKENZIE: Take March, 1878. The hon. gentleman is not capable of being fair.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I will give the hon. gentleman March, 1877, during which month there were ninety-one wheels broken; for March, 1880, there were only ninety wheels broken. The fact is that the number of wheels broken in 1877 was in excess of those broken during the present year.

MR. MACKENZIE: What I desire to obtain is the number of accidents that have occurred, and the causes that have produced them. The hon. gentleman stated, for instance, when there was an incidental discussion on this subject some weeks ago, that there was not a single passenger's life lost upon the Railway during last year. It was true there was not a single passenger's life lost, but there were nineteen lives lost against twelve the previous year. There is no necessity for making statements that are not complete, and the statement of the hon. gentleman with regard to the number of wheels broken cannot be regarded as a complete one.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I will give the hon. gentleman all the figures I have. The first part of the statement is with regard to the number of wheels broken. In 1875-6 there were 108 car-wheels broken; in 1876-7, 461; 1877-8, 350; 1878-9, 351; and down to the end of February this year, 261. That is all the information it is possible to get in relation to this, and it shows that the impression that there has been an undue number of accidents, or more than the usual number of car-wheels broken during the present fiscal year is a misapprehension. Then, I can give the hon. gentleman the number of wheels broken to miles run in the month of February of each year. In February 1877, there was one broken wheel for every 9,464 miles run; in February, 1878, one wheel for every 19,449 miles; in February, 1879, one wheel for every 23,681; in February, 1880, one wheel for every 23,709 miles. A similar statement for January shows that in 1877 there was a broken wheel for every 12,395 miles run; in 1878, one wheel for every 24,823 miles; in 1879, one wheel for every 33,897 miles; in 1880, one wheel for every 33,161 miles. That is the fullest information I am prepared to give the hon. gentleman in this regard.

MR. HADDOW: I would like to re-

mind the hon. the Minister of Railways, of the petition presented to him last year from the inhabitants of that section of Belledune, lying between the stations of Jacquet River and Belledune, on the Intercolonial, where there is already a flag station, and where the petitioners desire that a siding may be also placed. It is a district where considerable quantities of oats and potatoes are produced, and it is desirable that they should have every facility afforded for shipping their produce. I also desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the need there is for a freight house at Eel River Station, a building costing about \$200 would answer all purposes at present, and would be a great public convenience. It is a station only about half the distance from Dalhousie town where the Dalhousie Station is, and from it there is a great deal of passenger and freight traffic in connection with the accommodation and freight trains of the Intercolonial, but there is no freight house in which anything may be stored. Another subject to which I would also like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister, is the rates of freight between Montreal and Restigouche. Two weeks ago a through rate of sixty-five cents per 100lb. was asked on dry goods, and about fifty cents on hardware, and though the same might be taken to Quebec for ten cents per hundred pounds by the Occidental line, the Intercolonial would charge sixty cents per hundred from Point Levis. These rates, it must be admitted, are very excessive, and can only tend to cause shippers to look for other means of forwarding. I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Government to restore to the Intercolonial workshops at Campbellton, the machinery and workmen removed from there some time since. I am sure it must have proved a very convenient place for carrying on the work, and I hope the Government will soon see their way clear to have the works kept up there as in times past. The hon. Minister will remember that I had some communication with him some time ago regarding two oxen killed on the line between Dalhousie and Campbellton, for which the owners have not been paid. They got on the line from land not owned by the owners of the animals, and for that reason the superintendent refused payment for the loss.

MR. HADDOW.

There was no fencing on that part of the line at which they got access, and the owners of the oxen are told that, according to law, they cannot recover, because the animals got on the line from a neighbour's land.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is the law.

MR. HADDOW: The hon. ex-Minister says that is the law. Well, if it is so, I think he will agree with me that though it may be law, it does not seem like justice. If the animals had got on the line from the lands of their owners, then I conclude that compensation would have been recoverable. I trust the hon. Minister will see that justice is done in the matter, and that, while seeking to carry out a system of increased economy on the Intercolonial, he will not allow the settlers along the line to be treated unfairly.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It would be impossible to effect any reduction in the expenditure if the Government were to erect stations and sidings at every request that is made. The Government desire to give every convenience necessary to do the business of the country, but not to increase stations and sidings just for a little increased convenience of parties, without effecting additional traffic, because every additional station established interferes with the operation of the road, you have to stop so many times more, and it lengthens the time of making the through distance. I will again look into the subject. It is very unpleasant to be compelled to refuse applications for increased station accommodation, but it cannot be avoided. The stations are five or six miles apart, and there may be half a dozen persons between them who would like to have increased station accommodation. A station does not mean merely the cost of putting up the building, but it means, in addition, a large annual cost of maintaining it, and in employing station masters, and so forth, in connection with it. Wherever we find increased station accommodation necessary to do the business of the road, and that it will increase the traffic, we provide it. With reference to cattle killed on the line, if the investigation of the officers of the Department shows that there is a just claim, we pay it; but if they are satisfied that there is no legal claim, we refuse; and in cases of doubt, I have the case referred to the

hon. the Minister of Justice to decide upon it. There are a great many cases of hardship, undoubtedly, as far as individuals are concerned, especially, for instance, in cases of fire, where property is burnt owing to sparks flying from the locomotives; if the spark-arrester is in a proper condition, and if it is on the locomotive, the Government are not liable, although it may be clearly established that the burning took place through sparks from the train. If cattle are allowed to stray at large and get on the line, the owners must take the responsibility; if they get on the line from the owner's own property, and if it is owing to the neglect of the Railway Department, then the Government are obliged to pay. The practice is—where there is any doubt, or where the parties are not satisfied—to have the matter referred to the Official Arbitrators, who proceed on sworn testimony to report to the Department, and, in any case where the Government are liable, there is no hesitation in rendering satisfaction.

MR. MCKAY said he thought the law was strained too much in favour of the Railway in deciding that they were not liable when the cattle went on the line from a neighbour's land. He knew of one case where payment was refused in which a cow hopped on to the roof of a snowshed adjoining the owner's land, and falling down on to the track was killed.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought cows should not go on to the roofs of houses.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH called attention to the case of Mr. Lingham, killed on the Railway some six weeks ago, leaving a father, and, he thought, a mother, who had been dependent upon him for their support, and he (Sir Albert J. Smith) wished to know if anything would be done for them by the Government.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Unfortunately, although every possible effort was made to change the overhead bridges, the work having already commenced, there were two of them not yet raised when the frost set in; and this conductor, nobody knowing why, went on to the top of the car, where he met his death. There has been no claim on the Department, for the

reason that these parties are insured by an Insurance Fund.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: Was he insured?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am just now told that the insurance is against accident, not against death, and in that case I shall give the matter as liberal a construction as possible. He was a very valuable officer; his death was a very unaccountable one. There was no reason why he should go on to the top of the car, and he was perfectly aware of these two bridges not having been raised.

MR. MCKAY thought there was a sum payable under the insurance at death. He also called attention to the fact that the Government Railway made an agreement to pay in a sum of money, and the men had a certain sum taxed off their wages coming to about \$8,000, but the Government had not carried out their part of the agreement.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER promised to look into the matter. The fund had, however, proved quite adequate to the demand upon it.

MR. MCKAY thought then the amount subscribed by the men should be reduced.

MR. SNOWBALL: I asked for the returns of rate of freights charged on the Intercolonial Railway early in the Session, but they have not been furnished to the House to the present time. The hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Haddow) has, however, referred to the high rates charged on the Intercolonial. I also have to complain of the extreme rates that have been charged during the past fall and winter. The rate of freight on flour, from Toronto and Western Ontario, was advanced during this fall from 65c. per barrel to \$1.05 per barrel. It must be admitted that this is an extremely high rate, and could not be enforced if it were not for the import duty imposed on flour. When importers complain, they are told the rates are fixed by the Grand Trunk and other roads. Whoever is to blame, the subject is cause of great complaint and dissatisfaction. If it was not for this duty of 50c. per barrel imposed under the National Policy, we would buy in the United States markets. Take, for instance, in November last, when we bought largely for winter stock. Flour was \$5.50 per barrel in New York, and

only \$5.35 for the same quality in Toronto. The duty, if imported from New York, is 50c. per barrel, and the freight and charges 37c., making the total price, if brought from New York, \$6.37. Now, if imported from Ontario, the first cost was \$5.35, and summer rate of freight 65c., making total cost \$6. If this was the freight from Ontario, we would not have nothing to complain of. As soon as this occurred, the railway companies advanced the rate of freight to \$1, making the Ontario flour cost \$6.35 per barrel. We do complain that this duty enables railway companies to impose on the people of the Lower Provinces. The Maritime Provinces import from 900,000 to 1,000,000 barrels of flour annually, and the duty enables the railway companies to impose from 40c. to 50c. per barrel extra freight, making a tax of from \$400,000 to \$500,000 on our people each year. The farmers of Ontario get no portion of, or benefit from, this tax. The Treasury of the Dominion gets no benefit from it. The consumers have it to pay, and it is taken from them by railway companies. The subject demands the serious attention of the Minister of Railways. With a thousand miles of railway under his control, he should be able to remedy this by putting pressure on the railways with which he connects. Hon. gentlemen seem to doubt the fact of 900,000 barrels of flour being used annually by the Lower Provinces. The quantity has been carefully ascertained, and I assure them this quantity is correct. The hon. Minister tells us that he discharged over 100 mechanics because there was no employment for them, and that the country saved a large sum by their discharge. When there were twenty locomotives in the workshops awaiting repairs in February, 1879, and also in February, 1880, against only twelve in 1878, and while these twenty locomotives were awaiting repairs, and short of mechanics to repair them, the Government actually had seven locomotives hired from the Grand Trunk to assist in doing our work, and poor, wheezy locomotives they were, if report is correct, and I hope this will receive the attention of the hon. Minister, with regard to the twenty locomotives that the Return brought down states are undergoing re-

pairs. At the workshops at Moncton, which are supplied with the very best machinery, there is every facility to do the work required for the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. the Minister of Railways has told us that the locomotives should be as nearly as possible alike, each piece of one fitting the other, and this causes delay in getting them constructed. Where then is the place to get them done better than in the Government workshops, where they have every tool requisite, and which were procured at a great cost to the country. Now, these twenty idle locomotives represent a cost to this country of about \$200,000, and should not be unemployed, when we are paying \$100 per day for others to take their place, and our mechanics leaving the country to get work. I would ask the hon. the Minister of Railways how many locomotives have been condemned during the last two years, and if the condemned locomotives are included in the twenty he tells us of, as the country believe, that including those condemned, there are more than that number.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Question, order.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT protested against the unseemly interruption.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I hope this interruption will cease at once. It is very important that hon. gentlemen should have an opportunity of stating their views on important subjects of this kind. I am not able to say how many locomotives were condemned within the last two years.

MR. SNOWBALL: I am told there are locomotives on the Intercolonial not put in use of late years, and I would like to know if they could not, with reasonable repairs, be used again? I believe they could. While they need repairs the workshops are idle, and many of our mechanics are leaving the country; and we are using Grand Trunk locomotives that are worse than our own. In reference to the rails, the Minister of Railways has told us he has given us every information, even to the names of the makers, as trackmen get the makers name from each rail that breaks. If he ever examined the matter, he would have found

that it is most difficult to ascertain the maker by looking for the names on the rails, the letters, in many cases, being so imperfect that such information is not to be implicitly relied on. To justify the many accidents by breakage of car wheels lately, it is said that as many broke under the late management, but it makes all the difference in the world whether the wheels break when the cars are on the road and in motion, or if flaws are detected by proper inspection in the yards, and broken there, as was the case years past. In the latter case, defects were discovered in time, and we had the breaks, but no accidents, as at present.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Snowball) a little unfair in endeavouring to represent that there were more locomotives in the shops than I stated. I have shown that when Mr. Brydges was in charge of the road and works, and had 400 men more than I have, the same number of locomotives were in the shop, for repair as on the 1st February this year. What, then, are the hon. gentleman's criticisms worth? With \$200,000 more paid for salaries and wages than at present, there was the same number in the workshop on the 1st February, 1879, as at the same date in 1880. What then have hon. gentlemen to complain of? I have stated we are running 840 miles of railroad instead of 714, as last year; that we had not enough rolling-stock, and had to hire six locomotives from the Grand Trunk, very inferior though they were, and constantly breaking. We changed four locomotives from coal-burners to wood-burners, and sent them even to the Pacific; so, by a fair comparison, there were many less in the shops this last winter than in the year before. The evidence is all against the statement that the rolling-stock is running down, and as to the through rates from the west, they are made by the Grand Trunk; we have not the power to make them. All the efforts we are capable of to obtain the most reasonable rates from the Grand Trunk, we put forth. Any reductions that can be made call forth our efforts; any apparently excessive charge we at once bring to the notice of the Grand Trunk, to get the rate made as low as possible, consistently with the interests of the road. In fixing the rates, the Grand

Trunk, Great Western, and all the railways are influenced by the water-competition. Where there is no such competition, their rates are higher. It is beyond our power to correct that practice.

Vote agreed to.

196 Prince Edward Island Railway. \$186,000
197 Canadian Pacific Railway..... 200,000

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Thirty minutes after

Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 26th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 113) To authorise making certain investigations under oath.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

DOMINION NOTES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.

FIRST READING.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I have to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to leave the Chair, that the House may go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:

“That it is expedient to provide that the amount of Dominion Notes issued and outstanding, at any one time, may be increased to \$20,000,000, provided that the Finance Minister shall always hold for the redemption of such notes an amount, in gold, or in gold and Dominion securities guaranteed by the Government of the United Kingdom, equal to no less than 25 per cent. of the total amount of such notes then outstanding, and that at least 15 per cent. of the total amount of such outstanding notes shall be so held in gold; and the statements to be published by the Finance Minister, under the eighth Section of the Act 31 Vict., chap. 46, shall show distinctly the amount so held by him in gold and guaranteed securities respectively.”

The nature of the existing law is well known to the House. At the same time I desire to call attention to it, and the changes proposed, as well as the effects that will be produced by these changes. Under the law, as it stands at present, all

Dominion Notes, up to \$9,000,000, are required to be secured by 25 per cent. specie, requiring for the first issue of \$9,000,000, \$2,250,000 in specie; for the next \$3,000,000, 50 per cent. in specie, or \$1,500,000; and for \$400,000 issued in excess of the \$12,000,000, dollar for dollar is to be held in gold, making over \$4,000,000 in all. The proposals of the Government, as presented by this Resolution, is to take authority to issue \$20,000,000 of Dominion currency and the issue to be limited to that sum, at present there is no limit to the issue. It is the purpose of the Government to limit the total issue for the first year to \$16,000,000, and reserving the additional \$4,000,000 to be issued later on. The Bill will limit the increased issue of \$4,000,000 per annum; and it is provided that 25 per cent. of the amount of the notes in circulation shall be held in gold or Dominion guarantees, 15 per cent. at least in gold, and the remaining 10 per cent. to be covered by guaranteed Government securities. Should the issue be increased to \$16,000,000, the Government would require to hold \$4,000,000 in gold and guaranteed securities, and the remaining \$12,000,000 in Government debentures. Practically, to cover the whole issue of \$16,000,000 Dominion Notes, there will be \$4,000,000 in gold or Dominion guaranteed debentures, and \$12,000,000 in unguaranteed Government debentures. The object in the issue of Dominion Notes, in the first place, was that the people of the Dominion might have some share in the profit of the circulation of the Dominion. For several years the issue has been from \$10,500,000 up to \$12,000,000; it is now \$12,500,000. The object of the original Act, authorising the issue of Dominion Notes, was to give the people of the country a share of the profits of the circulation. I know that, in regard to the proposition I am about to submit, there is a doubt in the minds of some hon. members as to the propriety of this expansion, and the ability of the Government to meet promptly any demand that may be made on the Treasury for gold. I do not think that there is any foundation for this doubt. When I visited England, in December, 1878, for the purpose of floating a loan, the Government had at their disposal £2,100,000 sterling of guaranteed debentures, but £1,500,000 was placed upon the market, and we still hold the balance £600,000, and these we purpose holding under the provisions of our proposed Bill. Then, in addition, the House will observe by the Bill, it is provided that debentures should be issued for the balance, whatever it may be, of notes put into circulation, those debentures to be made available should they be required. I do not think that will happen, however, because during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and down to the present date, there has never been a period when the banks have had less than \$3,400,000 of Government deposits, and they now reach \$12,000,000. It is scarcely to be expected that the deposits remaining in the banks will be under \$3,000,000, at any time these deposits will be available for the purpose of meeting any demand that may be made upon the Receiver-General for gold. The average circulation in \$1 and \$2 notes, last year, was from \$2,500,000 to \$3,000,000. The House will observe that, in the proposed renewal of existing bank charters, the banks will not be permitted to issue any note less than the denomination of \$5. Under the present law the banks are bound to hold an average of 50 per cent. reserve in Dominion Notes, and at no time can they hold up less than one-third of their reserves in Dominion Notes. The present proposition of the Government is to increase the minimum of reserves from 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ to 40 per cent. The effect will be that, supposing that under the operations of the law the circulation will be increased next year to \$16,000,000, the Government would be required to hold \$2,400,000 in gold, 10 per cent. in guaranteed securities, or \$1,600,000, or \$4,000,000 in all. The Government would then issue additional unguaranteed securities, \$12,000,000 in all, to be held in case of an unusual demand for the redemption of notes. If the law was in operation to-day with the circulation as at present, instead of holding \$4,150,000 in gold for redemption, the Government would be required to hold but \$1,860,000 in gold, and the balance in guaranteed securities, which would relieve \$2,240,000 in gold from deposit, replacing that amount, to a considerable extent, by the

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

guaranteed securities. When in England, last year, arrangements were made by which there can be no question whatever that those securities can be made available at twenty-four hours' notice, should there be a demand for gold. The Government ask that the issue shall not be increased over \$4,000,000 during the next twelve months, and my impression is that that will be quite as much as we will be able to judiciously circulate. Of course the amended charters of the banks will place us in a position to increase the circulation. As one mode of increasing the circulation at this time, as stated by premium, we purpose sending our \$1 notes into the North-West Territory and to British Columbia for the payment of Indian annuities. We have provided in the Bill that the Dominion Notes are to be redeemable at Charlottetown, Victoria, and Winnipeg, as well as at Halifax, St. John, Montreal and Toronto. I do not think there will be any difficulty in circulating the additional notes, in view of the fact that the circulation, without any effort on the part of the Government, has now reached \$12,500,000. The practical effect will be to give us in the first place, if this Bill becomes law, \$2,290,000 of gold that is now held by the Receiver-General. This is a proposition in accordance with the spirit of the first Act intended to give, as far as possible, the people of the country a fair share of the profits of the circulation, and make it secure beyond any controversy. There is now \$21,000,000 of bank circulation; deposits, outside the Government deposits, \$70,000,000; Government deposits, about \$11,000,000. So that, altogether, with their Notes in circulation, and their deposits, they have \$101,000,000, or \$102,000,000 of liabilities, against which they hold in Dominion Notes and gold at present something like \$16,000,000, or 16 per cent. and this is considered ample for their purposes. The reserves to be held by the banks, for the future, increasing from year to year, must be large; because they have not only to provide for circulation, but for \$70,000,000 or \$80,000,000 of deposits, and a large amount of Dominion Notes, must, therefore, remain deposited with the banks, probably \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000.

Next year it will be considerably increased. It is but right that the public should have some profit from this increased circulation. But the security is ample to provide against the possibility of surprise or inconveniences under any circumstances whatever.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Did I understand the hon. the Minister of Finance to say that we have now \$4,250,000 of gold in hand?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: The Return in the last *Canada Gazette*, dated 23rd April, 1880, shows the total as \$3,690,520. Surely, in the short interval to the 26th April, there cannot be a large increase of the Supply.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The statement I have announced was given to me as correct to the end of the month of March.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: The date of the *Gazette* is 23rd April, to which date the Return must have been made. The amount of notes in circulation is given by the *Gazette* almost as by the hon. the Finance Minister—\$12,390,000. The discrepancy seems considerable, about \$400,000 or \$500,000, between the *Gazette's* and the hon. gentleman's statement. I notice, also, in his statement, he puts down the amount of gold required to be held on account of the first \$9,000,000 at 25 per cent.; the *Gazette* puts it at 20 per cent., or only \$1,800,000, which, according to my recollection of the Act fixing 20 per cent., is all that is required to be held, making the *Gazette's* return apparently correct. I would like to know the exact amount of gold that has to be held; it being a matter of some importance.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I was in communication with my Deputy on Saturday morning, with reference to this matter. I had not looked at this Return; but he gave me the amount of the circulation from the last bank Return we had. I spoke from that report. This Return referred to is not to the end of April.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: There is no great difference in the amount of circulation. The difference is in the amount of gold.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I understood from the Deputy that the amount in circulation at this date is \$12,511,000,

and he said he had not given the order with reference to the transfer of specie, because he expected this Resolution to pass at an early date.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I rather think the error has arisen with the person who furnished the hon. gentleman with the statement he read. Supposing that we had to hold 25 per cent. for the \$9,000,000 of Dominion notes, instead of 20 per cent.—that would account for the error of \$400,000. With regard to these Resolutions themselves, I think it is to be regretted they could not have been brought down at an earlier period. This was one of the measures specially promised in the Speech from the Throne, and it would have been more convenient and desirable that we should have carefully considered a well-digested measure which we might have discussed in the earlier weeks of the Session. However, I take it that I am not doing either the Government or the hon. the Minister of Finance any great injustice in imagining their views on this subject have undergone rather considerable modifications since the date of the Speech from the Throne. I rather think that if it were possible for us to pry into the sacred mysteries of the Cabinet, we should find that these Resolutions are by no manner of means those originally intended to have been proposed, and that the deputation of bankers which waited on the hon. the Finance Minister succeeded in altering, to a very considerable extent, the proposals which he originally intended to submit to the House. I suppose it will be convenient to take the Resolutions all together. There are three objections which occur to me as having a rather serious bearing on the propositions now submitted. In the first place, it is quite clear that this measure will raise the amount of Government notes to be either put directly into circulation, or held by the banks, to the sum of \$20,000,000 from the sum of about \$12,000,000, and this is a long step in the direction of the Government taking the entire control of the currency of the country. I am aware that this is a matter on which there always has been, and probably always will be, a great diversity of opinion. Theoretically, I am not prepared to say that the objections to this course are at all so strong as they are in

a practical point of view. In my own opinion, it has always appeared to me that, there was great danger in the Government assuming control of the circulation, partly because they would find it very difficult to perform, officially, those functions which banks perform, more particularly in the way of expanding and contracting the circulation; and also because the universal experience of all countries shows that whenever a Government has taken charge of the circulation, it has almost always resulted in the country having an irredeemable currency in a longer or shorter period, as is well known to have been the case, not only with the adjoining Republic, but with a great number of European countries. In the next place, I am inclined to fear that the practical working of this measure may be such that in times of stringency, when a large amount of currency may come back on the Finance Minister's hands, he might find himself compelled to take measures which would have a very considerable tendency to aggravate the commercial crises which are apt to prevail from time to time. And lastly, which is, perhaps, the most important objection, it is quite clear, judging from the working of the last measure, that this step will still further diminish the small amount of gold reserves which is now held in this country. Now, I regard that as a grave objection. At this present moment, although our banks are reasonably well fortified with reserves, the total amount of gold which our banks possess is very little over \$6,700,000. In the last *Gazette* return which I have in my hand, it is given at \$6,705,000, but that omits several banks which, I suppose, hold smaller or larger amounts. Now, at the time these measures were first introduced by Sir A. T. Galt, and afterwards by Sir Francis Hincks, this result has been very apparent, that the tendency of the banks has been steadily, from year to year, to hold more Dominion notes and to hold less gold. I regard that as a dangerous thing in a country circumstanced as we are. Our position is somewhat peculiar. We have a circulation of extremely small notes, and we have next to no specie currency of any kind in actual use, with the exception of a small silver currency. In the case of

England, with whose system we may advantageously compare our own, it is known to all hon. gentlemen who have paid any attention to this subject, that the smallest note in circulation is a five pound note, although in Scotland and Ireland there is a circulation almost identical with that to which the hon. gentleman proposes to limit the banks. But in England the minimum circulation, consists of notes of \$25 each, and, in addition to the reserves held by the Bank of England, there is a very large amount of gold always in circulation. It is difficult to estimate the amount so held, but I believe those who are best qualified to speak on the subject, think that there is as much as sixty or seventy million pounds sterling in circulation in that country, or about an equivalent of three hundred and fifty million dollars of our money, which constitutes a valuable reserve upon which, in case of emergency, the banks or the Government might, if they saw fit, easily draw by the substitution of a smaller denomination of bills than that now in use. Our position at present, I think, has hardly been fairly tested. Almost from the moment that Sir Francis Hicks introduced the measure in its present shape—almost from that moment we have been steadily and continuously borrowing large sums on the other side of the Atlantic. I think, to the best of my recollection, from about the year 1873, we have entirely ceased to remit any sterling exchange to England, except in very small amounts, for the purpose of meeting the annual interest on our indebtedness. Now, I will call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this. We have at present an annual indebtedness to pay in England of between seven and eight million dollars, and it is quite clear that as soon as we stop borrowing in England we shall be under the necessity of remitting in sterling exchange or in gold, this sum from year to year, quarterly, for the purpose of meeting our annual interest. Now, under these circumstances, I fear that there may be considerably more inconvenience than he expects from a measure which will certainly, I think, have the effect of enormously diminishing the very small stock of gold which we now hold in Canada. At the

present moment, with the exception of six or seven million dollars held by the banks, there is no gold, that I am aware of, held by our people except this \$2,690,000, as credited in the *Gazette* returns. What I fear will happen in this matter is this: I suspect that we will find that this additional issue of \$8,000,000 will have the effect of reducing the six or seven millions of gold to an extremely small figure; that it will become in a great measure a forced loan from the banks, just as the original eight or nine millions which they now hold was practically a forced loan of a certain proportion of their gold. I need not remind the House, that although Dominion legal tender notes are perfectly good as Canadian money, they will not do to pay our foreign remittances with. What I fear is that the Minister of Finance, as this measure develops and expands on his hands, will find himself compelled to give a great deal more attention to the demands of the Mother Country for bullion, and to the commercial stringencies that may arise from time to time, than is either expedient or convenient. The hon. gentleman will soon discover, that under such circumstances the Government of a country will always be held responsible for any serious contraction that takes place. Now, I may say to him that it was largely the conviction of the mischiefs that would arise from this, and largely the experience of the inconvenience that arose from having had at short notice to supply large additional quantities of gold, that induced me three or four years ago to alter the terms of the law as introduced by Sir Francis Hincks. I desired, so far as possible, that this business of supplying gold might be worked with a minimum of inconvenience to the public and to the Finance Department. I believe that at that time, at any rate, the measure I resolved upon of compelling that Department to hold dollar for dollar for all excesses over twelve millions, was as far as it was then safe to go. I can assure the Minister of Finance that during several of the years during which the former system prevailed, very considerable practical inconvenience did arise from the necessity of the Department reinforcing itself with specie from time to time. It is my impression that that incon-

venience will not be diminished, but will be largely aggravated if he gets out the additional \$8,000,000 he proposes to issue. The hon. gentleman said very little as to the mode in which he proposed to keep out his circulation. Of course we all understand that payments, such as those that he spoke of, to be made to the Indians at a distance, will give him circulation for a short time, but I think he has hardly any conception as to the rapidity with which, even in those distant countries, a circulation of this kind is returned upon the hands of the issuer. I presume that he does not intend to compel the Indians to accept notes redeemable at Halifax, or Toronto, or Montreal. I presume, as a matter of course, that he will deal "on the square" with these wards of ours, and that they will receive notes which will be payable at Winnipeg. Well, I am inclined to think that both there and in other parts of the country, the hon. gentleman will find the circulation returning with amazing rapidity. I can speak with some little experience on this subject, because nothing was more noteworthy in old Canada than the extreme rapidity with which the large amount of circulation withdrawn, for the purpose of moving crops, was in the habit of being returned on the various banks. I think he will find that precisely the same thing will happen with respect to the issues which he intends to get out in that way. What the hon. gentleman said with respect to the amount of actual circulation we now have is quite true. The total amount of such circulation is very small, not more, I think, than about \$3,000,000, or thereabouts in small notes. I may remark, in connection with this, that when you come to take into account the fact that for these three millions you must hold some reserve, although but a small reserve, and that you must prepare these notes and maintain this reserve, in various places, for the purpose of circulating them, even to the extent we do, I may remind him that the cost of obtaining circulation is considerable, and will make a very serious inroad, I am afraid, in the profits he may expect to obtain therefrom. I know, of course, he attempts to provide for this by compelling the banks to pay every body that demands sums of \$50, in ones and twos, and I am not prepared to

say that it will not have some effect, though probably much below the effect the hon. gentleman expects. As for the rest, I fear it will become, to all intents and purposes, a forced loan, which the banks will pay to a very great extent out of the small amount of gold they now have. The result will be that the hon. gentleman will have laid on his shoulders the responsibility of providing practically almost all the gold that the banks want. I am aware that up to the present time far less inconvenience has arisen from that than might have been expected, but what was the cause? The hon. gentleman himself alluded to it in one portion of his remarks. We have had most extensive public works going on. We have been steadily borrowing large sums of money, and we have had during the last six or seven years larger amounts to our credit in the banks than we would naturally have had, or perhaps we ought to have had, and, of course, on that account, we have had the banks, to a considerable extent, in our own hands. But if another state of things arose, as it probably would if we ceased borrowing to any great extent, if we run down our balances, as we will probably have to do, to a tolerably small amount, then a greater inconvenience will arise than we have yet experienced, and that inconvenience is going to be aggravated by this additional issue. Nor is it unworthy of note that in this measure we are going a little further than we have hitherto gone in the way of borrowing money at short notice at all. The credit of the Dominion is pledged to redeem all or any portion of this \$20,000,000 when the notes are presented for redemption. We have also a considerable amount in the Savings Bank, a portion of which may, under certain circumstances, return upon our hands. I do not at all deny the right of the people of Canada to a fair share of the profits of the circulation. That I have always contended for myself, but I point out to you that the total circulation is only \$21,000,000 or \$22,000,000, even deducting the \$3,000,000, now out of the remaining \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 will undoubtedly be a very large share of the profits derivable from the circulation. While the banks have a monopoly specially conferred upon them by Parliament,

that is no reason why a fair proportion of these profits should not go to the state ; but I think I am justified in saying that it is a very serious error to think that the banks have profited unreasonably or unfairly by their exclusive privileges. I do not believe that from the year 1850, the holders of bank stock have received more than 6 per cent. on an average, considering that a large portion of bank stock has been blotted out since that time. To my mind, the way in which the hon. gentleman proposes to diminish the power of banks in extending this circulation is dangerous. It will extract a large amount of capital from the available Wages Fund of the people of this Dominion, and when we can get capital at such low rates in England, it would be much better to obtain capital as we want it, than for the Government to lay hands, as we are now doing, on the Bank Gold Reserves, or the circulation of banks to any very large extent. I am not, myself, sufficiently familiar with the American system which, at one time, there was some intention of introducing, to be able to say with the accuracy I could wish how far the advantages and disadvantages of that system compare with ours. But I will say this, that on the whole, no great proportion of our people have been serious losers by the failures which have taken place under the old Canadian banking system, which will compare very favourably with those of England, France and Scotland, as far as the last twenty-five or thirty years ago. I do not anticipate from the propositions just made any very great immediate evil, but I foresee that he will find himself compelled to use much greater vigilance in watching the money market than he has done hitherto, and he will find himself severely censured for many difficulties that will arise and which he cannot prevent. In his second system of Resolution, I see he proposes to make the notes a first lien on the assets of the bank. I am aware that in this case also there is a great difference of opinion, but I am rather inclined to think that the hon. gentleman, if he consults the experience of banks, will find two things. First of all, there is far more danger of a run from depositors than from noteholders. Under the system he now proposes, there is a danger that a

large number of these depositors may be alarmed by the provision the hon. gentleman is now making, and I am afraid that there will be more danger to the credit of the bank from alarm arising among depositors, who are far less easy to deal with than noteholders, as a general rule. Then it is likely that a great number of the depositors will take the opportunity of changing their deposits into notes, if there be the slightest difficulty in getting gold, and there may be some serious inconveniences against which the hon. gentleman can make no provision. I would have been very glad to have heard from the hon. Minister of Finance his opinion as to the proposals which have been freely circulated throughout the country to make us rich by means of a national currency. I observe the hon. gentleman, perhaps, with commendable prudence, has entirely abstained from any allusion to the advantages to flow from that system. I presume that the hon. gentleman is not going to introduce in his Bill any very important alterations in the Banking Act. If he had, he would have taken the opportunity of alluding to them. In any case, anything further I may have to say, I will reserve until the time of the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE (South Norfolk) : The hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, has spoken of a proposition in circulation in the country of making people rich by issuing a National Currency. Now I happen to be an advocate of a National Currency, and know pretty well the views of those who advocate it. There is no such absurdity advanced by those advocates as that of making people rich by issuing a National Currency. They know there are no means by which men can become rich except by labour and the accumulation of labour. Although I regret that the Government have not gone farther than they have, I feel like congratulating the hon. the Minister of Finance and his colleagues upon what they have done. I recognise the fact that no Government can go far in advance of its supporters, or of public opinion, without ensuring its own destruction, and by that destruction accomplishing no good ; therefore, it would be folly, on the part of the Government, to attempt to legislate so that neither the House, nor their support-

ers, nor the country, would sustain them, and in acting cautiously in inaugurating what I believe to be a great reform, they are doing well. We hear much about the waves of depression that are periodically sweeping across the world, making revolutions in commerce, and we are told that they revolve in cycles. Now, I cannot understand anything of this sort. Everything has a cause; and what are the causes of these periodical depressions? Why do they revolve, as it is said, in cycles. I can understand, if a hurricane sweeps across the country and destroys property, that it will bring misery. I can understand if the earth refuses to yield its increase, that it will bring misery; I can understand frost destroying crops; I can understand other natural causes creating misery and commercial disaster, but I cannot understand commercial disasters coming without any of these apparent causes. There must be some other cause, and if there be, I hold it is the duty of Parliament to see if these revolutions in commerce are attributable to any active legislation; and if they be, I hold it is the duty of Parliament to remedy these wrongs by legislation, for I believe that whatever man does, man can prevent. I believe that these depressions are, in a great measure, if not entirely, due to the false monetary system that prevails in many countries in the world, that regulates Great Britain, this country and some other countries, where what is known as a gold basis exists. I may be asked: "How do you account, through the instrumentality of this system, for these commercial crises?" I hold that the monetary systems referred to lacks what the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat fears, that a system, based upon the Resolution introduced by the hon. the Finance Minister, will lack the power of expansiveness. I hold that the expansiveness of the monetary system is not in an equal ratio to the expansiveness of the industry of the world; therefore, credit takes its place, and to broken credit are due, in a great degree, the periodical revulsions in commerce. If any other gentleman can give a better reason for these commercial revulsions it is his duty, if possible, to try to remedy these evils. I hold that the gold basis is a false sys-

tem. It has in it the elements of weakness. It carries with it that which destroys itself. An industry built upon a gold basis can only expand until it outgrows its gold basis, and the moment it does that it must fail, or something else must take the place of gold. Credit steps in, and when credit breaks down by being overdone failures take place, confidence is destroyed, and down comes the whole fabric, just like a child's house of cards. I hold these break-downs are lamentable. They are caused in this way: The more prosperous a country is, the more quickly it outgrows its basis, and the more quickly comes ruin. The failure of J. Cooke and Company, in 1873, began the great crisis on the other side that spread to this country. It involved the failure of others, and these failures created a want of confidence, which destroyed the whole system of credit. Then universal ruin swept over the whole world, and it was due entirely to the false monetary system on which a very large share of the business of the world is conducted. I intend, as briefly as I possibly can, to go into this matter, to show why I think the system we are adopting is a good system, except in this way: That having a gold basis at all, we have the element of distinction within it. It will be necessary to consider money, its uses, and the effects upon the industry of the world. It is a creator of law. Some hon. gentlemen will say it is gold, others that it is silver. I contend that it is neither. Take a sovereign or a ten-dollar gold eagle. It is the imprint of the Government that distinguishes between money and gold. Gold, as money, is two commodities. It is, first, the commodity gold, and, in addition to that, it is the commodity money. Money is not gold. It is a commodity created by law. As an illustration take the timber in a waggon. It is true that it is still the same timber that it was before the waggon was made; but it is more, and by it you have created a new commodity. So it is with a piece of silver or a piece of gold, when you make it into money you create a new commodity; you make it into a legalised instrument of payment. If you contract with a man to deliver any article to him he cannot compel you to deliver that article; you can compel him to take money instead. Money is only

the legal value by which all other values are measured. I may be told that gold is money and that money ought to be gold, because money is valuable and gold is valuable. But what is value? I may say value is usefulness. A thing of no use is of no value. Scarcity creates value it may be said. But it does not. Scarcity is a factor in determining the quantity of value in any article. If there was no want for a particular article, or if it was of no use, its scarcity would not create any value. Divisibility creates value. I say it does not. It is a factor in determining the value. You may take a useless article and divide it, but you do not make it useful. Indestructibility gives value. I say not. If an article is of no use, the fact of its being indestructible would not render it of worth; it would render it more than worthless, its indestructibility would prevent people getting rid of it. Abundance does not make value, the more abundant a useless article is, the greater nuisance it will be, as abundance tends to lessen value. The law of supply and demand comes into operation here. It is said that money must have intrinsic value. I contend it is not intrinsic value, but representative value. For instance, a man works a day and gets a dollar. What is the value of that dollar? It is the man's labour; and that is all he has to represent that labour. Money is not of intrinsic, but representative value. Money of intrinsic value is not fit to be money.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. WALLACE: I hear some hon. gentleman say "hear, hear." I have no doubt some will sneer and laugh. I may be wrong, but if I am I am sincerely wrong in believing I am right. Money is simply the measure of value. Value cannot measure itself. The values of two articles are comparative, but the one cannot measure the other. In contradistinction the one to the other, one may be more valuable than the other, and all values are subject to supply and demand, which is the only regulator. If money is made of an article of value it must be subject to the law of supply and demand, it must therefore be a changing quantity, and a measure that would be a changing quantity would be an absurdity. Take a bushel of wheat. It is 60lb., but if it were a changing quantity, you never

would know what a bushel of wheat was; it would be 60lb. at one time and 58lb. or 62lb. at other times. It is true that by law you do not allow the quantity to change in money. You make a dollar 100 cents. It is never 96 cents, 98 cents or 102 cents; but it changes in two ways, by its scarcity or its abundance, or, if it is of value, by the scarcity or abundance of the article of which the money is made. So I contend that money should not be of intrinsic value. Again, money does not determine value. The value of any article is a matter of agreement between parties to a bargain, between buyer and seller, money measures the quantity after it has been agreed upon, just as a yard measure determines the quantity of a piece of cloth, and as a pound weight determines a quantity of sugar or of any article sold by weight. It is by money that a man expresses the quantity of value he is willing to give for what he wants to buy, or that he will take for what he has to sell, and determines the quantity of one value that is to be given for another value for which it is to be exchanged. Money earns nothing. It produces nothing; it is only an evidence—if it has been legitimately obtained—that its possessor has earned it or bought it with the products of labour. There are various ways of getting money; one by means of loaning money at interest, another by swindling, or stealing, or robbery. Money is only a convenience. It is simply useful for exchanging products, just as railways and other conveyances assist in exchanging the products of different sections of a country and different countries. There is no reason why the convenience money should be gold any more than that railways and steamboats, which are conveniences for like purposes, should be gold. Money is not valuable for the gold in it, if it is gold, but for the power it gives a man to purchase commodities. A man does not want money to hoard it, but to use it, because only in using does he get any value in it. He has got to part with it before it is of any value to him. It is not because it is money that he wants it, but because the law has conferred a power upon it; because it will enable him to pay any debt or make any purchase. Now, as to borrowing money. The hon. the Minister of Finance thinks it best to borrow money. I think it better to make

it. What do English capitalists lend money to Canada on? Simply because they trust in the credit of the country, because they have faith in its resources. Surely, if Canadian credit is good enough for foreign money-lenders, it should be good enough to employ Canadian labourers; and surely Canada can be trusted for the payment of their labour. Or is it that the people of Canada have less faith in the future of their country than Englishmen, who are willing to lend their money on Canada's credit. We are entering upon the construction of great public works in Canada. Canada has got the labour to perform the work. We are going on with the Pacific Railway, and it requires labour and material. Have we not hundreds of men standing idle to-day, and can we not set them to work. It is not money but labour and material that makes a railway; and if we have the labour and the material, have we not the food and the clothing to pay the labourer for his labour. We can do it, Sir, without borrowing money from England or any other country. I may be told that this money will depreciate. This I dispute. I hold that the money of a country, where gold, or paper, or silver, is used for money, must all be equal; because in either case it represents the credit and confidence in the country, and nothing more. Therefore, gold and paper money, as far as money is concerned, must be of equal value; that is, if the country stands. If this Government issued a paper dollar and a gold dollar, the people will take the paper dollar at the same rate as the gold dollar in payment of commodities, or in payment of any indebtedness of any kind. To say that there would be any difference between the paper dollar and the gold dollar would be to say that, of two things that are equal, one is greater than the other. Each one has the fiat of Canada, and carries with it the confidence and worth of the people of Canada, and, therefore, one cannot predominate over the other. Outside of the country the paper dollar and the gold dollar must stand or fall by the relative values of the commodities of what they are made, or by the confidence the outside world has in the country of their creation. The gold dollar in that case must be worth

much more than the paper dollar, because the former, as a commodity, may be worth 90 or 95 per cent. of its money value, whereas the latter may be worth less than 1 per cent. of its nominal value. You can, therefore, readily understand that, when the money of a country passes beyond the limit of the power of its creation, one may be worth more than the other. If gold and paper money, equal in Canada, are offered an Englishman or a foreigner, of these two the gold coin will be the material of the money of nearly all the countries in the world, and will have a commodity value everywhere, whereas, the paper money will only be valuable for buying or paying in Canada; and if the holder of the two kinds of money can buy produce in Russia, or elsewhere, cheaper than in Canada, the gold would be worth more than the Canadian paper money. In that way the gold dollar would be more than the paper dollar; but if the goods of Canada were much cheaper than those of other countries where gold is the money, then the paper dollar would be equal to the gold dollar, for as much could be purchased with one as with the other. In fact, I think the one—the paper—would be worth more than the other, because the paper could be more easily and safely transmitted than gold. Then again, we are told that paper money is fiat money. I would like to see a piece of money that is not fiat money; that is, not created by the law. All money is fiat money; without the fiat of the law it would not have existence. Take away the imprint of the law from a gold or silver piece, and it is no longer money. The existence of money depends upon its creation by the law. It may be asked, how can we carry on trade with outsiders? It might carry on the trade of the country internally. I say we have no possible way of trading with other countries except by products. Again, I contend it does not interfere, in the slightest degree, with our trading with foreign countries, for the simple reason that we trade with our productions. Our wheat, grain of all kinds, or butter and cheese, our fish and all kinds of products, form the basis of our trade with other nations. It is not our gold, because we have none, except what we buy, except what little we dig out of the

mines of British Columbia and Nova Scotia, or what is brought into the country by immigrants. By issuing paper money we would create a greater demand for labour; there would be more employment for immigrants, and, by the increased production, would have more to export. We may get more gold in that way, and in no other, unless we are going to follow out the ruinous practice we have been following of late, of borrowing money. I believe the country has been running fast to ruin owing to the borrowing proclivities of all classes, and our true interests demand that this ruinous practice should stop. Then, gold is spoken of as a standard of value. I contend there can be no such thing as a standard of value, that the value of anything is just what people will give for it—the value of the article to them. To say that gold is a standard of value, is a perfect absurdity, which any one can demonstrate. When a man wants to get food, clothing, or a house to live in, he gives gold for them. Then, how is gold a standard of value? If a man were perishing with hunger and thirst, he would give all the gold in the world if he had it, for a loaf of bread or a drink of water. There can be no regulator of value, except one, and that is the law of supply and demand. If an article is abundant, the tendency of abundance is to make it cheap; if it is scarce, the tendency of scarcity is to make it dear. I want the House to take this into consideration. We are all the advocates of a National Policy. We believe that this country ought to produce to the greatest extent that which the population require. I contend, therefore, that money which is not exportable, which cannot be sent out to buy foreign goods, is the truest and best system of Protection, because it would protect the people without taxation. If we import more goods than we send out exports to pay, we must have gold wherewith to make the purchases. Then, if gold is scarce, it will be high in price, and if it is high in price, imported goods will advance in a ratio equal to the increased price of the gold required for their purchases. Importers will take this into consideration, and will say: The exports are going to be light this season, because crops are small and timber is scarce, and therefore,

if we have to import goods, we will have to pay a high premium in order to meet our payments. What is the result of this high price of gold? The importer puts on an additional percentage on his goods to cover the cost of the gold. The additional price of imported goods would stimulate manufactures, because people would say: "We can afford to manufacture such and such an article at a less price than we can buy it at." Again, I contend that non-exportable money tends to the stability of the governmental institutions of the country. For instance, if a man can put his money into his pocket and can go and live in any other country, what object has he to stay here if any difficulty arises. He would say: I will take my gold and escape the dangers. But if he had non-exportable money, he would be obliged to stay and fight for the country, because he would know that if its governmental institutions should be overthrown, his money would be worthless to him. Thus, this class of money would give stability to the Government, because, not being an article of value outside of the country, every man would be more bound to fight for it than if he had no such incentive to his patriotism. I do not intend to occupy the House at any great length, but I simply want to present my views on this money question. When the Resolution comes up in Committee, I intend to move an amendment to, because I believe that the Government are tying up public opinion by allowing the banks the privilege, for the next ten years, of issuing the currency. I have simply dealt with the Resolution now before the House in a way which commends itself to my judgment as being in the interests of the country, and it is for hon. gentlemen to take the matter into their earnest consideration. I ask them to forget that they are partisans; I ask them to be patriots, and ask themselves what they should do for the best interests of the Dominion, and, after having decided, to act in accordance with the decision of their judgments. I believe that to the present system of money, which is lauded up as the perfection of wisdom, is due the fact that there are so many men out of employment. It is said that over-production is the cause; but what are the facts? Are not nearly half the people of the

world almost naked? There is an over-production of clothing, and yet there are so many persons naked. There is an over-production of food, and yet there are hundreds of thousands of starving men. There are thousands of empty houses, and yet there are hundreds of thousands without habitations wherein to shelter themselves from the cold. I believe this system has brought ruin to every country which has adopted it, and burdened with misery the people. If hon. gentlemen agree with me they can support my amendment, but if they believe that what I have put forward is not true, it will be their duty to do all they can to controvert the propositions I have put before the House.

MR. CHARLTON: With reference to the matter more immediately before the House, the proposition of the Government to increase the legal tender currency of the country, I shall have very little to say, further than to express my conviction that the step taken by the hon. the Minister of Finance is in a dangerous direction. A danger always surrounds a Government that engages in the issue of legal tender paper. The Government has no law above itself. There is nothing to restrain the Government, which may first enter upon this policy with proper restrictions, from exceeding those restrictions. There is nothing to restrain it from entering upon a course with reference to paper money that may prove ruinous. I will cite one or two authorities on this subject which, I am sure, will commend themselves to the House. I will first quote from Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, who placed the finances of that country on a firm basis, and restored them to good order after the Revolutionary War. He says:

“Paper emissions by the Government are of a nature so liable to abuse, I may say so certain to be abused, that the wisdom of the Government will be shown by never trusting itself with so seducing and dangerous a power.”

The only authority in addition which I will cite is that of another Finance Minister of the United States, who has led to a victorious conclusion the attempts to resume specie payments in that country. I refer to John Sherman, who said in a speech upon the currency question in the Senate, Jan. 24, 1870:

MR. WALLACE.

“So there are a multitude of other questions that might be drawn into this discussion. The question of a choice between greenbacks and bank-notes might be drawn into it, but we have avoided any reference to it, because I believe the judgment of the country is gradually settling down to the conviction that a note issued by a Government cannot be a proper agency of circulation. Other nations as well as our own have often tried the experiment of maintaining a circulating note issued by the Government, and they have uniformly found it to fail. It is impossible to give a currency issued by a Government the flexibility necessary to meet the movement of the exchanges; and, therefore, experience has shown that a note issued by a Government and maintained upon the guarantee of the Government alone, does not form a good circulating medium, except during a suspension of specie payments. It must have a flexibility which will enable it to be increased in certain periods of the year, and to flow back again into the vaults of the banks at others. I am convinced, although it is unnecessary to dwell upon that point here, that in time it will be wise to retire our United States notes and all forms of Government circulation, and depend upon notes issued by private corporations, amply secured beyond peradventure, so that in no case can the noteholder lose, and to subject the banks to regulations applicable to all parts of the country, making them free, so that the business of banking will be like the business of manufacturing, blacksmithing, or any other ordinary occupation or business of life, governed only by general law.”

It is a well-known fact that the ablest financiers of the United States are in favour of retiring the greenback circulation entirely, and confining the bank note circulation to the issues by the National Banks. I must hold, if the Government insist upon this policy, that the specie reserve is too small. A reserve of 15 per cent. on the issues is not sufficiently large to give that confidence as to character and redemption of those issues that the public should have. I shall now proceed to consider some of the points raised by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace). Although the danger arising from the agitation in favour of irredeemable currency may not be great, yet it would be folly to underestimate the gravity of the changes that the gentlemen engaged in the agitation seek to bring about. It is a peculiarity of mankind that we always find a considerable portion of the population ready to embrace any creed or theory, to believe any delusive promise that any political quack may make, if he offers relief from hardship, hard times, or any of the ills that pertain to humanity. And it is this

peculiarity of the human mind that render such agitations dangerous. I have been struck, not only to-day, but upon all occasions when I have heard this policy advocated, by the poverty of invention which characterises it advocates. I have been struck with the fact that their arguments are old arguments revamped. They are the very arguments that were used in France in the time of George Law; they are the very arguments used in the French Assembly in 1876; they are the very arguments used in the American Colonies; they are the very arguments used in the American Confederacy when continental money was issued; they are the arguments of all the men who have sought to resort to a worthless issue of irredeemable paper money in all ages, and which have been refuted over and over again by reason and by the logic of facts. It is only to be wondered that any gentleman, with the ability which the hon. member for South Norfolk unquestionably possesses, should have the courage to stand up in the House of Commons and advocate an old heresy, which has brought ruin and distress upon the countries that have tried it. I propose to fortify my position to-day by citing the testimony of men of great eminence. I will also cite the testimony of events, and I think I shall succeed in proving to this House and the country that the reasoning of the hon. member is fallacious and utterly without foundation. I will first quote the testimony of Mr. Francis Horner, chairman of the Bullion Committee of the English House Commons, in 1811, than whom there is no higher authority on this question. He uses the following language :

“The several successive steps which have been observed in every country that allowed its currency to fall into a state of depreciation, are coming upon us faster than was to have been expected in this country, and, as there will be no recovery after bank notes are made a legal tender, the discussions which precede such a measure are evidently of the last importance.”

And the report of the Bullion Committee, of which Mr. Horner was Chairman, was in substance as follows :

“The substance of the Resolutions may be stated as follows : The Act which suspended specie payment ought to be repealed, and the

bank forced to redeem its notes as soon as due caution would permit. To facilitate resumption the smallest notes were first to be withdrawn. It was thought that after two years no notes of less than £5 should be allowed to circulate.”

It may be comfortable to my hon. friend for South Norfolk, to be able to point to that precedent of folly set by the British House of Commons, which at once gravely proceeded to declare that a paper issue was equal to specie, when at that moment it stood at 15 per cent discount. But the views of Mr. Horner prevailed after the country had experienced the hardships and ills resulting from an irredeemable currency, and ten years from that time the Bank of England resumed specie payments. I will next quote the eminent legal jurist Judge Story, and I think no legal gentleman here will be disposed to dispute the weight of his opinion. With reference to the continental currency issues, that gentleman said :

“They entailed the most enormous evils on the country, and introduced a system of fraud, chicanery and profligacy which destroyed all private confidence and all industry, and all enterprise.”

Chief Justice Marshall, speaking for the Supreme Court of the United States, on the subject of irredeemable paper money, says :

“Such a medium has always been liable to fluctuation. Its value is continually changing, and those changes, often great and sudden, expose individuals to immense loss, are the source of numerous speculations, and destroy all confidence between man and man.”

In a letter from Richard Henry Lee, President of Congress, to George Washington, 19th November, 1785, occurs the following paragraph :

“Is it possible that a plan can be formed for issuing a large sum of paper money by the next Assembly? I do verily believe that the greatest foes we have in the world could not devise a more effectual plan for ruining Virginia. I should suppose that every friend to his country, every honest and sober man, would join heartily to reprobate so nefarious a plan of speculation.”

To it Washington replied :

“I have never heard, and I hope never shall hear, any serious mention of a paper emission in this State; yet such a thing may be in agitation. Ignorance and design are productive of much mischief. The former is the tool of the latter, and is often set to work suddenly and unexpectedly. Those with whom I have conversed on the subject in this

part of the State, reprobate the idea exceedingly."

Benjamin Franklin, in reference to this matter, bears the following testimony :

"I lament with you the many mischiefs, the injustice, the corruption of manners, etc., that attended a depreciated currency. It is some consolation to me that I washed my hands of that evil by predicting it in Congress, and proposing means that would have been effectual to prevent it if they had been adopted. Subsequent operations that I have executed demonstrate that my plan was practicable ; but it was unfortunately rejected."

The name of no public man of this century will command greater respect than that of Daniel Webster. In commenting on the objects in view in framing the American Constitution, he said :

"The establishment of a sound and uniform currency was one of the greatest ends contemplated in the adoption of the Constitution. If we could explore all the motives of those who framed and those who supported the Constitution, we should hardly find a more powerful one than this."

In point of fact that Constitution prohibited the emission of bills of credit by States, and undoubtedly the prohibition was intended to apply to the United States Government itself, and it was so held by the United States Supreme Court on one occasion when the matter was brought up on appeal ; and it was only set aside, I may say, by packing that Court, by appointing three new Justices. James Madeson, the father of the American constitution, in arguing for its adoption and referring to the evils of irredeemable paper money, said :

"The loss which America has sustained from the pestilent effects of paper money, on the necessary confidence between man, and the necessary confidence in the public councils, on the industry and morals of the people, and on the character of Republican Government, constitutes an enormous debt against the States chargeable with this unadvised measure which must long remain unsatisfied ; or rather it is an accumulation of guilt which can be expiated no otherwise than by a voluntary sacrifice on the altar of justice of the power which has been the instrument of it."

It was believed that power was sacrificed when the constitution provided that letters of credit should not be issued by the States. In relation to the same subject, Daniel Webster in his speech upon Legal Currency, April 25th, 1816, says :

"Wars and invasions are not always the most certain destroyers of National prosperity. They announce their own approach, and the

alarm. Not so with the evils of a debased coin, a depreciated paper currency, or a depressed and falling public credit. Not so with the plausible and insidious mischiefs of a paper-money system. These insinuate themselves in the shape of facilities, accommodation and relief. They hold out the most fallacious hope of an easy payment of debts and a light burden of taxes. * * * I know the great use of such paper as is convertible into hard money on demand, which may be called specie paper, and which is equivalent to specie in value, and much more convenient and useful for common purposes. On the other hand, I abhor all irredeemable paper—everything in the shape of paper issued for circulation, whether by Government or individuals, which cannot be turned into gold or silver at the will of the holder."

Upon another occasion, in referring to the same subject, Webster uses the following language :

"A disordered currency is one of the greatest of political evils. It undermines the virtues necessary for the support of the social system and encourages propensities destructive of its happiness. It wars against industry, frugality and economy, and it fosters the evil spirit of extravagance and speculation. Of all contrivances for cheating the labouring classes of mankind none has been more effectual than that which deluded them with paper money. Ordinary tyranny, oppression, excessive taxation, these bear lightly on the happiness of the community, compared with the fraudulent currencies and the robberies committed by depreciated paper. Our own history has recorded for our instruction enough, and more than enough, of the demoralizing tendency, the injustice, and the intolerable oppression of the virtuous and well disposed, of a degraded paper currency authorised by law or in any way countenanced by Government."

Henry Clay, in reference to this subject, says :

"If there be, in regard to currency, one truth which the united experience of the whole commercial world has established, I had supposed it to be that emissions of paper money constitute the very worst of all conceivable species of currency."

Andrew Jackson makes use of the following language on the subject :

"There never was, nor ever could be, use for any other kind (than redeemable currency), except for speculators and gamblers in stocks ; and this to the utter ruin of the labour and morals of the country. A specie currency gives life and action to the producing classes, on which the prosperity of all is founded."

Solmon P. Chase, the father of the green-back and legal tender system of the United States and, no doubt, a great authority with the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) in 1862 used the following language :

"The Secretary recommends no mere paper money scheme; but on the contrary, a series of measures looking to a safe and gradual return to gold and silver as the only permanent basis, standard and measure of value recognised by the Constitution.—[Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1862.]"

This gentleman was no believer in fiat money. He recommended the temporary suspension of specie payments under a great national exigency, but with the distinct pledge that the people should be ultimately paid in gold, provision for which, and for the payment of the interest on the bonds in gold, was made by the enforcement of the payment of duties on coin. Thaddeus Stevens, the Republican Leader in Congress, and Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, gives utterance to the following sentiments:

"No one would willingly issue paper currency not redeemable on demand, and make it a legal tender. It is never desirable to depart from the circulating medium which, by the common consent of civilised nations, forms the standard of value.—[Chairman of Ways and Means Com., on debate on Legal Tender Act.]"

The gifted Charles Sumner gave expression to the following sentiments in speaking of the currency question:

"I am not content with the long postponement of specie payment, I believe the time has come for this blessing, and I begin to be impatient when I see how easily people find excuses for not accepting it."

Perhaps the name of Abraham Lincoln may carry as great weight even here, as the utterances of my hon. friend from South Norfolk. Mr. Lincoln observed on this question:

"A return to specie payments at the earliest period compatible with due regard to all interests concerned, should ever be kept in view. Fluctuations in the value of currency are always injurious, and to reduce these fluctuations to the lowest possible point will always be a leading purpose in wise legislation. Convertibility, prompt and certain convertibility into coin, is acknowledged to be the best and surest safeguard against them.—[Annual Message, Dec., 1862.]"

My quotations from eminent men may appropriately be concluded with an extract from Macaulay's "History of England," as follows:

"The evils produced by a bad state of the currency are not such as have generally been thought worthy to occupy a prominent place in history; yet it may well be doubted whether all the misery inflicted on the English nation in a quarter of a century by bad Kings, bad Ministers, bad Parliaments, and bad Judges was

equal to the misery caused in a single year by a bad currency.

Those men are all dead and gone; their record is made up and their opinions are worthy of our consideration. I have quoted authorities than which no higher can be quoted on questions of finance; and the opinions of those who have made financial questions their study almost unanimously agree with those I have quoted. You will scarcely find a work on Political Economy that does not hold the views that I have enunciated here; and amongst all the experiments, and the experiments have been numerous, and tried in various ages of the world, with irredeemable money, there are but two instances in history where such emissions have been redeemed—where they have not brought either utter ruin or great disaster on the countries that have permitted them; these two instances are, first, England; and, second, the United States. In only one of those instances, that of the United States, was the paper currency made a legal tender. The issues of the Bank of England were never largely increased, but were kept within proper limits and bounds, and yet, notwithstanding the confidence of the public that those issues would be ultimately redeemed, and the fact that the Bank of England professed to be able to redeem in gold at any time, the notes were depreciated 30 per cent.; and in the United States, where there was a distinct promise on the part of the Government that its issues should be redeemed in gold, and where the volume of paper issues was carefully restricted, the discount on those notes became enormous, the premium on gold being at one time above 180, \$100 in gold being worth \$280 in this currency, notwithstanding that the people had undoubting faith that they would be redeemed as promised. This is one evidence of the small effect that the promise of a Government will have in maintaining the value of the currency when not immediately redeemable in gold. I have one instance further in illustration of this principle—it is that of the National Banks of the United States. Every bank was compelled to deposit with the Government \$100 in gold-bearing bonds, the interest payable annually in specie, to secure an issue of \$90 in currency, and yet, notwithstanding that these notes

were thus secured, they were as low as the United States greenbacks. This shows the effect produced when a currency is not instantly convertible into gold. I defy the hon. member for South Norfolk, or any advocate of fiat money, irredeemable or rag money of any kind, to show any instance in history where this experiment has been tried that it has not proved disastrous. I think we may come to the consideration of the practical operation of this system and dismiss all those fine-spun theories and volumes of words about money, capital and labour, values, etc., and take the broad, naked, plain facts as they stare us in the face, which show that in every instance where the theory has been tried, disaster has resulted. I may repeat some things I said last year in reference to this matter. It is not improper to repeat the lessons then brought before the House. It would not be improper to reiterate them a thousand times till every Canadian knows that actual trials and ample experience constitute the most powerful and convincing arguments against this scheme. The American colonies made the most ample trial of an irredeemable paper currency. Almost all of them issued money endorsed by the State, the result being the same in all cases. In Connecticut, in 1749, \$8 in currency was only worth \$1 in silver. In Rhode Island, in 1769, \$1 in silver would purchase \$26 in legal tender of that Colony. In North Carolina, in 1840, \$1 in silver purchased \$14 of legal tender; in 1740, in South Carolina, \$1 in silver would purchase \$8 in legal tender. In 1749, \$1 in silver would purchase \$11 of legal tender in Massachusetts. During the period of those paper money experiments, great disaster and great derangement in business existed in those Colonies, and industry was prostrated. We have further back in history many cases proving very conclusively what the operation of legal tender paper money always was. In China, in the ninth century, its Government issued fiat money, a currency stamped upon mulberry bark; the value of the money depending upon the size of the pieces. It was to be received and pass current on pain of death, but it was found, notwithstanding, impossible to keep it afloat, and it ultimately became utterly worthless. One of the most useful lessons supplied

with regard to this question is the experience of the United States in the first years of her history. Notwithstanding the lessons those Colonies had furnished, of the evils of our irredeemable currency, under the pressure of the necessities created by the Revolutionary War, Congress emitted a large quantity of paper money. The notes were to be paid in Spanish milled dollars. The credit of the country was pledged for their payment, in silver. The first issue was made in 1775 of \$2,000,000, and eighteen months after the notes stood at 50 per cent. discount. In October, 1779, \$1 in silver would purchase \$30 in continental money. At this juncture certificates redeemable at the end of six years, and bearing interest at the rate of 5 per cent. were issued, and the privilege was given to fund continental money in those certificates at the rate of \$40 in continental currency to \$1 in certificates. This was practically going into bankruptcy and paying 2½ cents on the dollar in a new promise to pay. Before the end of 1780 these certificates sank to ⅓ of their nominal value, at which rate \$320 in continental currency was equal to \$8 in certificates or to \$1 in silver. Shortly after this \$1,000 in currency equalled \$1 in silver and almost immediately afterwards it became utterly worthless. The issues of the Continental States were \$241,000,000. It was a currency abundantly cheap and fulfilled all the conditions that the hon. member for South Norfolk requires, being without value and easily obtained, though the promise to pay in silver would, in his opinion, be an objection. The consequences of the issue of this mass of currency were most disastrous to the country when it had run its course and an attempt was made to come back to a solid basis. Property was swept away under execution for debt without satisfying the claims, and in some States stay laws were enacted which prolonged the difficulty. In Massachusetts it was wisely determined to get rid of the evil as soon as possible. This occasioned the breaking out of the Shay Rebellion, which threatened the stability of the institutions of that State. All these were evils of a class which invariably manifest themselves under similar circumstances. With reference to England, the Bank of England suspended in 1797. **As**

I stated a few minutes ago, there was no over issue of notes. The Bank of England never increased its circulation beyond the limit that was deemed safe at the suspension, when its issues were fixed upon a specie basis. There was no lack of faith in the ultimate redemption of the notes of the bank, and the bank professed to be ready to resume specie payment at various times when the Government did not deem it prudent to permit it to do so. But in 1814, even under these circumstances, the difference between the Bank of England notes and gold was 30 per cent. £3 17s. 10½d. in gold being worth £5 4s. in notes of the Bank of England. Even under these circumstances, serious derangements to business resulted in England, legitimate trade in that country became uncertain and spasmodic, there were violent fluctuations in prices, laborers and artisans were in great distress, prices of the necessaries of life rose much more rapidly than the price of labour; there were labour riots in various parts of England, and when specie payment was resumed, this same labouring class was again subjected to great hardships by the fact that the price of their labour fell more rapidly than the price of the necessaries of life, so that they were first injured by the rapid rise of the necessaries of life and the slower rise in the price of labour; and secondly, after the return to specie payment, by the slow decline in the necessaries of life and the rapid fall of the price of labour. It was especially disastrous to widows and orphans, to recipients of salaries, and to persons possessing fixed incomes. Such has always been found to be the case in countries where the abandonment of the specie standard or debasing coin led to the depreciation of the currency, and the nominal enhancement of the prices of the necessaries of life. The extract, I read, graphically depicts the misery that existed in England from this cause. Macaulay declared that the misery from one year of bad money exceeded that caused by bad harvests, bad laws, bad Kings, and bad Judges, for twenty-five years. I come next to the consideration of two great and significant lessons afforded us by the experience of France with this class of money. In 1716, George Law, an enterprising Scotchman succeeded in inducing the French Government to embark in a

scheme of which he was the author, called the "George Law scheme." A bank was established. The issues of that bank were founded on the credits of the State, and upon lands. The issues of that bank amounted to three milliards of francs. An enormous inflation and fictitious prosperity intoxicated the people of France. This state of things lasted for four years, and then came the collapse. George Law fled for his life, and France was subjected to twenty-five years of derangement, distress and misery in consequence of this experiment. This was not sufficient. In 1787 the French Assembly again embarked in a similar scheme for the relief of the public necessities. Although that subject has often been referred to, I ask the indulgence of the House while I refer to it again, because no lesson is more conclusive in its teachings as to the folly of resorting to an issue of irredeemable paper money than the experience of France under the issues of the *Assignats* in the period of the French Revolution. The first issue was made in 1789, it was made against the protests of cool-headed men of the French Assembly who cited their fellow-countrymen to the experience of France under George Law, and predicted that the same evils would visit France again in an aggravated form. Despite their protests and warnings the French Assembly proceeded to issue *assignats* based upon the value of the Church estates. The first issue was 400,000,000 francs; the next issue in 1789 was 800,000,000 francs; the next issue in January, 1790 was 600,000,000 francs. When this point was reached, capital began to shrink from investments, and business in France became gambling. In 1792 the *assignats* stood at 30 per cent. discount. Then the debtor class—and it is from the debtor class that the pressure generally comes for cheap money—invasion the Assembly and demanded an increase of the issue of *assignats*, in order that they might the more easily pay their debts. Further issues were made. It was by this time found almost impossible to carry on the French Government. Salaried clerks could not live upon their salaries, and resigned in shoals. Then the Assembly stepped in and attempted to control the prices of the necessaries of life by passing maximum laws that provided that the price of wheat, oil, wine and

other articles should not exceed certain sums—laws fixing the prices of all the commodities that entered into daily consumption. As a matter of course these laws were inoperative, and were set aside by the inexorable laws of supply and demand. In 1793, the purchase of specie was prohibited, and the penalty of engaging in a transaction of this kind was six years in irons. In that year the sale of *assignats* below their nominal value was prohibited, and the penalty for this crime was twenty years in chains. Frenchmen began investing their means in foreign countries and this was prohibited by the Assembly under the penalty of death. In 1796, 5,337 francs in *assignats* were worth 34 francs in silver, and soon after 100 francs in *assignats* were worth five *sous*. In the same year the French Assembly resorted to the scheme which is generally resorted to under like circumstances—it went into bankruptcy. It agreed to pay 3½c. on the dollar in new promises to pay. It funded the *assignats* in *mandats* in the proportion of 30 francs in *assignats* to one in the *mandats*. These *mandats* soon declined, so that 1,000 of them would only purchase one franc in silver. At that rate the original issue was worth in the proportion of 30,000 to 1 in silver. Speedily the whole mass was repudiated; the whole issue became a total loss; the entire issue was 45 milliards of francs; and the testimony of history is, that the horrors of the *bastille*, the guillotine, and the wars that France engaged in during that period, all combined, did not inflict the evil upon France that was inflicted by the issue of the *assignats*. The Assembly now passed an edict permitting the circulation of any kind of money. Frenchmen were anxious to see real money once more, and goods were sold at an enormous sacrifice in order to obtain money that had an actual value. Hoards of gold and silver were now brought out of their hiding places, goods were cheap, exchange turned in favour of the country, prosperity returned, and, during all the wars of Napoleon, France carried on her vast military operations upon a specie basis. It may be wearisome to dwell on these instances of the experience of other countries with paper money, but this is an important question. I wish to show from the experience of

various nations the utter fallacy of the theories propounded by visionary dreamers. The next instance that I shall cite is that of Russia. Russia is a great empire of enormous resources, developed and undeveloped. In 1768, Russia made her first issue of paper money of forty million roubles. In 1787, she made an additional issue of sixty million roubles. In 1816, the aggregate amount of paper money in circulation was 577 million roubles. At that time 400 roubles in currency purchased 100 roubles in silver. Russia then resorted to the same scheme resorted to in most continental states, she went into bankruptcy. She offered to pay in the proportion of three and one-half to one, by a new issue of roubles or in silver. This new issue soon swelled to enormous proportions, and since that time the premium upon the paper currency has been extremely high. Russia has been in a state little better than chronic bankruptcy. The revenue has seldom equalled the expenditure, and to-day, if we look at the internal condition of that country, torn by Nihilism and Communism, we see the most unhappy country on the globe, and it would be very difficult indeed to say how large a proportion of these disasters were attributable to that false system of issuing irredeemable currency in that country. The next instance will be that of Austria: In 1796, the first issue of paper money was made. In 1806 silver stood at a premium of 75 per cent. In 1809, 315 florins were required to purchase 100 florins in silver. In 1811, when the amount in circulation was 1,061,000,000, 1,200 florins in paper purchased 100 florins in silver. In 1820, the Government resorted to the same time-honoured expedient of going into bankruptcy. It funded its issue by issuing a new batch of florins, and redeemed the old by giving one of the new for five of the old. By that means, all but 20 per cent. were wiped out. It then proceeded to issue a larger volume, in 1815 the value of this second issue was merely nominal, and it was funded again through the establishment of the Bank of Vienna, in the proportion of one florin of the new for eleven of the old. The finances of Austria are still in hopeless confusion, and its currency is still at a heavy discount. I might cite the case of the Confederate States of America, where in three short

years the currency went down until it required \$300 in currency to purchase one dollar in silver, and then it became utterly valueless. In Italy, the forced circulation of paper money is but of recent date, but it is already heavily depreciated and the country is in a state of financial confusion. The same state of things exists in Spain, in consequence of a depreciated and irredeemable paper currency. The same state of things exists in Turkey, where the currency is in a perfect medley of debased coins and worthless paper. Turkey is now attempting to return to a specie basis; having tried an irredeemable currency and found it disastrous. The South American States are almost all labouring under the same difficulties today. The rate of discount has reached, in those States, as high as \$400 in currency for one dollar in silver. The little negro state of Hayti, even, has found the hon. gentleman's panacea, and it requires \$500 there to buy your breakfast. So much for the testimony of history. These instances might be multiplied but the number I have cited is sufficient to cause us to pause before adopting a principle which has been so uniformly disastrous in its results in all countries where it has been tried, and that during many centuries. There have been only two instances in all human history where the result of an irredeemable money issue has not been ruinous, and in each of these cases the Government solemnly declared that its paper money emissions were to be paid in gold, and that ruin did not result was due to the fact that the people had faith that the promise of the Government would be redeemed. The hon. gentleman has at some length given us his definition of money. Money, he told us, was a creation of the Government. Well, Sir, is it true that governments can create money? If it is true that governments can give value to that which is worthless then the hon. gentleman can, perhaps, make out his case. But I deny that Government can create money, or that they can create anything that man will accept as value. What is money? It must have one requisite to commence with and that must be value. Money is an invention some 4,000 years old. Man has tried various expedients. Before arriving at that stage of advancement

where he could make use of money he resorted to barter. After trying barter he advanced a stage and used as money various articles possessing value. Cattle were used for this purpose and other valuable articles. Among barbarous tribes an analagous state of things still exists. The Africans use cowrie shells, copper, wire, etc.; the Indians wampum belts. Man finally reached that point where a wise and judicious selection of the article that was to pass as money was made, and for wise reasons the precious metals were selected as that article. Now, we need to bear in mind that there is a vast difference between specific purchasing power and general purchasing power. Any article that has value has a specific purchasing power. If its owner can find a person who wants it and has some other article that he wants, an exchange can be made, and each of the articles in that case possesses a specific purchasing power. Neither of them, however, can be used as a purchasing agent except upon the principle of barter, neither of them have a general purchasing power. Money possesses a general purchasing power. Everything that possesses value is convertible into money, and money in turn can be converted into anything that possesses value. The precious metals were selected for this purpose, and I wish to call the attention of the House to some reasons that had weight in leading to this selection. One of the main reasons undoubtedly was as to their quantity. The quantity could neither be increased nor diminished by an act of Government. It was entirely beyond the interference of Government. The quantity was sufficient for all purposes of commerce and could only be slightly and gradually increased. There have been only two considerable changes in the value of precious metals during the period of which we know anything about their production. The one was in the sixteenth century, when the value of silver was affected by the production of the mines of Mexico and Peru. The second was in the nineteenth century when the value of gold was affected by the discoveries of that precious metal in California and Australia. It was next chosen because it is universally valued. It is an article that is current in all lands. It

requires no edict of a Government to give to gold and silver a value. It was chosen because it has the power of equalising values all over the world. It also possesses a uniformity of quality. Gold mined to day is of exactly the same quality as gold mined long ago. Silver mined in Nevada possesses exactly the same quality as silver mined in Siberia. Of whatever age and wherever produced the quality of gold and silver is identically the same. Another quality it possesses is that it is convenient and portable. Another quality which it possesses is that it can be divided and subdivided. No matter how small the piece its value is exactly in proportion to its weight. Another quality is that it is practically indestructible, a coin in constant use will last, it is said, 2,400 years. The hon. gentleman stated that it was the Government stamp that gave value to this money. That is a preposterous assertion. It is the Government stamp that gives evidence as to the value. A thousand sovereigns in a mass, or a thousand eagles in a mass, are worth just as much as they were worth when in coins. The Government of Great Britain charge $\frac{32}{1000}$ of 1 per cent. for coinage while the United States coins free. The bullion of the United States is worth exactly as much when not coined as when in coin. The statement of the hon. gentleman, that the coin depends for its value on the stamp of the Government, is on a par with the other absurdities to which the hon. gentleman has given utterance in this House. The stamp of the Government is merely an evidence of its value. It is simply for the sake of convenience that Government have been deputed to fulfil this duty of stamping on coins their weight and value. How long have these metals been used as money? Is it an invention of to-day, or does it date back to the period of the French Revolution, or to the days of the Continental States of America, or to the days when the Chinese had fiat money consisting of mulberry bark? No; from the very earliest records of history the precious metals have fulfilled the functions they fulfil to-day. The experience of forty centuries is certainly worthy of consideration. It cannot be lightly set aside. If mankind have adhered regularly to one system, it certainly is a pretty conclusive argument that there must be some good reason for

adherence to that system. A good deal has been said by the hon. gentleman about standards of value, measures of value, mediums of exchange, and so forth, and I wish to draw the attention of the House to the distinction that should be drawn between a standard of value and medium of exchange. A check drawn by any hon. member of this House for \$1,000, provided there is confidence that the man has that amount of money in the bank, and confidence that the bank is able to pay that amount, is a good acceptable medium of exchange for \$1,000. Not that that is its intrinsic value, but it represents that value somewhere. A measure of value or a standard of value is something different. A cheque is not a standard of value, neither is a bank note nor a Government bond a standard of value, but all of these represent value which the public faith believes is lodged somewhere. A standard of value is something that possesses value. Gold and silver have been chosen by civilised nations, and barbarous nations as well, to serve for 4,000 years the functions of a standard of value, and a bank note or bill of exchange merely represents that the maker of that bank note or bill of exchange owns so much of that standard of value, which is payable on his demand.

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

After Recess.

MR. CHARLTON: When you left the Chair, Sir, I had just finished some remarks as to the character of money and the reasons which led to the adoption of the precious metals to serve for that purpose. In the course of this discussion much has been said about irredeemable money, about fiat money, measures of value, etc., and I wish, at this point, to define briefly what irredeemable is. Irredeemable money is a currency which promises to pay something in the future. The promise usually made is to pay in gold. The degree of discredit that attaches to irredeemable money is governed by its volume, and the degree of faith entertained as to its ultimate redemption and the point of other worthlessness, is reached when faith in the ability to pay is finally lost. The scheme we are dealing with to-night, as propounded by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), is not a scheme of

irredeemable money, I am sorry to say, it is a scheme even worse than this. The currency advocated by the hon. member is a currency that commences when an irredeemable ends at utter worthlessness, and that is the point where fiat money begins. The hon. gentleman in his speech says that money that has an intrinsic value is not fit to be money. Well, he certainly advocates the adoption of a currency that has no intrinsic value. He advocates the adoption of a currency that promises to pay nothing. It is a currency that never will be discredited, because no promise is given. The money the hon. gentleman proposes should be issued will promise to pay absolutely nothing. It will not read "The Dominion of Canada promises to pay one dollar." It will read "This is a dollar." We will suppose that the manager of the Grand Trunk road or the manager of the Great Western Railway should issue what might be termed locomotive paper affirming that "This is a locomotive," it would be absurd. If it announced that they would furnish a locomotive on demand we might consider it. Some follower of my hon. friend might go into the live-stock business and he might issue a piece of paper affirming "This is a jack-ass." It would more clearly express the character of the issuer than the character of the paper. My hon. friend tells us that one advantage this money will possess will be that it will be non-exportable—that you cannot take it out of the country, and that the country cannot be made poorer by the exportation of this money. There are various other articles that are non-exportable, bad bacon, musty wheat, rotten eggs, and almost everything you can mention that is worthless, is non-exportable, and it is for that reason the currency that the hon. gentleman proposes to issue will be non-exportable. He also says it will help to maintain the institutions of the country, and check immigration, the reason probably being because the people will be so poor that they cannot get out of it. I do not deny that a Government can give to a currency a debt cancelling power, but I defy any Government to give to currency a buying power, and whatever device man may adopt, gold will, in all cases, measure the value of his device. The advocacy of this scheme is either stupid or it is immoral. There may

be debtors in the community who desire in this way to defraud their creditors. Should this system ever obtain in this country we would see the old system of barter introduced again. Such was the case in the Confederate States of America. It was no unusual thing for persons to stipulate that their services should be paid for in produce. The same would undoubtedly be the case here in the event of the adoption of this system of currency. The hon. gentleman did not raise the claim to-day, but he did on a former occasion, that this scheme would make the rates of interest low. Exactly the reverse however, would be the case. Invariably, under the operation of a scheme of irredeemable money interest becomes exorbitant. The reason of this is not far to seek. With a fluctuating currency not only the usual rate of interest is charged, but a further rate is added, sufficient to cover the probably depreciation in the currency during that period that it will pass from the possession of the lender. This was the case in the United States during the greenback era. To my own personal knowledge, the best names could seldom obtain bank discounts in the interior at less than 13 per cent per annum. Since resumption, however, money, is easily obtained from 6 to 8 per cent. per annum. During the days of wild cat banking in the Western States, 40 per cent was no unusual rate of interest, and cases are known where 10 per cent per month was paid. Such a currency constantly depreciates, and when the lender parts with it he naturally demands a rate of interest that will give a reasonable return for its use, and leave an ample margin to cover its depreciation when he shall receive it again. There is an opinion that in this country, and in various other countries, the amount of circulating medium is insufficient for the wants of the people. It is undoubtedly true that in France and some of the Continental States of Europe the amount of currency in circulation is larger *per capita* than in England or the United States or in Canada. The mode of business is different in some countries from others. In the United States, in Canada, in Great Britain, people deposit money in Savings' Banks and other institutions; their payments are usually made by cheque, which is an

evidence of the possession of money. In New York, in London, in Chicago, not 5 per cent. of the daily transactions are performed with currency. A man draws his cheque, passes it over to another who endorses it, and passes it over to the bank; that cheque performs a dozen payments, perhaps, and finally goes to the bank. In France, business is done in another way; they use currency in transactions to a great extent; they do not deposit in Savings' Banks to the same extent. Almost every peasant or farmer has a small hoard of money laid away, and business is done largely by actual payment of specie or currency. For this reason a larger amount of currency is required than in England or the United States, where they depend more upon the operations of those great facilities of exchange, banks and the bank clearing house. The hon. gentleman need not borrow any trouble about not having a sufficient amount of currency in the banks. The banks of Canada are, in fact, unable to obtain circulation for their money. A man who wishes to have it must have security to place in the hands of the Bank of personal character and credit and then he can have it without any difficulty. I have dealt with the testimony of great men as to this question. I have dealt with the experience of the past, and with the general principles appertaining to this question; and now I propose to refer to one practical lesson worked out before our eyes in our own generation—the green-back period in the United States, commencing in 1862, and ending so recently as the 1st of January, 1879. The experience of that country will afford us many useful lessons, although there is a very great difference between the principles adopted by them, and the principles my hon. friend intends to adopt. That country issued a currency repayable in gold, which it was believed would be payable in gold, a currency which has been paid in gold. But here we are to have a currency which will never be paid in gold, a currency which will be worthless from the commencement. The effect under even these mitigating circumstances, the effect even where the currency was one not immediately payable in gold, though ultimately so payable, was expansion, resulting—as will always be the case on

the adoption of such a currency system—most disastrously to the creditor class. Who were they? They are all to whom debts are due; all who have more debts due to them than they owe. It includes nine-tenths of the working men of the country. It includes in the United States 8,000,000 of labourers, earning annually \$2,500,000,000. It would include in this Dominion some 600,000 labourers, earning annually some \$200,000,000. To this army of creditors in the United States, an average of \$100,000,000 is at all times due. It includes 700,000 policy holders in Life Insurance Companies. It includes an army of 2,400,000 depositors in the banks of the United States, against about 200,000 debtors who borrow money from the banks. Thus it will be seen that the benefits of inflation were reaped by a few at the expense of the vast majority of the people of the country. What was the effect in that country upon all those having fixed incomes: money was lowered in value; persons with fixed incomes, persons with salaries, were sorely pinched, and had great difficulty in obtaining the necessaries of life under the expansion and depreciation of money, and the advance of prices that resulted. Another marked influence was exercised in the United States, on the labouring class, in addition to that exercised upon them as creditors. While their wages advanced slowly, the prices of the necessaries of life advanced rapidly. By reliable tables it has been shown that the necessaries of life advanced in price 100 per cent. while wages only increased 50 to 62 per cent. The consequence was that as the system proceeded the difficulties of the working class relatively became worse and worse, and when the tide turned, when the United States had determined to return to a specie currency, the price of gold fell, then the wages of the labourer quickly descended to the level they had originally held, while the necessaries of life, on the other hand, followed the decline by slow degrees, so the labouring people were, therefore, again the great sufferers; they were ground between the upper and nether millstones, first by the rapid advance in the price of food and necessaries, compared with the advance in the price of wages; and second, by the rapid decline in the price of wages, compared with the

decline in the price of food and necessaries. While depreciation was increasing, business confidence was, in a great measure, destroyed; foresight as to the future became impossible; business became literally gambling; no man, no matter how astute could foresee the fluctuations of gold which actually governed all values. The goods of the importer were to be paid for in gold, his sales were in currency, no human foresight could tell him what margin should be charged to cover advance in premium between date of purchase and date of realisation, upon sales and business, from the force of circumstances became gambling. Another feature, and a most remarkable feature in connection with this state of things, was that the exact amount of money in circulation was known, there was no law of fluency in operation, gold could not be used as money, and would not flow in from other lands, it was an article of commerce. The result was that great operators were enabled to get possession of great sums in currency and create artificial stringency; it was repeatedly done by these means, these men temporarily locked up large sums of money to create stringency and panic. The market for stocks and produce was completely controlled by them. Black Fridays and spasmodic fluctuations were the result, and these large operators swallowed up the small operators by scores. Such fortunes as those amassed by Vanderbilt, Scott, Stewart and Gould were built up by means of this character. These gamblers made the nations necessities, its hopes, its very despair, counters in their game. Another result was wild speculation, extensive production of things for which there was no demand, wasteful extravagance, a shoddy aristocracy, a morbid desire to become rich without labour. The creation of great fortunes by this system, the robbery of the public and the nation by bold stock gamblers led to the raising of a popular cry against privileged classes and the bondholder. The people instinctively felt that they had been robbed, and the greenback or fiat money heresy would never have received the support it did but that a portion of the people thought to pay a debt which had cost the holders so little by resorting to a fraud infinitely greater than the frauds of the war period, and cancelling the bonds with worthless

currency. I desire, Sir, to examine for a moment the effect of this system upon debt and taxation, and to direct first, attention to the manner in which loans were made in the United States. They required means to carry on their war operations; the country was a borrower. Secretary Chase unwisely determined to maintain the price of American bonds at par nominally by depreciating the currency that was received for them. Had he borrowed no gold, placing his bonds upon the market at such discount as was necessary to float them, he would in the end have been infinitely better off. A bond of \$100 at one time cost but \$40 in gold, and the great bulk of the debt was contracted when \$100 in currency was worth less than \$60 in gold. The Government is paying these bonds at par in gold; The investors receive, in many instances, in gold 150 per cent. more than they invested in gold. This borrowing at par, in a currency which was to be repaid, principal and interest in gold, added enormously to the debt of the United States. Had the Secretary borrowed only in the equivalent of gold, and placed his bonds in the American markets at such price as they would command, the debt would have been \$900,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 less than it was, and to-day the United States, with the taxation they have paid, would have been entirely out of debt. The United States have had an ample experience in irredeemable money. The moment Richmond fell, the agitation commenced for a resumption of specie payment, and on the first of January, last year, they returned to a specie currency. And what has been the result? Men who held the views of my hon. friend from South Norfolk, believed that resumption would prove disastrous to the United States. Were these prophecies fulfilled? Were the United States injuriously affected? No; they were not. On the contrary the great majority of the people of the United States had been waiting for many years for that juncture to arrive, and from the moment it was known that the wishes of the country would not be disappointed, business revived; capital had been waiting for the time when there would be some assurance that the gambling era had ceased; and when that assurance came, when resumption was made certain,

business revived, as I have already said. And was that revival spasmodic or temporary? No; on the contrary after a lapse of nearly eighteen months since the resumption of specie payment in the United States, this revival may be considered a permanent thing; that country has entered upon a career of prosperity which will eclipse any previous period of her history; and I have no hesitation in saying, and it cannot be doubted by any reasonable man that this revival of business and this great prosperity is due wholly and exclusively to the resumption of specie payment, in that country. Are the United States likely to go back to the greenback system after having so many years experience of it and having abandoned it? Are they likely to back to irredeemable currency? What is the status of the greenback party of the United States? There is at this moment enough lunatic asylum capacity in that country to hold the whole of them. Our industries and our commerce need rest and certainty. Capital to my certain knowledge has already abandoned Canada, and sought investments elsewhere, owing to the uncertainty surrounding the money question. It is high time the Government ceased to coquet with this question; it is high time the hon. the Minister of Finance should give an authoritative expression of opinion on the views advanced by those who favour a fiat currency. A prudent farmer will not hire a man who has burned the barns of all those who have ever employed him; and a prudent nation will not adopt a system fraught with such ruinous consequences as is this irredeemable currency system. The experience of history, the dictates of reason, the declarations of the wise and the great, forbid us to believe that a fiat money is better than a currency based upon specie. I am firmly impressed with the belief arrived at, after a careful study of paper currency experiments, after careful consideration of the laws governing money questions, after a practical knowledge of the business experience of the United States during the period of suspension in the country since 1862, that a credit currency is a device which never fails to be calamitous in its consequences, and rarely fails to entail ruin. I cannot condemn too strongly the insane recklessness or the inexcusable ignorance

of the Utopian dreamers and designing knaves who advocate a measure which would bring upon us calamity and distress. By its operation values would be unsettled, rapid and sharp fluctuations in prices would be introduced, uncertainty as to the future would baffle the most astute. The poor man's wages would advance slowly, while the necessaries of life advanced rapidly and daily became more difficult to obtain, and the circulating medium of the country would rapidly gravitate to utter worthlessness. I would my words could reach every farmer, every artisan, every labourer, every man who earns his living by toil in shop or field, for their interests are dependent on an established credit, a stable currency, and steady means of payment. Honest labour has nothing to gain from shifting values, fluctuating prices, or impending collapse. Specie has a uniform and intrinsic value the world over. It is the bed rock as a standard, sure and steadfast. Rag money is a delusion, and bitter will be our experience, terrible the lessons by which adversity will teach us of our folly, if we insist upon learning in the school of fools, and refuse to be taught by the experience of others. I hope that the crude theories advanced by this class of financiers and political economists, so often exploded in practice, and so often shown in theory to be utterly without foundation, may never be adopted or tried in this country.

MR. McCALLUM: Although I do not agree exactly with the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) yet I believe the object of the Government in introducing this measure is to utilise, as far as possible, the currency of the people, and by that means to save as much interest as possible. So far as that goes, I entirely approve of the measure. The hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) said it was a long and dangerous step from \$12,000,000 to \$20,000,000. I do not regard it as very dangerous. I cannot see what injury can accrue from the Government taking so much circulation. I am only sorry they did not consider it their duty to take the whole circulation, so that when a man had a dollar bill he would know it was good and backed up by the whole Dominion. The money today is not all alike in the country. There

is a discount on Ontario bills in the Lower Provinces, and a discount on the Lower Province bills here. I think it is the duty of the Government to take this whole matter into their hands, and that they are neglecting their proper functions when they delegate to banks the power to issue bills to pass as money. The Government ought to retain this power for the benefit of the people. The hon. member for Centre Huron also said that the banking systems of Scotland and Canada are alike and that they have served good ends. Well, we have recently seen what disastrous results flowed from the banking system of Scotland, and we have not to look far back to see how the people of Canada suffered from our banking system. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that the Government might misuse this power. Now, the hon. gentleman is going back upon himself when he makes such a statement. The Government is responsible to the people who entrust hon. members with the power to pass all laws regulating property and everything else. The hon. gentleman also wished his language would go to every farmer in the country. If his remarks regarding the issue of the greenback currency in the United States, when he stated they were redeemable in gold when issued, went to the farmers, what would they think? If the balance of the hon. member's speech is on a par with that, I can assure him there are many farmers in his own county who have a better knowledge of the subject. This very much abused system of greenbacks saved the United States. What was the result at the beginning of the war when they tried to borrow money from their own capitalists to carry on the war? They could only get about \$12,000,000, at a rate of interest ranging from 10 to 12 per cent. They issued those greenbacks, and borrowed \$450,000,000 from their own people and saved the country. I do believe in a legal tender currency myself, but do not believe we should issue money to be redeemable in gold unless we keep the gold to redeem it with. Of what value to the people is gold, if it is piled up in the vaults of the Government? It is like manure piled up in a barnyard—it is of no use. But spread that manure around and it enriches the soil and brings forth good crops. It is the

same with this gold in the vault. Spread it around and it will increase industry and by that means increase the productions of the country. If the Government were to issue legal tender notes and bonds drawing 4 per cent. interest, never payable except at its own option, allowing the notes to be converted into bonds, or *vice versa*, at the option of the holder, I think it would be the means of giving us cheap money and lowering the rate of interest. I am sorry the Government have not seen their way clear to taking the whole circulation in charge. The people look for such a step, and I am satisfied that it will be made a test at the next General Elections whenever they take place.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Resolution.

(In the Committee.)

MR. ANGLIN: I presume the Resolutions will pass, but it is my duty to say that I regard this proceeding as one of very questionable propriety. It is very well to assume that, in absorbing a portion of the circulation, we are merely transferring to the Dominion the amount of interest which the banks are supposed to obtain from that portion of their circulation, but in point of fact this measure will absorb and take from the business of the country the total amount of this increased issue. It is practically borrowing another \$8,000,000, and it will circumscribe the lending power of our banks to that extent. It would be absurd to suppose that we could put \$8,000,000 additional paper money into circulation without, at the same time, displacing nearly as much of the bank paper which is now in circulation. There is just as much paper in circulation now as the business of the country requires or justifies. Every bank is eager to put its paper in circulation. It is not the fault of the banks that more paper is not in circulation according to population, but owing to the character of the business of the country. Of all the paper that goes out the greater part returns in a very short time and must be redeemed. We find from the market prices of stocks that the market price of very few bank stocks is, to-day, above par. Although the banks have the advantages of the issue of paper and a large amount of capital placed on

deposit at a low rate of interest, yet take one bank with another their dividends are by no means large. In some years the profits of well-managed institutions are large, but, on the whole, bank stocks do not yield more than other investments of a substantial character. The Government's only reason for taking this \$8,000,000 is because they want money. But the hon. the Finance Minister gave another reason. He said the time had come when the country should have a larger share of the profits of the circulation than previously. If that is a justification for this step, the hon. Minister should go further, and take the whole circulation into the hands of the Government. I have no doubt it will come to that in a short time. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), who is such an earnest advocate of what some call fiat money, is not satisfied with this measure, and would have the Government go further, and issue irredeemable currency. I am glad to see that very few hon. members sympathise with the hon. gentleman, who, I have no doubt, is perfectly sincere in his views. But he need not be discouraged. This measure, from his point of view, is but the tadpole, but in good time it will grow into a full-sized frog. The \$8,000,000 will be spent in good time, and the Government having this precedent before them, another \$8,000,000 will undoubtedly be asked for, and if hon. gentlemen opposite are as strong as they are to-day, their next demand will be supported and sustained as this is by their followers. The whole circulation of the country, exclusive of Dominion Notes, is stated to be \$21,000,000. This \$8,000,000 is a very large proportion of that amount. The hon. gentleman does not tell us how he proposes to put that amount in circulation, or how he will keep it in circulation. Hitherto the Government has had very little trouble with the circulation. Their whole issue was \$12,500,000, but of that \$9,000,000 was absorbed by the banks, and held by them as part of their reserves. That was but one way of getting a forced loan from the banks. The remaining \$3,500,000 was about enough to furnish change, small notes, for the business of the whole country; and, therefore, these small notes seldom or never came back for

MR. ANGLIN.

redemption. A few thousand dollars went into the banks and were held by them for their own convenience, or that of their customers. So, individuals, everywhere, who choose to hold some money for use, left those Dominion \$1 and \$2 notes, as a rule, with some notes of larger denominations, and in that way this money was continually kept in circulation, never returning for redemption. So the provision that it should be redeemed, did not trouble the Government. But the case will be different when you add \$8,000,000 or even \$4,000,000 to the issue. That amount will not be required as change. A very large portion, no doubt, will come back continually for redemption. The hon. the Finance Minister ought to have told the Committee how he proposes to provide for that redemption when the notes are presented, and to put and keep them in circulation to the amount of nearly \$4,000,000 this year, and \$8,000,000 the year after, so as to obtain all the profits he calculates upon. I think he will find that the interest saved will not be so large as he anticipates. If I am correct in saying that he is in reality about to abstract \$8,000,000 from the available capital of the country—out of its business—and expend it in public works—he is taking money which, in this country, is worth 7 or 8 per cent., and, in some places 9 or 10. That money he could borrow in London at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. at the outside, and it is a question of very serious economic importance whether it would not be more prudent and better for the country that the hon. the Finance Minister should borrow that money in London at $4\frac{1}{2}$, than from the business people of this country, whose capital is already small enough, and who are now compelled to pay 7 or 8 per cent. for loans. Another matter of some importance is the gold reserve. I would like to be told whether there is an amount of specie stored away in any part of the Dominion equal to what is called the gold or specie reserve? Or is it merely a credit at the Bank of Montreal and other institutions that stands in the room of this gold deposit?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It is an actual gold deposit with the Receiver-General.

MR. ANGLIN: They do not, surely,

hold altogether the proportion understood against all those millions of currency?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes; there is nearly \$4,000,000 in gold at present actually held by the Treasury, irrespective of what we have in the Bank of Montreal.

MR. ANGLIN: I question whether it is or not. If it is desirable to have a specie reserve, it is desirable to have something else than a credit at the bank. Sir Francis Hincks calculated that the amount which he provided the Government should hold was the minimum that ought to be held against the notes in circulation; it was not necessary to hold that amount as against the amount in the various banks, which was never likely to be presented for redemption; and this, perhaps, induced the hon. the Finance Minister to think it might not be necessary to have against any part of the proposed circulation such a gold reserve as is provided for in the existing Act. A gold reserve always seems to be superfluous while times are good, and no special run or demand for gold is made on any institution issuing paper, but is really a provision against extraordinary emergencies and should always be sufficient to meet them. Just at the time the banks may find it test their powers to the utmost to meet the run of themselves, a run on the Treasury on this new bank of issue about to be established by the Government would occur. Then the gold reserve would probably be found insufficient. Doubtless the hon. the Finance Minister could at any time draw against the guaranteed bonds of the Dominion to very nearly their full market value, and, therefore, they may be regarded equal to a gold reserve. But that cannot be said of the unguaranteed bonds. The mere authority to issue bonds would be quite as much security as the actual deposit of such bonds in any vault in the Dominion. Bonds which we may put on the market hereafter, are no security for any liabilities we may contract in the issue of paper money; they are themselves but the evidence of debt which the Government has incurred or which it is authorised to incur. They are not the slightest security, and I would very much prefer to see that provision struck out altogether, as it is calculated to throw discredit on the whole

operation. I regard this policy as essentially dangerous. Could there be any absolute security that this issue of Dominion paper money would never proceed further than these \$8,000,000, it might not be so objectionable; but precisely the causes which led us to issue the old \$9,000,000, and which are prompting us now to this proposed course, may by-and-by prompt Parliament to consent to further issues of paper money.

MR. MILLS: Disguise this scheme as we may, it is really a forced loan—an attempt of the Government to obtain from the banks \$8,000,000 on the terms of the Resolutions. Some hon. gentlemen have advocated a Government issue, and the deprival of the banks of the right to issue altogether. This scheme looks in that direction. It will not produce all the mischiefs of a purely Government issue, because the banks will largely continue the issue required by the country; but it will prepare the way for that result. The necessities of the Government will not permit them to stop here; they must continue to extend their emissions, until the right of issue is withdrawn from the banks altogether. I do not see that the Government have a right to share more largely in the profits of the circulation, as the Finance Minister says. If they have a right at all they should get all the profits. We have no right to enter into a partnership with them, and share the profits.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Why have we not?

MR. MILLS: The Government might as well say they have a right to share in the profits any capitalist made in his investment. The wear and tear of the bank circulation is simply an incident of the business of banking in which the Government have no money invested. The profits should go to the owners of the capital invested in the business. That is my answer to the First Minister. Apart from this view of the matter, the Government cannot share in those profits except at the expense of the public.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government are the public.

MR. MILLS: The Government are the mere agents of the public for certain limited purposes, and the people are a much larger body, and have much wider interests than those entrusted to Parlia-

ment, which deals with certain incidents that belong to the interest and the general well-being of the people; and it is because the Government might injure those wider, and it may be more important, interests that I object to the hon. the Finance Minister's propositions. Now, every bank declares a certain dividend in its capital, and one of the elements of the profits is the circulation. If the Government takes charge of it, what must be the consequence to the banks? They must increase the rate of interest to their customers, and make up the difference in some other way; and the money the Government takes from the banks, by sharing in the profits of the circulation, the banks will take from the public, in charging a higher rate of interest. The depositor will find his rate of interest cut down, as the banks will not be able, from their diminished profits, to pay as much as hitherto. The depositor, in return, will say to his banker: I cannot allow my money to be with you on your terms; and the effect will be its investment elsewhere, and the diminution of the banking capital required for the accommodation of business. This scheme will reduce the profits of banking and the available banking capital of the country. The statement of the hon. the Finance Minister is plausible, but fallacious. If there is any impression abroad that greater security would be enjoyed if the Government had charge of the circulation, the impression does not extend merely to the circulation but to the deposits, and even to the stock itself. Parties who know what the popular opinion was—I speak not simply of those in business—are aware that it was thought when the Confederate Bank failed, that if we had had a Government issue, the stock-holders would not have suffered to the extent witnessed. We know right well that the Government could not give any security to the stock-holders or depositors, but to a very limited extent, only, security to the business men of the country. What is true in England is true here. The statement was made a short time ago, by an eminent English banker, to the effect that but one-half per cent. of the business of the country was carried on by means of gold and silver, $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. by bank bills, and 97 per cent. by warehouse receipts, cheques

and bank balances. That is precisely the way business is done here; and if the Government issued every dollar of the circulation, there would be still, at least, $97\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of all the mercantile transactions carried on independently of it, while, so far as the 97 per cent. is concerned, the Government issues could not affect the question of security at all. But the Government issue, to the extent of its volume, will certainly affect the value of bank stocks. In fact it is an act of bad faith towards the banks. A man purchasing bank stocks to-day in Montreal or Toronto, finds, to-morrow, their value injuriously affected by the assumption of a part of the circulation by the Government, and the acquisition of a share of the profit therefrom. I do not say that, in the end, the banks will lose largely, because they will make out of the public what the Government filches from them. But, doubtless, serious mischief will be done by extending, what I regard as already a mischievous provision in our banking system; because, if the circulation is taken from the banks and monopolised by Government, the feature of expansibility, which adopts in an eminent degree our banking system to the wants of the country, will be entirely removed. In July, last year, one of our banks had an average circulation of \$700,000; in October following, it had doubled, to meet the temporary wants of the community while grain and other produce was being purchased and exported. Take away from the banks the right to issue bills and place it in the Government, and the banks will be wholly unable to meet the local requirements of the country. This change would produce serious mischief to our whole banking system, and would deprive it of one of those qualities which eminently fit it for carrying on the business of the country. I think it is perfectly clear that the statement made by the hon. gentleman is not a candid statement, when he says he believes it is a right principle that the Government should share in the profits of the circulation, and that it is not with a view to enable the Government so to share that he proposes the changes in the banking system that are now before the Committee. The real object is to enable the Government to obtain a forced loan from the banks to meet the necessities of the

Government. I say that is the sole object, and not the one the hon. gentleman has stated. I am certain that it will be found the most objectionable way in which the Government can obtain money to meet the necessities of the hour.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not think I ever heard so much heresy from a political economist in twenty minutes as I have heard from the hon. gentleman in his speech just now. In the first place he attempts to draw a distinction between the Government and the public; he says it may be for the benefit of the Government, but against the interests of the public. I really thought the Government and the public were one. The Government are merely trustees for the benefit of the public; whatever the Government gains, the public must gain; whatever the Government loses the public loses. I take it that they are synonymous. But the hon. gentleman says in the first place that the Government have no right, or in other words that the public have no right to go into partnership with the banks in the circulation, as if there was any right, vested or otherwise, in the banks or in individuals in making promises to pay, as if there was any right inherent and sacred to them, and as if the Government was committing a breach of faith in interfering at all. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I remember aright it is a principle in constitutional Government which obtains both in monarchies and in republics, and in every form of Government, that the right of making money for common circulation belongs to the Crown, to the sovereignty, to the nation. Gold, silver, copper, nickel, no matter what may be said to represent a circulating medium, is vested in the Crown, is vested in the sovereignty, is vested in the nation, no matter what may be its form of Government. It is a matter of fact as attested by history, that paper or a promise to pay are accepted on the credit of the nation to be an equivalent to gold or silver, and it is clearly admitted by all writers on money that the same power, the same sovereignty, the same nation, that has an exclusive right to issue gold, silver, or other circulating mediums, must of necessity have the right if it chooses to claim it, to issue its equivalent to gold or silver. It is a matter of expediency, a matter of

legislation, which may be modified from time to time for the Crown to give up any portion of the exclusive right to issue what is called money to the banks whether they may be private or public, and to say that it is a breach of faith it is absurd. I am quite astonished to hear my hon. friend use that argument for a moment. It is a breach of faith forsooth. If it is a breach of faith to issue \$20,000,000, it must be a breach of faith to issue \$12,000,000; and have not the banks for the last ten years been suffering under that breach of faith, and were they not willing sufferers, and did they not accept it. Why, there can be no injury or injustice done to the party who accepts it. They willingly accepted it ten years ago, and they willingly accept it now. I am very much surprised that the hon. gentleman, if this was a breach of faith, did not exercise his powers as a member of the Government, during five long years, in trying to relieve the country from this great stigma which rests upon it as a country, in allowing the breach of faith to exist. If it is a breach of faith to issue twenty millions, it is a breach of faith to issue twelve, five, or one million. If the hon. gentleman's argument is good for anything at all, it amounts to this: that no nation or sovereignty can issue paper money, although they can issue gold or silver money without breach of faith to people who desire to invest their money in the business of banking. Experience has shown that the law, which the hon. gentleman has been administering for five years, allowing the Government to issue \$12,000,000 without having gold to cover it, well, experience has similarly shown that there is no necessity in having so much gold. It is merely granting to the extent of 20,000,000 what by the universal consent of the last Parliament, and the Parliament before it, was granted to the extent of 12,000,000. If at any time—it is merely permissive—the Government is to have power to issue 20,000,000 instead of 12,000,000, without covering 8,000,000 with gold—without covering the 8,000,000 with gold in their vaults, and losing the interest on it—if at any time it is found that any practical inconvenience exists, there is no risk of the credit of the country being asserted, or of the Government not

being able to meet any demand for gold, then the Government can always check its issue, Parliament can force it every Session to diminish its issue, so the whole argument, it seems to me, is baseless. I really cannot understand, though I have tried to do so. I generally do appreciate the arguments of my hon. friend, but I cannot understand the basis of one single proposition he made in his speech to-day.

Resolution ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to, on a division.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 114) Further to amend the Acts respecting Dominion Notes.

Bill read the first time.

BANKING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolutions:—

“Resolved,—That the charters of the several banks to which the Act respecting banks and banking (34 Vic., chap. 5) applies shall be extended to the first day of July, 1891, subject to the following provisions:—

“1. That after the first day of July, 1881, (on which day the charters, if not extended, would expire) the payment of the notes of any such bank intended for general circulation, shall be the first charge upon its assets,—and that the bank shall not, after the said day, issue or re-issue any such note for a less sum than \$5, or for any other sum not being a multiple of \$5.

“2. That from and after the same day, any such bank, when making any payment, shall, on the request of the person to whom the payment is to be made, pay the same, or such part thereof, not exceeding \$50, as such person may request in Dominion Notes for \$1 or for \$2 each, at the option of the receiver.

“3. And that from and after passing of the Act to be passed in pursuance of these Resolutions, the proportion of the cash reserves to be held by any such bank in Dominion Notes shall never be less than 40 per cent.

“4. That the form of the Monthly Returns to Government be so amended as to show more clearly the financial position of the bank.

“5. That Section 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Act of the now last Session (42 Vic., chap. 45) respecting the numbering of bank shares be repealed.”

(In the House.)

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The hon. gentleman opposite asked how it was that

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

we proposed increasing the circulation. It is well known that for the last two or three years, or since the banks have been deprived of the privilege of issuing \$1 or \$2 notes, or any note less than for \$4, there have been complaints from all parts of the country, that people could not obtain small bills. The Government do not propose the establishment of expensive machinery for putting these notes into circulation. Persons now asking for the payment of cheques upon a bank frequently ask for \$1 or \$2 notes, but cannot obtain them. It is not the business of the bank to circulate them, they have no interest in circulating them or in keeping them out; they are only anxious to put their own notes in circulation. We propose requiring the banks to pay \$50 in small notes. This is one of the means by which the Government proposes to obtain an increased circulation for the \$1 and \$2 notes, and at the same time to give accommodation to people who require those notes. We will, in that way, in part supply the demand for \$1 and \$2 notes that are required for the payment of labour. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman opposite that you cannot force \$8,000,000 or \$4,000,000, or even \$2,000,000 suddenly upon the country. If we do we must expect to have to provide for it at short notice, because if you put it in the hands of contractors you may have to take it up next day. After July, 1881, we shall take from the banks the right to issue \$4 notes, and it is by these means that the Government expect to obtain a much larger circulation for their notes. It is true, as was just stated by an hon. gentleman, that the circulation must necessarily be limited, because large transactions are generally done by cheque and not by bank or Dominion notes. But the circulation is used in the payment of labour by our manufacturers and other employers of labour. The great difficulty has been to obtain these small notes. The Government would have to use expensive machinery if they undertook to establish a bank of issue, and so they only propose to use the old machinery, with some additional provisions in the new Banking Act, with which they will obtain an increased circulation, and these small notes do not return to the banks or

the Government for redemption as the larger notes do.

On paragraph 3,

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: At present the law provides that the reserve shall be 50 per cent., but at no time shall it be less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. This is changed. There is at present a margin of $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. between the minimum amount that may be held, and the average amount that they are expected to hold. I quite agree with the late hon. Finance Minister that in matters of this kind in increasing our circulation, we require to exercise increased care and caution and increased provision for the redemption of this circulation; though there are other causes besides those to which he refers, namely, to the interest on the debt, payable in England. It is true we have to provide six or seven millions in exchange. The demand for gold is not affected so much by the interest on the debt, as it is by the balance of trade between the countries. Of course what we pay on our debt, and that which the Local Government and municipalities have to pay, is provided for by bills of exchange or gold. But the balance of trade between the countries affects it to a greater extent than these do. This may be met by exceptional circumstances. There may be loans effected, either by loan societies, municipalities or Local Governments, in England, though the Dominion Government was obtaining no loan whatever. But, as I said the other night, the indications are that the balance of trade will not be as much against us in the future as in the past, and the result will be a reduced demand for exchange, or a smaller demand for gold. Of course, if the balance of trade be against us and the demand for exchange in drafts is greater than our people are prepared to provide, the difference will have to be made up by exchange purchased in the United States. Under these circumstances the balance of trade should be largely against us; of course we would require to provide a larger amount of gold. But under any circumstances, I think the reserves are ample. For a number of years the banks have held over the 50 per cent. that is required, but they may reduce the amount, under certain circumstances, to $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent., which would leave them still a

margin of a much larger amount than will be the case under this proposition. They never can hold less than 40 per cent., therefore, whatever they require to hold leaves the chances less that they will call upon the Government at any time for a larger amount of gold. This provision is necessary to prevent the possibility of a larger amount being called for at any particular time.

On paragraph 4,

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Under these provisions it will not be possible for such an occurrence as that in connection with the Consolidated Bank to take place again.

MR. MACKENZIE: How?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: By stating in the returns it will show the amount of money obtained from other banks on securities.

MR. MACKENZIE: That was only one of the instances where the public were deceived. They were deceived by the returns of the bank being deliberately falsified. No law can prevent that.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The reason given as justification by the officials of the bank was that there was no specific head under which that transaction could be made; therefore, the parties justified themselves by saying that they could make no specific return of this kind because there was no head provided for it.

On paragraph 5,

MR. MACKENZIE: Why do you repeal that?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It is found to be inoperative. I do not know but there may have been some litigation arising out of it. Brokers have evaded it in such a way that I have some doubts whether you can really reach them in this matter. No benefit has resulted from it, but a great inconvenience; and after giving that matter a good deal of consideration it was decided to repeal those sections. Then, there have been some decisions in the Courts, with reference to the conditions upon which banks may make advances upon certain properties. There are two other sections that have been introduced for the purpose of setting that matter at rest, and making it so clear that the question of the authority of the banks cannot arise in the future. Apart from these provisions there is little or no

change made in the old Act, as amended, and made applicable to the bank whose charters are now to be renewed. I move, Mr. Speaker, you leave the Chair.

MR. PLUMB: The Resolutions brought up by my friend the hon. the Finance Minister, enable me to make some observations in respect to Banking and Currency. The two subjects are so closely identified in the public mind, under an economic system, although not necessarily connected with each other, that it is difficult to deal with one without referring to the other. The hon. member for South Norfolk, has taken the opportunity of the introduction of the Resolutions in question, by means of an amendment to one of them, to propound and argue very important and deeply interesting propositions concerning the issue of paper money. Any gentleman in this House who carefully studies a special subject of public importance, and industriously prepares himself by research and reflection to present it here, is fully entitled to the grave and courteous attention of his fellow members. The hon. member for South Norfolk has made the subject, upon which he has just now addressed you, Mr. Speaker, a diligent study, I may venture to say, an absorbing one, and he brings to its discussion, with great earnestness and energy, the strongest arguments, doubtless, that can be adduced in its favour. I think it proper at the outset to say that I do not sympathise with those here who have seemed disposed to treat his propositions with levity or ridicule, as was, I fear, too much the case with the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. gentleman is fully entitled to credit and consideration, both for the sincerity of his opinions and the ability and clearness with which he has stated his theories; and although I am compelled to say at the outset that I differ with him *toto cælo*, I acknowledge that he is supported by the authority of many advanced thinkers, who imagine that an expanded currency, which has no fixed value according to the generally secured standard, may perform functions in the development of national undertakings so useful and important as to compensate fully for the disturbances in unsettling prices and in vitiating contracts which it may cause. The test of experience, however, which has been fre-

quently applied to issues of paper currency which were temporarily irredeemable, has demonstrated that they have led to extravagant inflations inevitably followed by disastrous depression, and great distress and loss, and it has been often the case that the currency has depreciated so largely in value as to make its ultimate redemption practically impossible. The issue of a practically irredeemable legal tender currency which is enthusiastically urged by my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace), can only be justified by the extremest public necessity, a necessity which, I trust, may never arise in this Dominion. The experience of the world is agreed upon the expediency of adopting a common standard for the measurement of value, and it is generally conceded that a safe paper currency must be convertible into or redeemable by that standard. I do not assert that gold, which has been so adopted, is the most perfect measure of value, theoretically, possible; but there are sound reasons why it has been universally accepted, and no substitute is likely, through the success of propositions such as we have just now heard from the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) should be accepted in its stead. Should this Dominion adopt any other, it would be isolated, and would not be able to force it upon the country, with whom it must have commercial intercourse. Gold has been selected by the common consent of the world for obvious reasons. It is of all the ductile metals the most ductile, and the most difficult to obtain. It is imperishable and easily divisible. No other metal so truly and constantly represents labour at its maximum reward, and is, therefore, so little liable to fluctuation in purchasing power. It has been stated authoritatively that the enormous additions to the stock of precious metals, through the discoveries in California and Australia, have not amounted in the average to more than a \$1 a day for each person engaged in the diggings. No other metal has been found to be so well adapted for use in coin or so convenient for transportation, by reason of its small bulk, in proportion to its value; but both gold and silver have been found less convenient than paper, redeemable in gold, for ordinary purposes of currency, and the chief commercial countries have accepted the

latter as a substitute for metal. The business transactions of such countries, requiring to be discharged by cash payments, will absorb and keep afloat just so much paper currency as they held and no more. In its legitimate uses it forms a very small part of the medium by which business transactions are liquidated. The larger transactions are settled or adjusted by means of cheques or bills of exchange. Paper currency is only made use of, as a general rule, in minor dealings. It would be practically impossible to carry about and to count large sums either of gold or paper. There can be no doubt, however, that considerable amounts of paper currency, beyond the legitimate requirements of trade, may be forced upon the public; but if it is so forced, its purchasing power will be reduced in proportion to its excess, and while, if the issue is made a legal tender, contracts will be impaired and great injustice will thereby result, the heaviest loss will fall upon the labouring man, who is compelled to sell his labour at the current market price, and will be at the mercy of others if he is forced to receive for his wages currency which has no fixed standard of value such as that would certainly be which my hon. friend from South Norfolk advocates. No more ingenious method was ever devised of robbing the poor, than that of an issue of irredeemable currency; and no Government that has resorted to it has been powerful enough to prevent its depreciation. Such an issue would take the form of a forced loan, and should it be exchangeable for a Government stock bearing 3 per cent. interest, as has been proposed in our case, it would be worth just as much as such a stock, less the delay and expense of conversion. For such reasons, if for no others, I shall never cease to raise my voice against all paper money schemes whatsoever, that do not provide for the redemption of such money in coin at its face value, dollar for dollar, on demand; and no man could have fallen into a more serious error than my hon. friend from South Norfolk when he imagined that by any sort of device the Government of Canada, or any other Government, can pay for public works by issuing irredeemable currency, and prevent that currency from depreciating. If it is redeemable, it will remain in circula-

tion just as long as it is fulfilling a legitimate purpose, and no longer. Considerable amounts will neither be hoarded nor kept on hand, because of the risks involved, and when it has passed from the hands of the Government to the contractor, and from him to those whom he has employed, and from them to those to whom they are indebted for food and clothing, its work is done, and it will find its way back to the Treasury for redemption. If it is irredeemable, it will be the prey of every shark who deals in money, and who will profit by the uncertainty of its value; and if the plan advocated by my hon. friend should unfortunately be adopted, it will inevitably bring ruin and dishonour to this country as it has brought ruin and dishonour to every country that has tried it. Many hon. gentlemen who have taken up the advocacy of a National Currency, which is a synonym with them for irredeemable, or as they call it more euphoniously, fiat money, have chosen to speak in very harsh terms of those who, like myself, feel constrained to differ with them, and to adhere to financial principles that are accepted by sound bankers, traders and political economists everywhere. They have been good enough to call us "gold-bugs," "bloated bullionists" and other pleasant names, but that does not affect us, or aid their argument.

Mr. WALLACE (South Norfolk): What about calling us "rag baby" people.

Mr. PLUMB: Nor should it affect the temper of those who hold opinions different from ours if they are not always treated with the serious respect which they deserve. Nor will abuse or ridicule supply the place of argument on either side. We differ from the fiat money men radically and entirely, and one of our strongest points of difference is in that they assert that a Government stamp alone can make of a bit of paper as good a dollar as if it were a bit of gold weighing the tenth of an eagle of mintage standard. They say that the stamp gives the value to the gold coin, we believe that the gold has a universal value which the stamp cannot increase but of which it is merely an assurance, and we believe that paper has no such value. Gold in dust, bars, or bullion, is not only coinable into money, by means of which the business of buying and

selling is measured and facilitated, but it is in itself an article of merchandise, the value of which is not enhanced by a mint stamp, which is merely a certificate of weight and fineness. In fact, gold coin going from one country to another is often melted down, reminted and restamped, which obviously would not be done if the value consisted in the stamp. But we need not look far for an exemplification of the unsoundness and danger of the views which the advocates of an irredeemable currency have propounded. Our opinions scarcely need any other strengthening than they receive from the experience of the United States in the issue of legal tender notes during the struggle between the North and South, which began in 1861. That issue amounted to over \$700,000,000, and although it was not professedly irredeemable, and was made a legal tender for payment of all debts except Customs dues, and notwithstanding that it was backed by the whole credit of the Government, it lost its purchasing power to such a frightful extent that it would not bring more than from 35 to 40 per cent. of its face value in gold. The creditor who was compelled to receive it for a debt contracted upon a gold basis virtually lost a large part of his debt. The price of daily labour remained nearly unchanged while that of most of the necessaries of life was enormously increased. The farmer paid double or treble prices for everything he bought, but the price of wheat did not rise in proportion. It is true that, after several years of inflation and depreciation, the legal tender greenbacks were brought up to a gold value by the resumption of specie payments, and it is equally true that the public, as a whole, lost by the transaction, while heavy profits were reaped by foreign bankers and stock-jobbers at the expense of the nation. A man would pay in that currency three-fold more than if he paid in gold. I know an instance of a friend of mine who, with \$100 of Canadian money, went to New York, paid all his expenses, stayed there a fortnight, and came back with \$120 in greenbacks, having sold his Canadian money for \$240 in greenbacks. That would be the state of things here in a far greater degree if we were to make an inconvertible paper currency. There is but one

common measure of value, and we cannot depart from it without incurring the disasters that have attended all such departures. It is impossible to compute the enormous losses that have followed the issue of irredeemable paper, or the suspension of specie payments by Governments or banks, and I fail to see any argument that can be urged in favour of voluntarily experimenting upon such dangerous theories as my hon. friend has seen fit to adopt. He has only to read the financial history of France, Austria, the United States, Russia, and war of England during the first twenty years of this century, to find ample refutation of his theories. My objections, however, do not extend to an experiment such as has been proposed by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, by which he hopes to extend the Government issues, convertible into coin on demand, by the amount of \$8,000,000, under the Resolutions now before the House. There can be no doubt that such a sum can be added to the \$12,000,000 now authorised, without hazard, and, inasmuch as it must be redeemed on demand, the hon. the Finance Minister must find means to redeem it, whether the basis now proposed is sufficient or not. My hon. friend knows, and the House knows, that there is no such thing as actual circulation of the \$12,000,000 now issued. At most, there are not more than \$2,500,000 or \$3,000,000 afloat. The remainder is held in the coffers of the banks as a reserve, and it is probable that a large part of the increased issue will also remain there. It is nothing more or less than a loan, and the profit may be calculated at 4 per cent. per annum, less the cost of printing the notes, the loss of interest in the gold reserve, and the risk and inconvenience of owing a loan payable on demand instead of a distant fixed day. That it is in the bank vaults is practically of little consequence to the Government as long as it is outstanding; wherever it may be it represents its face value to the Government, and saves the interest thereon, according to the terms I have just stated. It is immaterial whether it is in the hands of the bank or the public, except in this way: that the banks may require the redemption of the large sums they hold on some sudden crisis, at which time I have no doubt the Government will

have the power to meet the demand. But if the same sum was in the hands of the public, it could not be sent in for redemption so rapidly, for it is well-known that although notes are issued payable on demand, but a small part can practically be demanded at once, and a reserve of 30 or 35 per cent. of ready money for circulation and deposits is found, by long experience, to be ample for the wants of any sound banking institution. Loss may ensure sufficient means to meet any probable demand upon the Government. It must be remembered that the gold basis shown in the bank statements, however, forms but a small part of the actual available means; there is behind it the whole amount due from borrowers, which must be paid in gold or its recognised equivalent, and there is also the balances due from other banks and agents, often representing a far larger sum than the actual cash reserves.

AN HON. MEMBER: They cannot get it.

MR. PLUMB: They can get it with perfect ease as long as sound banking exists. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying they cannot. I do not pretend to say that any bank doing business in the ordinary way could pay all its liabilities on the instant, but I say that it is the calculation of every sound banker, based upon experience, that he must have cash in hand sufficient to meet any possible demand, and that its business shall be so managed as to provide funds from day to day to replenish his vaults if need be; and to this end he can stop trading and husband his receipts. The whole business of banking is based upon credit on both sides of the account. The stockholders lend the capital, the depositors lend their deposits, and the circulation outstanding is a loan from the public. It is an expansion of the credit system; but it is a voluntary arrangement. You cannot force the banks to continue business; you cannot hamper or tax them beyond a certain point without causing them to wind-up and give back their capital to the shareholders who will not lend it, and take all the risks without adequate prospect of remuneration. The hon. member for South Norfolk and his friends demand that the Government shall take away from the banks the privilege of issuing circulation, and some of them have

suggested that the banks shall issue and circulate the fiat money of the Government. Suppose the banks should refuse to have anything to do with irredeemable currency, and they ought to, and doubtless would, refuse—what then? The banking system is so entwined with our commercial affairs that it cannot be dispensed with. It would be impolitic and unwise to injure or destroy it. In connection with the question of the issue of notes arises the question of the renewal of the bank charters, which also forms part of the subject under present discussion. My hon. friend must see that the whole community is interested in the Resolutions and Bill which are before us, by which the charters of the existing banks are to be extended for ten years from the 1st of July, 1881, in a very much larger degree than at first might be supposed. For the convenience of all commercial transactions, it is desirable for the dealer to be able to go for his accommodations to places where there is an aggregation of capital. My hon. friend understands that; he knows that such aggregations of individual capital in banking institutions greatly facilitates the borrower, and enables him to carry on business transactions which would be difficult, if not impossible, without it. The profits of the banks have been by no means excessive, even with all the advantages gained by the privilege of issuing notes; and however much it may be desired to take from them that privilege, it would not be sound policy to do so. Credit, we believe, to be necessary for the successful development of trade and commerce. Some of the currency theorists argue that credit should be abolished, although they themselves are advocates for its extension in its most objectionable form. With regard to the terms upon which the Government have proposed, under the hon. the Finance Minister's proposition, to renew the charters of the banks, I beg to say that I believe that the public are entitled to the most ample security for the note circulation which the banks are permitted to issue, and which the public, as involuntary creditors, are forced to receive in the daily transaction of business. While I object strongly to the proposition to take from the banks the power of issuing notes, I think the proposal, which came, I understand, from

the banks, to make the issues the first lien upon their assets, and which is embodied in the Bill before us, is impolitic as regards the banks, although its effect may work satisfactorily as regards the public. I believe that it is the bounden duty of the Government to compel the banks to make those issues secure beyond peradventure. In order to do this, it was my idea, if possible, to assimilate our system—slowly and gradually, in order to avoid disturbance, but ultimately—entirely to that of the United States, under which the banks deposit with the Government at Washington a certain amount of public securities, which are transferred to the Controller of the banks, who holds their engraved plates in custody, and prints their circulation notes as ordered; he holds the security in trust for the redemption of the circulation; he gives the banks their notes countersigned in his department, and those notes represent not more than the current value of the securities thus held, the banks issuing no more notes than they receive from the Controller. They are entitled to receive notes to the amount of the market value of the stock so deposited by them, but such amount must not be above the par value. They are entitled to receive the interest on these stocks during the time the bank remains solvent. The banks are compelled to make Returns to the Controller, and are subject to rigid inspection; they are also obliged to hold a certain reserve as security for circulation and deposits: these reserves consist of legal tender notes of the United States. There are 2,045 banks in operation under this system, having an aggregate circulation of \$350,000,000. The public are so entirely satisfied with the security, that notes are rarely presented for redemption. The system is an absolutely secure one. In case of failure of any bank, the Government at once advertises that it will redeem the notes of that bank on demand at par in gold, and after a bank failure, its notes after continue in circulation, for nobody loses confidence in them or has any fear that they will not be redeemed.

MR. ANGLIN: But under that system the Government gets no share of the profits of circulation.

MR. PLUMB: Well, no; it does not directly. But there is this to be said:

MR. PLUMB.

the Government has an immense amount of currency in legal tender notes which the banks hold as their reserves, and the Government puts a large tax on the banks yielding about \$15,000,000 a year; that is the little profit the Government makes; and it would be a considerable one here. I thought the hon. the Finance Minister might be disposed to adopt some such system. As to the proposition of the hon. gentleman, the Bill before us to allow the circulation of the banks to become the first lien on their assets, I have very grave doubts as to whether it is judicious or desirable. It would be better for the banks to secure their notes upon some gradual scale similar to the system I have just now pointed out. It will be found, in the end, that the security of the notes, by making them a first lien upon the assets, will work to the disadvantage of the banks, when in case of a failure depositors find their claims postponed during the time the securities are being realised for the redemption of the notes, and I was in hopes that my hon. friend would see his way to put in a permission to the bank to take as the alternative of securing their notes by a first lien on their assets, the right to secure their notes at a rate of 10 or 15 per cent. a year by pledge of Dominion Stocks, retiring their old issues in that proportion. I thought that many of the larger banks would see it to their advantage to take this course, and still think it would be desirable to prevent the banks to have this option. To make their assets liable for their notes as a first lien would be excessively embarrassing wherever there was a bank failure; it would injure all other banks in regard to their depositors. It would be much better to permit them to come under the American system of securing their notes. It is claimed that, by securing their notes, they take out so much of their capital and make their circulation a sort of rigid iron rule that they need a more expansive system. Something of this sort was urged in the State of New York when the old banks were about to be compelled to go under the system now prevailing in the United States. I was then an earnest opponent of the new system. I felt there was the difficulty which has been suggested here, but the practical working has shown that any objection was

not sound. The banks have made more money under the present than they did under the old system. They have found no practical difficulty in furnishing facilities for moving the enormous crops of the west to the seaboard, and they have done the business far more safely than before. The produce business in the western United States is now transacted mainly by means of short date bills of exchange. It is a mistake to suppose it is absolutely necessary that there should be an expansive provision of currency here for that purpose. But not only so, for currency is so bulky that it could never form any very large item in the business transactions of the country. A package of \$10,000 in small notes would be two feet in length, and no one would take the risk of carrying it, or of counting it, if he could make or receive large payments in any other way. I am heartily in accord with the Banking Bill which my hon. friend has brought forward. I feel that the banks are entitled to a renewal of their charters, and also that the Government, if it chooses, is entitled to take the circulation of the four dollar notes or any others into its own hands. Whether it will do so or not is, however, a mere question of policy. It has been argued that, because the Government possesses that right, it should assume it; but that does not follow. The banks should not be unduly hampered in the prosecution of their business. Nothing can be more suicidal than for any political party to attempt to make a crusade against the business of the country—nothing can be more suicidal than the performance of any act which would form the slightest excuse for making a stringency in the money market. I do not think the operations of trade could go on, except with the aid of the great money institutions of the country, which are, upon the whole, ably managed and a credit to Canada. I trust the Resolutions and the Bill will meet with the acceptance of the House. Although I will say I would like to see them modified, so far as to permit any bank to secure its circulation in the way I have suggested if it elects to do so rather than by making it a first lien upon its assets; but if the hon. gentleman feels that he has the entire concurrence of the banking interest in his proposition, there need be no objection to them. It will

not be long, however, I venture to say, before many of the larger banks will see it is to their interest to avail themselves of the proposition I have suggested. I hope when the hon. gentleman deals with the general subject of chartering new banks, he will be prepared to recommend a scheme like that which obtains in the United States. I can readily understand why the hon. the Minister proposes to repeal the Act of last year in reference to the registration of bank shares. I did not think it was a practicable measure at the time, but I was willing to give in largely to public sentiment, which desired to prevent dealing in such shares by brokers, by making fictitious sales, in which no stock was transferred or, in fact, possessed by the seller. The banks, in whose interest the Act was passed, seem now to desire to have it annulled, having found it, as I understand, quite useless.

MR. CASEY: The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has given us a great deal of information on a subject on which I believe he has reason to be specially acquainted; and when he speaks on subjects on which he has special knowledge, he is always instructive to the House. I do not intend to go into a general discussion of the currency question, as the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) has promised us another opportunity for that. I suppose we are all agreed on the data of the problem which the Government wish to solve by these Resolutions. In the first place, they probably wish to give the holder of notes of all kinds throughout the country that perfect security, which I believe it is the duty of the Government to afford them. Government should neither issue notes of doubtful goodness, nor allow others to issue notes under charters which are not properly secured. The other object of the Government must have been to secure a certain share of the profit to be derived from the circulation of those notes, and they have chosen to get that profit by becoming issuers themselves to a larger extent than before. With regard to their first object, that of security, they have tried the experiment of making all notes a first lien on the assets of the banks; the second object, that of profit, is also in the nature of an experiment. In both cases nothing has been definitely settled. They have

agreed upon no definite line of policy to guide us in the future, but have proceeded only in an experimental way. Perhaps they may be right in this; but it is open to hon. members to point out in what respect their experiment is wanting in the conditions which ensure success. It is true that by this means a Government can obtain a forced loan without interest for some period, but, as has already been pointed out, that loan is for a very uncertain period and for a very uncertain amount. The Government have no means of keeping notes in circulation other than those possessed by banks, consequently they cannot secure a larger circulation than the banks could have secured if there were no Government currency. They undertake to stop a certain part of the bank issue by monopolising the right to issue notes of certain denominations. I think the chances are that this plan will not succeed to any great extent. There is one piece of information which the House should possess before passing on this subject, namely, the amount of bank notes of the denominations proposed to be monopolised now in circulation. Perhaps the hon. Minister can give us light on that point.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I do not know the exact proportion. I do not know how many fours are in circulation—some banks do not issue any.

MR. CASEY: Then in framing this scheme the hon. gentleman has not had before him the information necessary to form a rational idea as to its probable success. The banks come in immediate contact with borrowers, and it will be their interest to induce borrowers to accept the denominations of notes which they issue in preference to Government notes. It remains to be seen who will come out best in this rivalry—the banks, who have all the circumstances in their favour, or the Government, who are dependent upon the banks to keep their notes in circulation. It has been found in England that about £15,000,000 of currency remains out permanently, and I have the highest authority for saying that this amount is never trenced upon during any crisis. If the Government could say positively just how many millions of currency would remain out here, we might, probably, effect a permanent loan to that

extent, but I cannot see how it can otherwise be done. The total circulation of the banks has often been below \$20,000,000, and that fact points to the great danger there is that this \$20,000,000 might not be kept permanently in circulation. When the Government have to pay out large sums on contracts, it might be embarrassing if those notes were returned suddenly to be cashed.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: We do not propose to pay it out on large contracts. I said it would be returned at once if such were the case.

MR. CASEY: Then we have no clear idea of how this money is to be disposed of, except so far as it will be used in payments to the Indians. It has been suggested to me that it would be a good plan to increase the Indian annuities and so get rid of the notes. The hon. Minister told us that a very large quantity of gold, now held as reserves would be liberated by this issue. I think there is a stronger idea generally prevalent about the benefits from the liberation of gold than the facts justify. If it should be so liberated, something else will take its place. Notes which are as good as gold for common use, will take its place in the bank reserves, and be equally locked up. This gold will go out of the country, as it will not be required for banking reserves. There would be only a temporary benefit. There are several general dangers arising from the issue of notes by the Government. The fact is, that they would not be regulated by the requirements of the public for circulation, as is the case with the bank issues. A bank has no temptation to issue faster than the circulation of the country absorbs its notes. The Government has many temptations to issue notes faster, including political inducements. They may suddenly require a moderate sum to tide them over a temporary difficulty for which they would not care to ask the authority of Parliament. If the circulation is already full when those notes are issued they would only stay out a brief period, and the country would have to cash them very shortly after, and perhaps to effect a loan for that purpose. It is very possible that embarrassment would be caused to an incoming Government, by some irregular and careless issue of notes by the

MR. CASEY.

outgoing Government. We have known incoming Governments to be embarrassed in more than one way by the acts of their predecessors. I scarcely think that any party Government in this country is to be trusted with the power of disarranging the prices of everything, and involving the country in debt, and exposing to embarrassment new Governments by the issue of large quantities of paper money. But there is another view of the matter: that this issue would shorten the accommodation which the banks can afford to their customers. They have been in the habit of lending their own credit in the shape of bank notes, having thus been able, when a demand arose for currency, for the purpose of moving the produce of the country, to increase the circulation temporarily for the benefit of their customers as well as themselves. If a large proportion of the currency is composed of Government issues, the banks cannot do this to the same extent. The currency required by this particular class of borrowers consist largely of notes the Government reserves to itself, and the borrowers cannot take their loans either in cheques or large notes. The banks will then have to lend, instead of their own issues, the Government notes, for which they must give value. Their lending powers will be restricted, for the time being, exactly to the extent of the increased circulation of Government notes. It is argued that the Government would get some profit from the circulation. To be sure they will, but somebody else will loose to that extent, and the country will be nothing the richer. The plan the Government has devised for securing the note-holders at first sight struck me very favourably. No doubt it was just to make the note-holders preferential creditors, but it has been urged by a gentleman whose opinion I much respect, that such a provision will alarm depositors, who, as soon as banks become shaky would change their claims into preferential ones to withdraw their deposits in the form of notes of the bank. So the note-holders and depositors would stand on the same footing, instead of the note-holder having the advantage, as was intended, I think it quite possible, however, that the possibility of depositors converting their claims into preferential

claims would prevent, to a great extent, that timidity which is largely the cause of the runs on banks, and that after a few of them had converted their claims the rest might gain confidence and the runs might stop. But this is altogether an experiment. Again, supposing what is dreaded with regard to the depositors did not occur, but that the note-holder remained the only preferential creditor, I do not think the first lien would secure the value of the notes after the failure of the bank. The poor man would have to cash them at once, and they would be at a discount pending the liquidation of the bank's affairs. The hon. member for Niagara has suggested that we should adopt the National Banking system of the United States. The wants of elasticity in that system is almost a sufficient objection to it. On the other hand there are some points of it which might have been adopted by the Government, in preference to the means they have adopted, of securing a portion of the profits on circulation. They might have imposed some tax on the banks for the privilege of issuing notes, so as to obtain a portion of the profits instead of issuing Government notes. That would have been perfectly legitimate. Still further, a plan for combining the undoubted security which the Government guarantee gives with the facilities for issuing, which only the banks possess, might have been contrived. I will take the liberty of suggesting that, on certain securities being given to the Government, the Government might guarantee the notes of the banks on receiving a certain portion of the profit. That would secure the note-holders, and the banks might so arrange as to secure the Government. I have suggested the plan of giving the Government a first lien, and this form of lien might be free from some of the objections to it in the present form. If the Government held the first lien, and nobody else could become a preferential creditor, the Government would be perfectly secure, and also the note-holder. The arrangement would work advantageously to the banks, except in so far as they would have to pay something to the Government for the use of its name. I think the chief of all the objections that can be brought against this plan of the Government is that pointed

out by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), that it appears to favour the idea of a National Currency as understood by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace). I did not feel that point so strongly until that hon. gentleman congratulated the hon. the Finance Minister on cautiously inaugurating what he considered to be a great reform. It is clear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) considers this measure a step in the direction in which he wishes to proceed. This is the chief danger. The people would be very apt to assume that something of this kind is intended in the distant future, from what is now taking place. I think it would be the duty of the Government, sometime in the course of this discussion, to make it clear: whether they intend to proceed with the reorganisation of the currency on the basis proposed by that hon. gentleman, or to make merely some modification of that gold-based currency system always hitherto prevailing in this country.

MR. ROSS (Dundas): I would like some information in regard to one feature of this scheme. At certain periods of the year, I think there would be considerable difficulty with business men if the Government assumes the circulation up to notes of \$4, and the banks can only issue fives, tens and higher notes. At the active business season when men go into the markets to buy and handle large quantities of produce and have to get accommodation from the banks, by what means can we oblige them to pay out to people in need small notes for change—bills of \$4, \$2 and \$1. It would be utterly impossible with only bills of \$5 and \$10 to make change. Dealers will want to make payments with notes of \$4 and smaller amounts. The banks will not give us \$4, \$2 and \$1 notes hereafter. Is there no means by which we can compel the banks to give us smaller notes? If we had enough of \$4 notes, we need care very little about \$2 and \$1. If those customers cannot get smaller bills than \$5 from banks, the scheme will not work well. I have no objection to the other features of the measure.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I think I can answer very satisfactorily the question put. Under the provisions of the Bill the banks will be deprived of the

circulation of \$4 notes. Any man having an account with the bank, and wishing money to buy produce, can draw a cheque for \$500 or \$250, and the bank must give him, if demanded, a certain amount, whatever sum he may want, not exceeding \$50 in \$1 and \$2 bills, and the Act requires them to furnish those bills. That would give him ample change for the purpose.

MR. ROSS: It will go a certain distance; but the active buyer, with two or three thousand dollars to pay out during the day can only demand \$50 or so in small notes, and will feel very often inconvenienced. I would rather see the Government surrender their \$1 and \$2 notes altogether and assume the \$4 and \$5, which would be far better because any commercial man can meet the difficulty by having \$4 and \$5 notes; but there would be great difficulties if operators can only demand \$50 or so in small notes.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The increased circulation of say two and a-half millions would be largely in \$1 and \$2 bills, which, in addition to the three millions now out would be sufficient, I think, for the purpose referred to. When any man is paying money into the banks he can keep the \$1 bills for change, and deposit the \$5 and \$10 bills, but he will have more small notes from this increased circulation. If there is any difficulty, instead of drawing a cheque for \$1,000, he can draw for \$200 or \$250 if necessary.

MR. MACKENZIE: That would be a mere trick.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: No.

MR. ROSS (Dundas): We know very well that the banks will not pay out Dominion Notes unless required to do so; it is not their intention to do it.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Hear, hear.

MR. ROSS: I hope there will be no difficulty, but I do not see how it will be possible to handle great quantities of produce, say from September to December, particularly with convenience, under this scheme. I fear we shall be completely at the mercy of the banks.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said he did not think there would be any such means attempted as compelling bank

agencies to cash money—\$50 cheques for one per cent in small notes. They would only require the \$1 and other small notes for ordinary transactions of business, and if there was any difficulty in obtaining them, the Deputy Receiver-General could be applied to, the interest of the Government being to put as many as possible into circulation. It is natural, of course, that the banks should wish to circulate their own notes as largely as possible, but with the assistance of the Deputy Receiver-General, the Government notes could be furnished for the public requirements. There would be no inducement to annoy the banks by drawing out considerable sums in small notes unnecessarily.

MR. MCLENNAN: There is a very important question involved in this Resolution for the issue of a larger amount of Government currency, and although we passed the Resolution, I think the most convenient time to discuss it is in connection with the question with which it is so closely related—the renewal of the charters of banks. These two matters of currency and banking are so closely related that it is impossible to discuss them separately; they are both expedients for the facility to use and to increase wealth. Everybody knows that the first method of trade and the simplest form is that of barter. A man who raises a bushel of wheat exchanges it, in the natural state of things, for a pair of boots, or a heifer, or whatever he wants to exchange it for. To obviate the inconvenience of that method of doing business currency is invented. What form that currency should take is a thing I do not propose to discuss. I am willing to assume just now, that the Government does not propose to make any change in the form or in the character of what passes current for money. The fact that a gold basis has served the purposes of the most advanced nations of the world is a sufficient reason for us to follow that example and to stand by it until we know a great deal more about new theories than we do to-day. I say this with all deference to the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) whose earnestness in his view of the case, and whose great desire to increase the wealth of every man in this country, I sympathise with in the fullest measure. The question of increasing the issue of the

currency, however, is not a question of the right of the Government, because it has a perfect right to take the issue of the currency into its own hands; but I think there is a serious question of policy involved in it—a question of doing it. I am not without hope that the hon. the Minister of Finance will find that the true wisdom will be to refrain from increasing the volume of Government currency. It is well-known that the use of currency is to facilitate commerce; the establishment of banks in the form in which they exist now has been found to be not only a great convenience, but to have multiplied the uses of wealth by the various means that are adopted in the practice of banking. Bankers, in the first place, were men who accumulated wealth and used their own money altogether. After that they served the purpose of custodians of money, from which I fancy the name is derived. But that form of banking has almost passed away. It is true, bankers are still the custodians of money, but they are so, chiefly, in the sense of custodians for use. The moneys deposited in banks are used in the first place for the purpose of trade to the extent that is safe, beyond keeping a certain reserve, and in the next place the use of bank notes increases the amount of money that can be put into circulation. This does not mean uses that are special to bankers. Bankers have no patent for making money out of the money of others. But it is used to increase the vitality of every existing form of trade, to increase and multiply every industry of the country. The difference between nations in the progress they make in wealth can be readily traced to the principle adopted in banking. It is the practice in some highly civilised countries to hoard money; it is the practice in others to deposit it in banks. The deposits in the London banks at the end of December, 1872, amounted to £120,000,000 sterling; the deposits in the banks of Paris amounted, at the same date, to about £13,000,000. Now, the contrast between the deposit of money in the banks in these two countries forms the key to the relative development of these countries in trade. The population of France, in 1876, was nearly 37,000,000 of people; the population of Great Britain and Ireland was some-

thing over 31,000,000. The revenue and expenditure of France were very considerably greater than those of Great Britain, yet the imports of France were only equivalent to \$892,000,000, while the imports of Great Britain and Ireland were within a fraction of \$2,000,000,000. That is nearly two and a-half times as much. The export trade of France was \$961,000,000, while that of Great Britain and Ireland was \$1,268,000,000. The imports of France were at the rate of \$24 per head, and the exports \$26 per head; the imports of Great Britain were \$59, and the exports \$45 per head, the difference facilitated in a great degree by the different principle in these countries of using money. The country nearest to us, the United States, is most assimilated to ourselves in all that pertains to trade, and the uses and increase of money. We find that in all these respects it comes nearer to the practice of Great Britain. Now, everybody knows that the difference between these countries does not result from a difference in wealth. It is well known that France is probably the richest country in the world for its size in production of soil, industry of the people, and everything that makes a country wealthy. The best proof of that is the readiness with which within a few years it paid the enormous war indemnity, as the result of its war with Germany. But its development in trade, and the commerce of the world is very small compared with that of Great Britain, and chiefly in the expenditures that go on all over the world, as developed in the case of Great Britain in her Colonies and elsewhere. Now it seems to me that this question with respect to the issue of Government notes, is a serious question in respect to the measure in which it may interfere with the business of banking, and it is a serious question in the measure in which it may prevent the banks from assisting in that development and wealth of the country in all the varied forms in which the industries of the country are carried on, in the productions of the soil, in manufactures, in shipping, and in everything that goes to increase the wealth of the country. All these are developed by the assistance of banking capital, and that capital is useful in the

measure in which it can be relied upon to serve the necessary purposes of banking; that is, by discounting and loaning money to people who carry on these operations. It is clear that if the Government takes out of the hands of the banks a certain proportion of money that forms a credit for them, to that extent it runs the risk of limiting the power of the banks to accommodate the business of the country. It is true, it may be said, that if the Government supplies that money the purpose is served. Well, there are several things that may be said in respect to that. It may make money dearer, and in this connection it is well to consider what the profits of banking are in this country. We hear a good deal about the difference of interest between these large financial institutions, as they are called, and the people. Well, it happens that the people of this country are the bankers of this country. Every man who makes a little money invests it in something as far as he can, and a very large proportion of it is invested in bank stocks that are considered to be tolerably safe. But, like everything else, it is comparatively safe. Investments in the capital of banks to the extent that is safe, returns but a very moderate profit. Now, there was a short period in the history of this country, during the time of the American war, when some banks took their capital to New York, and entered upon the risks that were incident to the disturbed state of the currency in that country at the time. Taking very large risks in that disturbed currency it happened that large profits were made, and I believe that two or three banks in this country added a very considerable amount to their rest, and paid unusually large dividends for a few years; but what is the effect for the last five years. The effect is that banking capital in this country does not yield over 6 per cent. interest, and is not paying over that amount, to-day, upon the average. If we look, for a moment, at the result of banking in Great Britain, in comparison with this, we shall see the very great difference that exists in the country where the Government imposes no restriction in banking. I may say, in passing, that I think it is a very good model for us to follow. There is a certain relation between the Government and the bank of England, but it is almost

a nominal relation. There is scarcely any legal obligation upon the bank beyond the obligation of holding a certain amount of Government securities and I believe now, and I think my hon. friend will find after trying this expedient, that it will be wiser for him to adopt the same plan by which if he must have money from the banks he will allow them to take his securities bearing interest as a deposit to secure their circulation or for any other purpose to secure safety to the public and by that means create the security to the public, and get the loans for the Government which are required without impairing the efficiency of the banks or the facility with which they can use their money for the public good. Of 110 joint stock companies in England, in 1870, there were fifteen that paid dividends of over 20 per cent. per annum; twenty paid from 15 to 20 per cent.; thirty-six paid from 10 to 15 per cent.; thirty-six more paid from 5 to 10 per cent.; and only three out of 110 paid under 5 per cent. Now, it is true that in that country there is a very large amount of capital deposited in the banks for which no capital is paid, and that, of course, helps the dividends of the banks very much. But in Scotland, where daily interest is paid on all accounts, banks have paid as high as 13 per cent. During the same period the result of the peculiar position of the Bank of England has been that it does not pay quite so large an average of dividend as some of the others, although I am not at the moment able to say what that dividend is. The banks, as a general thing, have not a larger rest than the banks have in this country, but they have a very large amount of money upon which no interest is paid. But I merely mention these facts, with reference to the dividends of banks, to show that in this country the money used in banks is not so profitable that this House or the Government can afford to deal with it in a manner to reduce its value to the owners or its efficiency in serving the public. It has been suggested that the American system might be a useful system to introduce. I think that system would have the advantage that the banks would have the interest on the Government bonds as a nucleus of earnings, and I believe that interest is very much more than any advantage derived from the circulation. But there

would be inconvenience attending it, because the banking system in this country is not adapted to that system, by reason of the large number of branches at distant points, where notes must be held to meet the fluctuations of trade, and a change of that kind would interfere with the ability of the existing branches to perform the functions that are so necessary. The Resolutions, I see, provide for an amended form of return. That would, perhaps, assist to keep the country better informed as to the securities of the bank. I do not, however, attach much importance to the Resolution giving preference to the note holder. I think it should be the desire of this House, in passing an Act for the regulation of the banks, to make every liability of the bank so safe that the question of preference would be one of very small importance. This question of placing the money of the country on a good foundation, is one of very great importance. It is so to everyone who has a dollar, and to everyone who expects to have one. It is the first thing we look after in new communities, and a great deal of the growth and prosperity of a country will depend, from time to time, on its money being established on a basis safe and permanent, and world-wide in its character.

MR. WALLACE (South Norfolk): The hon. gentleman who has just spoken says there is an intimate connection between currency and banking. I disagree with him in that respect. There is no more connection between currency and banking than there is between growing wheat and speculating in it. I hold that the Government of the country is wanting in its duty, and that this Parliament is recreant in its duty when allows any set of men to furnish the currency of the country. The hon. member for Niagara, and the hon. member for North Norfolk, says that we are the advocates of an irredeemable paper money. That, however, is not a fact. Who ever heard of a National Currency man advocating an irredeemable currency. They talk of unconvertible money, which is simply idiotic. If it was not convertible it never could be used, and if it could not be used it would be folly to issue it. The hon. member for Niagara says there is a common measure. I maintain there is no such thing as a common

measure, for every country has its own measure. He also says that gold is suitable as a measure of value, because it is difficult to get, which is a little illogical. I do not think that which is advantageous as a convenience should be difficult to obtain. The hon. member for North Norfolk referred to the American greenback, but he did not state the case accurately or fairly. He stated that the American greenback was payable in gold, which is not the fact. The Resumption Act was only passed in 1875. The doubts entertained in the stability of the Government affected the price of greenbacks. Greenbacks also fluctuated in accordance with the balance of trade. If the imports were large, the price of gold went up, if they were small the price of gold went down. Again, the American greenback, when the National Debt was \$1,709,000,000 and when they had \$833,000,000 of paper money in circulation, stood at 38¢. The next year when the Americans had increased their paper money in circulation by \$150,000,000, and their debt by \$1,000,000,000, the greenback stood at 70 cents. So with this increase of the debt, and of the amount of paper money in circulation, the price of gold fell and the price of the greenback increased. Then if you trace the history of the war you will find that the greenbacks as compared with gold fluctuated just as the chances of war seemed for or against the country, and now, notwithstanding that the debt of the country is over \$200,000,000 more than it was in 1864, the American greenback is worth dollar for dollar; while in 1864 it was only worth 38 cents, now it is better than gold. The Government employés would not take the gold. There had to be an order passed to compel the employés to take the gold. Now, Sir, let us look at the history of that country during the time that it is said they had this depreciated money—during that greenback period—and let us see how the country prospered. I hold a statement showing the miles of railway put in operation when they had that greenback money, that worthless paper money. In 1864 they built and put in operation, 738 miles of additional railway; in 1865, they put in operation 1,177 miles of additional railway; in 1866, they put in operation 1,716 additional miles of railway; in

1867, they put in operation 2,449 miles of additional railway; in 1868, they put in operation 2,908 miles of additional railway; in 1869, they put in operation 4,615 miles of additional railway; in 1870, they put in operation 6,070 miles of additional railway; in 1871, they put in operation 7,608 miles of additional railway; and in 1872, 5,720 miles of additional railway. Next year they put in operation 4,000 odd miles of additional railway, thus showing that when the greenback paper was used they had the largest prosperity, they had the largest cost expended on their public works, and the largest amount invested in their railways. When the greenback was beginning to be withdrawn from circulation what was the effect? As the paper money was withdrawn from circulation bank discounts began to take their place. In 1866 bank discounts amounted to only \$766,000,000; in 1873 bank discounts had risen to about \$1,300,000,000 or nearly double, thus showing that as the currency was decreased, the bank discounts—the inferior credit—had increased in an enormous ratio. I was astounded by my hon. friend quoting from Sherman to show that the notes of private corporations was the best circulation for the country. Why, it is an absurdity to say that the credit of a small part of the country is better than the credit of the whole, or to say that the credit of a few bankers would be better than the credit of the whole of the Dominion. It is illogical to say that the credit of the United States is no better, or is worse, than the credit of a few bankers in the United States. It is illogical to say that the credit of a part is better than the credit of the whole. Here is another thing I want to consider in this matter. When that country was pestered, as it is said, with this irredeemable money what was the effect on traders? Were there failures, or were they in a prosperous condition? In 1862, at the beginning of this greenback system, they had 16,252 failures, representing \$23,000,000; in 1863, they had 495 failures, representing \$7,000,000, and these were the years in which the great increase in circulation in greenbacks took place; in 1864, there were 520 failures, representing about \$8,000,000; in 1865, they had 535 failures, representing

\$17,500,000: in 1866, as the currency began to be contracted, as the wise men began to draw it in from circulation, the failures were 632, representing \$47,000,000—I apprehend that in this \$47,000,000 was the large failure of Jay Cooke and Company, which firm was instrumental in bringing about the crises of affairs in that country. In 1867, the failures were 2,386, representing \$86,000,000, and so it went on until the failures came to represent, in one year, \$228,000,000. And this is the beautiful state of things brought about by the abandonment of the greenback system and the resumption of specie currency. This is the system to be continued, and thus hon. gentlemen say we must have a gold currency. But the hon. gentlemen are not true to themselves, they are not true and consistent advocates of a gold currency. If they will have a gold currency, why not stick to it? What do they say? They say it is not necessary, it does not require 100 cents in the dollar of gold; it does not require 50 cents in the dollar of gold; it does not require 25 cents in the dollar of gold to make a gold currency, and now they are trying to do it at 15 cents on the dollar. Yes, Sir, and I believe they are wise. Gold is not wanted to carry on the internal trade of this country, if the people and the Government have confidence in their own country; it is only necessary to keep up a few banking institutions, to keep a few thousand or so of men rolling in wealth to the ruin of the masses. It must be allowed that we are drawing nothing but interest to pay on the debt in England. Let us show the world that the Canadian people have confidence in their own country and in their own country's resources.

An Hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. WALLACE: "Carried," Yes. Well, we will carry it. I will not, at this late hour, trouble the House much more. I will move my amendment to the Resolution. I have no antipathy to the banks. It would be unwise to withdraw the right of circulation from the banks at once, because we have too little currency; and if we compel them to pay dollar for dollar for gold, we would still more restrict the circulation and work irreparable ruin to the country. But I wish to have inaugurated

a system that I believe will be beneficial to the interests of the country. I believe there is no doubt that every man in Canada is deeply interested in the doing away with the pernicious system. It is said that it works well. But what results have we? We have an infinitude of misery, not produced by vice or crime, which I hold should be the only cause of misery. But we have an infinitude of misery caused by the false monetary system which is crippling the power of this country, which is injuring the industries of this country, and causing many of our population to starve. I am not an advocate of taking away the whole circulation of these banks at once, because that would be injurious to the business of this country; but I am in favour of its being done away with as fast as it can be without unduly injuring the business of the country. I make this proposition, that the following words be added to the Resolution—:

"That no bank which under the authority of any Act of this Parliament shall get a renewal of its charter, shall be empowered to put in circulation a larger amount in value of its own notes than the amount of said notes in circulation at the date of the expiry of its present charter."

I do not desire to do anything to embarrass the trade of the country. On the contrary, I desire to do what I believe will tend to promote the industry and prosperity of the whole Canadian people.

Mr. BOULTBEE: I think this is a subject of sufficient importance to warrant me in giving expression to my very crude ideas for a few moments. It seems to me that this matter is not only worth discussing, but well worth discussing by men better able than I am to discuss it; because we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we have a good deal of trouble in conducting our affairs, and have had for some years past. We have been seriously embarrassed. We have been going from one stage to the other, the latter worse than the first, and it is necessary to take some means by which we may hope to extricate ourselves from the slough of trouble we have got into. In inaugurating the National Policy we had in view the effort to get our affairs into such a shape that we could do business amongst ourselves and create our own wealth; but in doing this, and so as to give that policy a fair scope and a full

trial, I think we require better and larger business means, I think we require more capital. I agree fully with the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), that it would not be advisable to increase our present means by borrowing abroad. I take it that it is a great evil to have a large foreign indebtedness which is becoming augmented from year to year, causing an increased difficulty in carrying on the business of the country. I am aware that a certain measure of ridicule attaches to any man who attacks the gold currency or says anything in its disparagement, and the reason is to be found in two causes. In the first place, those who discuss it are generally men connected with financial institutions, generally the wealthy men of the world, and the result is that where there is any suggestion of interference with the established currency, which is controlled by these men, it is only natural for them to oppose any such interference. A small ring of financial men stand with their hands on the throat of the world. They tax every enterprise, and burden every genius. Nothing can be projected, no scheme can be set afloat; no man can spend years of his lifetime devising anything for the good of mankind, but seven-eighths of its profit will be gobbled up by these financiers. They have control of the financial interests of the world, and accumulate money out of money. It is, therefore, only natural that they do not like to have the settled financial basis disturbed in any manner; but there is another reason more solid than this, that is, the one stated by the hon. member for North Norfolk, viz., that gold and silver have been fixed by nations for a long period as the measure of value in international exchange. Now it does seem to me—and it is a question for dealing with seriously—that it is quite possible for the affairs of nations to be conducted internally upon a National Currency founded upon the natural resources, and yet to leave the gold value as the basis of International Exchange. Perhaps as we are now endeavouring to open up our North-West by means of a railway, we may facilitate that work by the use of a currency of this sort. If the Government, for instance, were to issue a Dominion currency in payment for 100 miles of the road, giving

the land as security for a limited period, say for ten or fifteen years, I do not see that it would suffer any depreciation, and even if it did I do not know of any objection to it. If we go to England instead, what do we borrow it on? Not on gold, because we have no gold. We borrow it on our national resources, on the railways, on the land to be hypothecated by the Government; and it seems to me on looking at the question inaugurated by these Resolutions, it is no more than doing what statesmen have been trying to do, to a great extent, all along. It is attempting to preserve the theory of the gold basis of value, while practically assigning it. They do not want to shake or disturb the currency, but they want more money in circulation. The hon. gentleman did not want to disturb the old established gold basis, but simply to have a larger proportion of currency to a smaller proportion of gold. I maintain that it is nothing more than a practical recognition of the fact that a fixed gold value is only a theoretical value, and that the natural basis of value are the practical resources of the country. The arguments of the hon. members for both Norfolks have been used for scores of years, there is nothing new in them. There were certainly some novel ideas in the remarks of the hon. member for South Norfolk, but there was nothing novel in the arguments of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk. That hon. gentleman simply read the old opinions on financial matters, which have been issued for years. It was unnecessary to read them, but every opinion quoted was based not on such a scheme as I have suggested, a reasonable amount of National Currency, but on what is called fiat money in improper quantities without resources to redeem it. What I suggest is very different from this: it is the issue of a small and reasonable amount in payment for a public work with that work as a security, as also the land allocated in aid of the work, and redeemable at a fixed period in fiat stocks.

MR. CASEY: I notice that the hon. member for South Norfolk has not only put less in his Resolution than he is in the habit of doing, but he has moderated his claims, to a great extent, on the currency question. In his first speech he claimed that anything could be made

money by the fiat of law—that it required no value beyond that given to it by law; but now the hon. gentleman says that anyone would be insane who advocated the introduction of currency that was not redeemable in something of value, and that the currency he now proposes would be redeemable in something of value. We have him on the horns of a dilemma. Either he was not clear in his ideas when he advocated the issue of a currency of no value, except that given by the fiat of law, or else he is coming down, to a tremendous extent, from his former position, when he says that the currency he favours would be redeemable in something of value. The Resolution before the House does not touch the question the hon. gentleman has discussed. He tells us this currency would be redeemable by payment on dues to the Government, and for lands and by conversion into bonds. When the hon. member for North York said it would be redeemable in railroads and locomotives, he struck the idea exactly. Now, a currency which the Government is willing to receive in payment of dues, or for lands and bonds, has a certain intrinsic value as a security; but it does not follow that that currency would be a suitable one—indeed, that it would be useful as a currency at all. The notes issued by the Government would have value as securities, but no such value as would fit them for use as currency, for they could not be redeemable except by going out of circulation. In being paid for dues or bonds they would go out of circulation, and nothing would take their place. It may be said they could be paid out again. But nothing is to be gained by that, since the Government could make new notes in an unlimited quantity. The value of the notes would depend on certain circumstances, and would not be a fixed value by any means. Suppose \$20,000,000 come due to the Government in the course of the year; then \$20,000,000 worth of the currency in circulation would be as good as gold as a security, or as an investment, because it could be used in place of gold for paying those debts to the Government. Of course, you cannot imagine the whole currency of the country being paid into the Government, since it would occasion

a periodical destruction of currency which could not be endured. There would, therefore, have to be more currency than is to be paid in for dues each year, and the surplus would have no value in itself. As nobody would know exactly what part would be redeemable, the whole body of the currency would be depreciated, and would bear a value proportionate to the relation between the amount receivable for dues and the amount in circulation. Let us take the case of convertibility into lands, to which the same argument applies to a great extent. The value conferred by convertibility into land would depend upon the amount of currency available for such conversion during the year, and the value of the lands available for sale, because Government lands are put at a fixed price per acre. A dollar bill, based on land, means an acre, or one-fifth, or one-half an acre, according to the price of the land. The value to be attached to that dollar bill would depend upon the value of the acre or fraction thereof which could be obtained for it, and the currency would be just as much a subject of speculation as wild lands are now. I need say very little in regard to currency redeemable in railways or based on the railway to be constructed. Nobody will desire to get together \$20,000 in bills and cash them in a locomotive, or in a mile of road-bed. We come now to consider convertibility into bonds. If a bond were only payable in similar paper it would add nothing to its value. In the United States the experiment of converting greenbacks into bonds was continuously tried. When the greenback was at its lowest point, it could be converted into Government bonds, but neither one added to the value of the other. The surplus over the needs of circulation available for convertibility would not increase with the increasing volume of currency. Inflation raises prices, and higher prices require the use of more currency in each transaction. Currency is, therefore, relatively as scarce in times of inflation as at other times. The whole proceeding goes in a vicious circle, the one factor continually aggravating the other, and I think we may conclude which that it is clear that no currency which is redeemable in anything else than some other valuable article equally available as a means of exchange would suffice. No

stronger illustration of this can be had than the history of the paper money adopted in France in 1791, when *assignats* were first issued. There were troublous times in France then. The credit of the country was very good, but there was a demand for more currency, the people being under the impression that more currency meant more capital. They issued those *assignats*, which were a currency redeemable in land, not by the process of payment by land, but as mortgages upon the land, bearing interest at 3 per cent. per annum until cashed in land. The lands were not wild lands, situated thousands of miles from the civilised portions of the country, but the choice lands of France. They were at first the confiscated Church lands, and afterwards the lands of exiled nobles were included with them. The orators of the day asserted that this currency was not only as good as gold, but better. One said: "I would rather have a mortgage upon a garden than upon a kingdom, because the one I can enforce by law, and the other I cannot." This currency was reinforced by laws which compelled its acceptance at certain maximum prices. A man was not allowed to charge more than so much for any particular article, and he was compelled to take the *assignats* at par. That was the most logical attempt to give value to a paper currency that I ever heard of. But that currency fell to such a point that 288 francs in paper were worth only 1 franc in gold after five years trial. It was followed by another kind of currency, which, instead of consisting of mortgages was a currency of deeds giving an absolute title to lands. That was found to be as bad as the other, and the whole attempt had to be given up, and the currency repudiated. I think this should be a sufficient answer to any argument that a currency based on the North-West lands, or on an unproductive Pacific Railway in British Columbia, or an unproductive Intercolonial Railway, if you choose, would have any permanent value or be safe from depreciation. The hon. member for South Norfolk accounts for the weakness of business in the country by the fact that interest is so high that nobody can afford to borrow money to carry on business with. I do not think a fairer example of putting the cart before the horse can be

MR. CASEY.

conceived than to say that business is slack because interest is so high that nobody will borrow money. Who fixed the rate of interest? It was fixed like all other payments for the use of money or any other article—by the law of supply and demand. Therefore, it is ridiculous to say that business is slow because the rate of interest is high. The rate of interest is generally raised by the briskness of business, and depressed by its slackness.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question, carried, lost, order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD appealed to hon. members to observe order and allow Mr. Casey opportunity of finishing his remarks.

MR. CASEY: Interest is always lowered when business is slack. In England it was so low lately owing to the depression, that some of the banks charged one per cent for taking care of the customers money. The rate of interest in the United States was much higher before the depression, and while inflation was rife than it has been of late. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) went on to say that greenbacks were not payable in gold. I dispute the soundness of the assertion as an argument. True, they were not in terms made payable in gold, but it was the hope that they would be payable some time in gold which give them all the value they had. Greenbacks were a currency whose redemption was deferred indefinitely. Everybody knows that as the time for their payment in gold drew near the greenbacks rose in value. The hon. gentleman stated that the Government of the United States had to pass a law to force their employés to take gold instead of greenbacks. That was at a time when greenbacks were redeemable in gold, and as good as gold. The value that greenbacks had acquired at that time was not due to the fiat of the law. The hon. member for South Norfolk argued that it was not the excess of greenbacks that produced their depreciation—that it was the involvement of the country in war. The excess was one factor in the problem, and the war was another.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MACKENZIE appealed to the Chairman to try to preserve order saying

the noises and interruptions were quite intolerable.

The CHAIRMAN requested hon. members to allow Mr. Casey to proceed quietly.

MR. CASEY: An excess of any currency will cause depression in its value. If we have more of any article than is required a fall in value ensues, and it is the same with money; if the issuer is in bad credit, the depreciation will be the greater. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) stated that in 1864 greenbacks were worth thirty-eight cents on the dollar, and that the following year after a large issue they reached seventy cents, and he attributed this fact correctly to the cessation of the Civil War. That fact was one cause of the improvement, but the depreciation to even seventy cents was caused by the excess of greenbacks over the wants of exchange. He (Mr. Wallace) had gone on to ridicule the idea that we have still a gold currency when we only held a percentage of gold against it. Nobody ever claimed we had a gold currency but only a gold-based currency. So long as it is known our notes can be redeemed in gold, the currency possesses a gold basis. It is absurd to argue that credit is better than gold as the hon. gentleman had done; the statement has no meaning unless its author means that the credit of the issuer will enable him to procure something more valuable than gold. Credit is as good as gold, and it is on credit that the value of all issues depends, when the belief is that the issuer is able to procure the gold for the notes if required. But to use that for an argument in favour of paper currency, as the hon. gentleman wishes to do, is illogical and inappropriate, because his currency would not consist of a promise to pay anything. It would not bind the Government to exchange it for anything, but only to receive it on debts and dues, or for the purchase of land. The hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Boulton) says that business men think we should have more currency to facilitate business operations. I think it is meant that we have too little capital in the country, which is probably true. That is different from saying that we have too little currency, as currency is not capital. If you issued \$100,000,000 of Government currency to-morrow, there would not be a single dollar more capital in the country of the kind advocated by

the hon. member for South Norfolk. Unless based on gold it would not add anything to our facilities for productive industry. Even then it could only be procured in the same way as money is now, in exchange for value or labour. We have a free and open currency market in this country. Banks are allowed to issue as much currency as they choose within certain limits, namely, up to the amount of their paid-up capital. What do the Bank Returns show as to the demands for currency? This: that although they have authority to issue \$60,000,000 of currency, they only have in circulation about \$18,000,000, which proves we have not too little currency. If the country required more there was no difficulty in obtaining it. The fiat currency would not any more than the present one give people currency of a purchasing power without giving value for it. In no other way could it increase the wealth of the people, in reference to the argument that the currency should expand in proportion to our industries. The fact that the country now does not need as much currency as some years ago, is apparent from the fact that the bank circulation of Ontario and Quebec, at the end of 1872, was \$22,500,000; at the commencement of the financial year of 1877, \$16,440,000; at the commencement of 1878, \$16,528,000; at the commencement of the present financial year, \$15,971,000. Let us take the busiest time of the year, October, when most produce is being moved. At the end of October, 1872, the bank circulation was \$25,906,000; in October, 1877, \$22,018,000; in October, 1878, \$20,419,000; and in October, 1879, \$20,800,000. So that the needs of the country have not been increasing during the past eight years. But one of the strongest arguments that the hon. gentleman brought forward, in his estimation, was that the United States had prospered tremendously under the greenback system. He said that thousands of miles of railway were opened during that time, and but few failures occurred. He might have described the establishment of enormous manufactories, with other indications of what he calls prosperity. Where did the money come from that built those railways and manufactories? Was it greenbacks? Did the people get

it for nothing? Was it a present made to the country by the Legislature? Not at all. Most of it was borrowed abroad, with interest payable in gold. Were the construction of these works and the institution of these manufactures a true test of prosperity? They were signs of recklessness and extravagance. A country like a spendthrift can make business look lively. But a reckoning has come to the United States. These railways and other works were unproductive, and in the last few years the crash has come, and those very transactions were the direct cause of the misfortunes that have overtaken the United States. If those reckless expenditures and undertakings were the fruits of the greenback policy, as claimed by the hon. gentleman, they are the most decided condemnation of that currency. I hold the greenback heresy entirely responsible for those misfortunes. We know that the inflation of the currency produces a general inflation of ideas. People who find governments living exclusively on credit think they may live exclusively on credit themselves. It was the reckless condition of public opinion, caused by the greenback issues, that was chiefly responsible for that tremendous extravagance, and the ruin and depression that have followed it. It was the cause of the industrial depression which has since taken place. In 1876, in the early part of the period of depression, there were universal strikes of labours throughout the United States. Shortly afterwards the current of emigration began to turn and began to flow from the United States to England, instead of from England to the United States. It was the cause of the penury and want that overtook settlers in the western country. All these evils were, to a great extent, due to the general inflation of ideas and extravagance brought about by the greenback heresy in the United States. I think I have now gone over all the points that have been brought up in the speeches of the two hon. gentlemen to whom I have replied, although I have by no means touched upon all the arguments put forth by the advocates of fiat money. I think the House has become pretty thoroughly seized before this of all the facts in relation to that subject, and I think we are

MR. CASEY.

now in a better situation for giving an intelligent vote on the subject than in any previous Session. I am sorry the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) did not this year, as on previous occasions, formulate his views in favour of fiat money, in a straightforward Resolution, challenging the Government to take the sense of the House upon it.

Motion in amendment *negatived* on a division.

Resolution *read the first and second times and agreed to.*

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 115) To amend an Act relating to Banks and Banking, and to continue for a limited time the charter of certain banks to which the said Act applies.

Bill *read the first time.*

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Resolved, That on every Wednesday for the remainder of the Session, Government Measures shall take precedence after Questions put by Members.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

QUESTION.

MR. CASEY: There is one measure which will have to be left out, but which, I think, the Government should take up in another form. In the Speech from the Throne, we were promised a Bill for the reform of the Civil Service. The hon. Premier promised us a measure on this subject "ere long." Perhaps he will tell us when "ere long" will be, and whether it will be brought down this Session.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think my hon. friend must give notice of that question.

House adjourned at
Fifteen minutes before
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 27th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

FIRST READING.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.), in introducing a Bill (No. 116) To amend the Pilotage Act, 1873, said: It has been found that, in many places, pilots do not

properly discharge their duties ; and it is a difficult matter for the pilotage authorities to deal with them, or to get rid of them when they do not perform their duties. Under this Act their licenses will be renewed yearly by endorsement by the pilotage authorities. It is better to give them authority, when pilots will not do their duty, to refuse licenses for the following year. The Act is not intended to apply to the Province of Quebec, but only to the rest of the Dominion where there are pilotage authorities and pilots. The Corporations of Quebec and Montreal do not care to be interfered with. There is a clause also which declares that harbour masters shall not act as pilots, nor pilots as harbour masters. Complaint is made that, in many parts, it gives the harbour master a considerable advantage over other pilots, because he can give his own ships the preference.

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

MR. POPE said the ports of Montreal and Quebec were differently situated ; they managed their own affairs, and it was not desirable to interfere with them.

MR. BLAKE : They are under the same infirmities there as elsewhere.

MR. GILLMOR said that in some parts in the Lower Provinces harbour masters take the vessels down the river three or four miles ; there should be some provision to allow these, because there may be no pilot to do the work.

MR. POPE : For the reason I have stated, pilots complain that one who is harbour master can give advantages to the owners of ships, and thus get the preference himself in piloting ships.

MR. ANGLIN : At very small ports there may be a difficulty in this way : that the position of harbour masters is not sufficient to pay a man so much that he could live by that alone. There is certainly a strong objection to appointing a pilot as a harbour master, when that can be avoided ; but it may be difficult to find a man knowing sufficient about the duties of the position to be satisfied with the income at a small port. I would suggest that discretionary powers should be given to the hon. the Minister of Marine, and these, no doubt, would be exercised so as not to prejudice the general interests of the trade of the country.

MR. MACKENZIE : I observe, as the

result of a recent interview between some people connected with the navigation of the St. Lawrence and the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that the latter promised a revision of everything connected with the navigation of the St. Lawrence River and lakes. With regard to that, I presume he will do something as to the pilotage of the river to the Gulf. There have been repeated and serious complaints in the newspapers about the manner in which the pilotage has been conducted between Montreal and what is called the lower part of the St. Lawrence, where the pilots leave the vessels, and I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman has considered any plan with reference to the pilotage system existing there at present.

MR. LANGEVIN : The hon. gentleman is right and wrong in what he says. He is right as to the deputations. Two large and influential deputations from Ontario and Quebec came to see members of the Government about the free navigation of the St. Lawrence—to give us their views in regard to making the canals of the St. Lawrence and the harbours of Quebec and Montreal as free as possible. The second deputation looked more to the harbour and tonnage dues of Montreal. The answer the Government gave was this : That this was a very large question, that the Government could not consider it just at this moment, and that we could not take up a separate subject such as the canal tolls or the harbour dues of Montreal, but that the whole subject would receive the consideration of the Government during the Recess. We did not promise we would do this or do that. The matter is to be considered by the Government, and the result of that consideration will be submitted to Parliament at its next Session.

MR. MACKENZIE : Then it is not proposed to take any action this Session ?

MR. LANGEVIN : No.

MR. ANGLIN : I hope that the Government will not confine their consideration to the harbours of the St. Lawrence, but will embrace the ports of the Maritime Provinces, where the people would like to be relieved of the harbour dues.

MR. LANGEVIN : I have no doubt the consideration of all those subjects will

be taken up by the Government during the Recess. We have made no promise and cannot make any promise now, because the matter has not been considered.

Bill read the first time.

DISMISSAL OF THE LATE LIEUT.-GOVERNOR OF QUEBEC.

MOTION OF WANT OF CONFIDENCE.

Order for the House to again resolve itself into Committee of Supply, *read.*

MR. MACKENZIE: I take this opportunity of bringing under the notice of the House a question which we were not able to deal with last Session, but which, in our opinion, requires an expression from this House as to the subject, the manner in which it was dealt with, and the manner in which the House was treated. It will be remembered that during last Session a motion was made by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), condemning the action of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec in the dismissal of his Ministers; that upon that motion a vote was obtained, that upon that vote, and upon the vote of the Senate, in the previous year, the Ministry based their action regarding Lieutenant Governor Letellier, advising that he should be dismissed on account of his action in dismissing his Ministers. We waited up to the last day of the Session hoping to obtain some definite intelligence respecting the remission of the matter to England. I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House, but simply to recapitulate some facts connected with the case, and then submit a motion which I will place in your hands, Sir, at the close of my remarks. It will be remembered that in the season of 1878, the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir. John A. Macdonald) who was then leading the Opposition, moved a vote which might be called a vote of censure, although it was not so in terms, upon the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec for the dismissal of his Ministers. That vote was negatived by a large majority. The Senate, however, being composed of the friends of the hon. gentleman, passed a motion somewhat similar in terms. The Government of the day, of which I had the honour to be a member, declined to take any action in regard to Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's dismissal of his Ministers, for the simple reason

that we conceived we had no standing ground on which to take such action. Whether his action was wise or unwise—politic from a party point of view—taking that low ground, and assuming, as was done in the memorandum, that Lieutenant-Governor Letellier acted from partisan motives, we expressed no opinion. Not but that we had an opinion to express; but because I conceived it would have been improper in any Minister to express an opinion that he was not prepared to give full effect to by a vote in this House. Our opinion was, that the Lieutenant-Governor acted strictly within his technical rights in the discharge of his duty; that there should be no interference from the General Government with any of the Local Administrations, and that such interference should be upon such clearly defined grounds that there could be no mistake about the propriety of it. I am glad to know that that opinion was also entertained in the highest quarters in this country as well as in the Mother Country. But while the Government thus declined to take action, and so, as I contend, closed the case, the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government brought it up afresh, or rather it was forced upon him, I believe, afresh by his supporters, in the first Session of another Parliament. I think we have fair reason to conclude from the inaction of the Premier and his Government, for several months after their accession to office, that they did not believe it was a case in which the Executive should interfere with the discharge of the duties of his office by a Local Governor. But the hon. member for Bagot was not to be restrained by constitutional usages, and he moved a motion identical in form with that moved by his leader in the previous Parliament. This motion was carried by a large majority, and shortly afterwards the Government acted upon this motion, and a motion passed in the previous Parliament, in the Senate, recommending His Excellency to dismiss Lieutenant-Governor Letellier. For what? Why, there was no reason assigned, that could be called a reason, under the language of the 59th Section of the Constitutional Act. It was simply recommended on the ground that his usefulness had ceased. And why had his usefulness ceased? Of all reasons it was because two other bodies had

passed a vote of censure upon him, the House of Commons and Senate, after the question had been settled, and if a mere vote of censure of this House is sufficient, on all occasions, or an implied vote of censure, to secure the dismissal of a Lieutenant-Governor, then his tenure of office is held by the merest thread, because it is always within the competence of a large and partisan majority to pass an opinion upon the conduct of a Lieut.-Governor, if it is known the office will be vacated by that expression of opinion. In this case the expression of opinion was simply that his conduct was unwise and subversive of the provision of his adversaries—a pure truism and nothing else. The Act of dismissal was subversive of their position, because it removed them from office, but that does not say it was constitutionally adverse to the position of constitutional Ministers. The proper remedy, as we conceived, lay with the Local Legislature, and not with the House of Commons or Senate, or the Executive of the Dominion. The pressure of the right hon. gentleman's followers seems to have been the ruling motive of the Government in the dismissal of Lieut.-Governor Letellier. It would be interesting to know the opinion of the higher authorities of the Empire on this case. We have, after the reference to the Imperial Government, an opinion upon two matters. In the first place, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach gave the opinion of the Imperial Government upon the question of the reference at all. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) last year gave notice of a motion which we would have been delighted to support. But he avoided getting his motion put before the House till too late. It was ruled out, and it would be a pity the hon. gentleman should be without an opportunity of recording his vote on so interesting a subject. Perhaps we may be able to support his negligence with an opportunity which he did not, perhaps, expect this Session. In reference to this matter, Sir M. H.-Beach says, in his despatch of July 3, 1879:

“I have not had occasion to call for any arguments on either side on the merits of Mr. Letellier's case. The law does not empower Her Majesty's Government to decide it, and they do not therefore propose to express any opinion with regard to it. You are aware that the powers given by the British North

America Act, 1867, with respect to the removal of a Lieut.-Governor from office, are vested not in Her Majesty's Government, but in the Governor General.”

With reference to the other point, the question of Lieut.-Governor Letellier's removal, he said:

“There can be no doubt that he has an unquestionable constitutional right to dismiss his Ministers, if from any cause he feels it incumbent upon him to do so. * * * It was the spirit and intention of the British North America Act that the terms of the high office of Lieut.-Governor should, as a rule, endure for the term of years specially mentioned, and that the power of removal should never be exercised, except for grave cause.”

Showing very clearly that the Imperial Government disapproved of the action taken by the Canadian Government, and asked a reconsideration. Sir M. H.-Beach then urges the Canadian Government “again to consider the action to be taken in the case of Mr. Letellier.” He hoped no doubt that the Ministers here would regard the exposition of law and the advice of the Imperial Ministers. The Colonial Secretary did not know the parties he had to deal with, if he thought it was possible such a thing could take place as a reconsideration. Such, however, was his generous conclusion, and he suggests the propriety of it taking place at any rate. Now, we find the opinion of His Excellency the Governor-General, expressed in a very decided manner. He says, in his despatch, after reciting the appearance of the Premier and his interview with him:

“I said that Sir John must know, from what I had already said to him on this subject, that I could not agree in the policy he recommended, but requested him to give his reasons in writing, and told him that I should put my reasons against a policy in writing. He intimated he would do as I requested. I said further, that I considered that the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor would set a bad precedent.”

Lord Lorne, therefore, upon constitutional grounds, disapproved of the advice of his Ministers, and refused to accept it; and besides that he intimated that he considered, if done, it would be a very dangerous precedent. His Excellency requested that his First Minister should put his opinions in writing, and he, himself, engaged to put his opinions in writing. Whether such opinions were ever put in writing I have no means of ascertaining, further than

is to be inferred from the memorandum of the hon. the First Minister, with which I will deal shortly. The Governor-General in this case was led to believe, at the close of this first interview, when he rejected the advice of his Minister, that the reasons would be put in writing by the First Minister as well as himself, and that further discussion might take place upon such correspondence; or it may have been that he intended the correspondence to terminate there, he being resolved not to yield in the matter. But this interview, which was held on the 29th March, was succeeded by another interview on Wednesday, the 2nd of April, when the Premier produced a note of a statement he proposed to make to the House, and which he submitted for His Excellency's approval. It was in these terms:

"Sir John A. Macdonald waited on His Excellency the Governor-General and informed him that after the Resolution of the Senate in the last Session of Parliament, and the Resolution of the House of Commons during the present Session, it was the opinion of His Excellency's advisers that the usefulness of the Hon. Mr. Letellier as Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was gone, and they advised that, in the public interest, it was expedient he should be removed from his office. His Excellency was thereupon pleased to state that as the Federal system introduced by the British North America Act of 1867 was, until then unknown in Great Britain or her colonies, there were no precedents to guide us; that the decision would settle, for the future, the relations between the Dominion and Provincial Governments, so far as the office of Lieutenant Governor is concerned, and that he, therefore, deemed it expedient to submit the advice tendered to him, and the whole case, with all the attendant circumstances, to Her Majesty's Government for their consideration and instructions."

This Message was brought down, if I recollect right, on the following day, the 3rd of April. The immediate effect of that message in this House was of a very serious character. It led hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, beyond all question, to come to the conclusion that His Excellency had not only refused the advice of his Ministers but, contrary to their advice, had determined to remit the matter to England "for consideration and instructions," these being the words used in the minute, and we all remember the fervour with which the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) and the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), and some other hon. gentlemen, denounced His

Excellency the Governor-General in very strong terms as trampling upon the liberties of the people, as trampling upon responsible government, as setting at defiance the principles under which we are governed. All this denunciation of His Excellency was listened to by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government and his colleagues, but not one word was uttered to show that it was not at His Excellency's suggestion that the reference to England was made at all, but upon the suggestion of the Government themselves. We do not know, and it is not right we should know, what passed before the next step in this matter between His Excellency's advisers and His Excellency, but we do know that four days after the statement came down the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) asked a question in the House, and the hon. Premier said:

"I am glad the hon. member has asked the question. I beg leave to state to the House that the Postmaster-General, my colleague, will sail by the next Canadian steamer for England for the purpose of supporting, with the consent of the Governor-General, the advice given by the Government for the removal of Governor Letellier. He may perhaps be accompanied by another gentleman: at all events he goes next Saturday. I need scarcely say that the fact of our holding the position we do at this moment shows that the Governor-General did not make that reference against our advice, and the fact of our remaining in office shows we hold ourselves responsible for the action of the Governor-General."

This still showed conclusively to the House that it was the Governor-General's action that referred the matter to England, but his Ministers generously held themselves responsible for his action, when, in reality, the Governor-General, no doubt, stretched a point, in order to conform to the suggestion and advice of his Ministers to send this matter to England "for consideration and instructions." So far the House was entirely deceived by the Government, in reference to the true position of His Excellency the Governor-General and his Ministers, and the odium, a heavy odium, a just odium, if true, was left upon the Governor-General of being himself the instigator of a violation of responsible government, according to the very strong language of the hon. members for Bagot and Laval. The true facts of the affair became known to the hon. gentlemen, although it did not

become known to us on this side of the House, because every excuse was resorted to for not proceeding with their motion as soon as they found that it could not be levelled at the Governor-General, but would be levelled at his Ministers. Every device was resorted to to stave off the motion of the hon. member for Bagot, although he knew all the time, apparently, that there was something else to be said which never was openly said in this House, and of which they did not become cognisant until the papers were published in the Imperial Parliament. I have felt that it was absolutely necessary to place this matter right upon our Journals and upon the Debates of the House, in order that, for the future, the position of a Governor-General and his advisers may be perfectly understood, and that if hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House choose to vote against the motion I intend to place in your hands, they will have to vote against the light and knowledge which has been shed upon this subject since we discussed it last Session. I do not propose to discuss at any length the memorandum of the hon. gentleman enclosed in the despatches to England, but there are some points in them which seem to me to call for special notice. We are told with reference to Lieut.-Governor Letellier, and other Governors :

“A stranger to Quebec might naturally enquire what object Mr. Letellier had in dismissing his Ministers. He had, it is believed, a distinct and specific object. The general elections for the Dominion Parliament were, of necessity, to take place in 1878 when the Ministry of which, as has been already stated, Mr. Letellier had been a prominent member, would be obliged to go to the country and give an account of their stewardship. In consequence of the traditional influence of Government which has been alluded to, it was obviously of political importance to that Administration to have such influence exercised in its favour. Hence arose the anxiety of Governor Letellier to forget his position as Governor, to dismiss his advisers, who were known to be politically opposed to the Dominion Ministry, and to substitute for them a Cabinet which would act in sympathy with them and exercise the Provincial patronage to carry the Dominion Elections.”

Now, those words were written unadvisedly. The hon. gentleman could not have been cognisant of anything which would justify him in imputing such motives, and using such offensive language

towards Lieutenant-Governor Letellier. It is stated here that he was a member of the Administration at the time of his appointment, and the hon. gentleman evidently mentioned that with a view to create an impression that the very fact of his having been a member of my Administration, was an argument against his appointment, and an argument in favour of the belief that he had acted improperly, that he had acted unconstitutionally, that he had acted in the interests of his political party. Who were the Governors whom the hon. gentleman has appointed from time to time? Mr. Governor Morris was appointed; he was a member of the hon. gentleman's Administration since Confederation. Mr. Adams Archibald was appointed; he was also a member of his Administration. Mr. Howe was appointed; he was also a member of his Administration. Mr. Howland was a member of his Administration. Mr. Robitaille was a member of his Administration. The last appointment made was Mr. Wilmot; he was also a member of the hon. gentleman's Administration. So far as I can recollect at the present moment, every Governor who has been appointed were members of the hon. gentleman's Government, except Mr. John Crawford, late Lieut.-Governor of Ontario, and Mr. Haviland. My hon. friend from Bothwell reminds me that Governor Caron was not a member of the hon. gentleman's Administration since Confederation, although he was, no doubt, a colleague formerly.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No, never.

MR. MACKENZIE: My recollection in the case then is imperfect. At all events, here are a number of names, eight in all, about whom there is no question. Everyone of these men are subject to the reproach contained in this innuendo. The office of Lieutenant-Governor in all our Provinces is one of high dignity. It is one, I think, to be filled by the leading political characters who may be willing at the time to accept such a position. It is one, not merely of dignity, it is one of rank. It gives social as well as political position in the country, which has made it an object of great value in that respect; and I do not think it is a generous conclusion to come to that any member so

accepting it has accepted it as Lieutenant Governor Letellier is here stated to have accepted it for the distinct purpose of exerting his official influence on behalf of his political friends in such a way. I am sure, so far as I was concerned, as a member of the late Administration, occupying the first position in the Administration, that during the term of that hon. gentleman's incumbency and my own, that not one discussion about any political objects to be delivered in either that Province or the Dominion ever took place between us; that no suggestion as to a political course was ever made by him or asked by him. I am bound to say this much in the vindication of a man whom I conceive to have been grossly ill-used, and whom I greatly esteem as a personal friend. There are other passages here suggesting that Mr. Turcotte was sent for, and that his acceptance of the Speakership was arranged in the presence of Mr. Letellier and Mr. Joly. I do not know anything about that, but I am informed it is not true. Another passage in the hon. gentleman's memorandum says this :

"Except in this case no complaint has been made that any Lieutenant-Governor has allowed his conduct as such to be influenced by his party predilections. He (Mr. Letellier) was a prominent member of Mr. Mackenzie's Ministry and the leader of his Government in the Senate. It was, therefore, especially necessary that he should have avoided even a semblance of being actuated by party feeling in his new position. Instead of this, there is too much reason to believe that he assumed his office with the distinct purpose of exerting his official influence on behalf of his political friends."

This, if possible, is still more unworthy of the hon. gentleman to place such a statement on paper. The hon. gentleman shows his inconsistency in the following statement. He says: In order to escape from the difficulty although Mr. Joly secured a majority—

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend says, no. Very well, he carried on his Government. At all events he could hardly have done that without a majority. The hon. gentleman says that the Local Elections, which occurred immediately after the dismissal of Mr. Letellier's Ministers, did not turn upon the question of the dismissal of the Ministry, but upon the merits of the Joly Administration and

MR. MACKENZIE.

the DeBoucherville Administration, but that the Dominion Elections, occurring many months afterwards, did turn upon this question, and the result was a large majority in favour of the Dominion Government, while the Local Government, who committed the wrong, if it was a wrong, was sustained by the Local Elections. I have never read any State document that seems so unworthy of a great Minister as this document. The hon. gentleman says, in respect to the Local House at that time :

"Notwithstanding the purchase of a Speaker, a vote of Want of Confidence was passed in the Legislative Assembly, and a similar Resolution was adopted in the Upper House. Mr. Joly, however, did not resign, as he ought to have done. He held to office and proceeded with the business of the country."

What a shame he did not resign. He insisted very improperly, as the hon. gentleman thinks, on carrying his measures through the House. He refused to resign, because he had got his measures and his money vote through the House. A lacking impropriety indeed. I am afraid the hon. gentleman opposite would not be very apt to resign if he could get his measures through Parliament, and his Supplies voted.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Carry a vote of Want of Confidence and I will resign.

MR. MACKENZIE: We will see whether the hon. gentleman will resign after the vote is taken upon the motion I am about to submit. I cannot conceive it possible that any hon. friend from Bagot and his friends will vote against this Resolution, and we will see whether the resignation will take place. The document goes on to say :

"Mr. Joly did not resign as he ought to have done. He succeeded in carrying the Supplies, and the fact of his having done so is cited as a proof of the substantial confidence of the House in him. But the refusal of Supplies is an antiquated procedure, and has long since been succeeded in England by votes of Want of Confidence, and for the same reason which induced the Opposition at Quebec to vote the Supplies."

We can imagine Mr. Chapleau, who is distinguished as a remarkably moderate politician, as a man who never says any severe things of any person, as a man who never takes any strong views of public matters, resigning under such circumstances. Not he. He is as genial as

a sucking doe. My hon. friend also who sits behind (Mr. Angers) is another very genial person. These hon. gentlemen, rather than resort to any antiquated procedure, though quite parliamentary, determined generously to vote supplies to a Government they wished to get out of office. Such a sacrifice cannot be too greatly commended. One cannot help pausing in order to revere the men who had such a just regard for modern parliamentary practice that they would not, on any account, resort to the antiquated procedure of refusing the Supplies. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman forget a little circumstance in connection with this antiquated procedure. He forgot to say that but for resorting to this same antiquated procedure in the Upper House, Mr. Joly would have still been in the Government. It was an antiquated proceeding, and one that was most unjustifiable in the DeBoucherville party to refuse the Supplies in the Lower House, but not antiquated for the Supplies to be refused in the Upper House. I was under the impression that our constitutional usage required the Upper House to pass the Supplies voted by the Lower House. Only on one or two occasions have the House of Lords attempted to dispute that as a principle, and they had to yield, and have never resorted to it since. But here is a House, whose duty it was to give Mr. Joly his Supplies, refusing them. They had a constitutional right to refuse them. Such are the main points of this extraordinary Memorandum. Now there is one thing evident, that if the dismissal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier was justifiable for the reasons given in the hon. gentleman's Memorandum to His Excellency, then any Lieutenant-Governor may be dismissed upon any pretext of political bias for the time being; if it be true that any man who accepts the position of Lieutenant-Governor can have his views or his motives impugned, and be dismissed by this Parliament on account of his happening to have been an opponent of the Government in his previous political views, then there is an end of all respectability in connection with our highest political circles, and an end to that independent relation between the Government and the Governments of the Provinces contemplated in the Confedera-

tion Act. But I believe that the public opinion of the Province of Quebec were hostile to the course pursued by the hon. gentleman opposite, as shown by their supporting Mr. Joly's Administration. Were we to allow the dismissal of the Governor for such reasons as are given in that Memorandum without a formal protest, we should acquiesce in an action on the part of the Government which would tend to the destruction of the principles upon which our constitution is founded—principles by virtue of which we should not interfere with the internal administration of the Provinces, but leave everything that can be left to the discretion of the Legislatures and people of the Provinces. We should not interfere with the dismissal of the Lieut.-Governor's Ministers, be the act wise or unwise. He called a gentleman to form a new Administration, that was duly formed; they carried their individual elections; they carried the elections of the Province; they discharged the duties of the Government of that Province for nearly a year and a half after they assumed the responsibility of Government; and I hold there was far more injury done to Constitutional Government, assuming the hon. gentleman opposite to be correct in his appreciation of the question, in the dismissal of Mr. DeBoucherville than would have been done had the hon. gentleman permitted the matter to rest. I propose to put our views on record by moving the following motion which contains the main points as I desire to lay them before the House. I would like to speak on other points connected with the case, but I am sincerely anxious not to hinder the business of the House which has yet to be done. I, therefore, place this motion in your hands:

That all the words after "that" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—
 "It be Resolved, That the Hon. Luc Letellier de St. Just was removed from the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec on the ground that his 'usefulness was gone;' this conclusion being reached because the Senate in 1878, and the House of Commons in 1879 passed Resolutions condemning the action of Governor Letellier in the dismissal of his Ministers, though the reason so assigned (in the memorandum of Sir John A. Macdonald 2d April, 1879) was not such a cause as was contemplated by the British North America Act, 1867.

"That immediately after the dismissal by Lieutenant-Governor Letellier of his Ministers

on the 2nd March, 1878, he called upon the Hon. H. G. Joly to form a new Administration, who succeeded in doing so, and constitutionally and specifically assumed the responsibility of the Lieutenant-Governor's action, and who retained office for sixteen months, after passing through a General Election.

"That during the Session of the Dominion Parliament of 1878, Sir John A. Macdonald moved the following Resolution:—

"That this House do resolve, that the dismissal by the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec of his Ministers on the 2nd day of March, 1878, was, under the circumstances, unwise and subversive of the position accorded to the advisers of the Crown since the concession of Responsible Government to the British North American Colonies."

"That this motion was defeated by a large majority, the vote being 112 to 70.

"That the same motion was repeated at the next Session in a new Parliament, when it was moved by Mr. Mousseau, member for Bagot, supported by Sir John A. Macdonald and his Ministers, and carried by a strictly party vote.

"That it does not appear that Sir John A. Macdonald and his colleagues, as Ministers, took any step hostile to Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, until after Mr. Mousseau's motion was made, although they were more than five months in office.

"That on the 29th March, 1879, Sir John A. Macdonald, as Prime Minister, waited on His Excellency the Governor-General, and communicated to him the decision of the Cabinet. The decision was to the effect, that the usefulness of Mr. Letellier was gone, and that he must be relieved of his office.

"That the reply of His Excellency was, that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) must know from what he had already said to him on the subject, that he could not agree in the policy he recommended. * * * His Excellency said further that he considered the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor would set a dangerous precedent.

"That on the 2nd of April, four days after His Excellency had refused to act on the Ministerial advice, Sir John A. Macdonald again went to His Excellency and as an alternative * * * suggested that the question involved in the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec should be referred to Her Majesty's Government, to which advice or suggestion the Governor-General assented."

"That thereupon Sir John A. Macdonald produced a note of the Statement he proposed to make to the House on the subject; it was in these terms:

"Sir John A. Macdonald waited on His Excellency the Governor-General, and informed him, that after the Resolution of the Senate in the last Session of Parliament, and the Resolution of the House of Commons during the present Session, the was opinion of His Excellency's advisers, that the usefulness of the Hon. Mr. Letellier, as Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was gone, and they advised that in the public interest it was expedient that he should be removed from his office. His Excellency was then pleased to state, that as the

Federal system introduced by the British North America Act, 1867, was until then unknown in Great Britain or her Colonies; there were no precedents to guide us, that the decision in the present case would settle for the future the relations between the Dominion and the Provincial Governments, so far as the office of Lieutenant-Governor is concerned, and that he therefore deemed it expedient to submit the advice tendered to him, and the whole case with all the attendant circumstances to Her Majesty's Government for their consideration and instructions.

"That on the 3rd April, 1879, the above statement was read in the House of Commons, without further explanation by Sir John A. Macdonald that it gave rise to the impression and belief, in the House generally, that His Excellency had, without the advice of His Ministers, determined to remit the question to the Imperial Government for consideration and instructions."

"That, as the result of such belief, Mr. Mousseau, on the 4th April, gave notice of the following motion:—

"That in the opinion of this House the fact of submitting the advice of the Privy Council of Canada to the review of Her Majesty's advisers in England upon questions which are purely of an administrative character, like that involved in the dismissal of Lieutenant Governor Letellier, under the British North America Act, 1867, is subversive of the principles of Responsible Government granted to Canada.

"That Mr. Ouimet, a Ministerial member, on the same occasion, used the following language in his place in the House of Commons:—

"I rise as a representative of the people whose rights, I think, have been trampled on by the Governor-General, who, I believe, has acted unconstitutionally. * * * The illustrious gentleman, who is now Governor-General, believes (at least so we must understand from his act) he has authority to refuse the advice of his Ministers in a question purely and simply of internal administration. * * * I had been

accustomed to believe, during the last twenty-eight or thirty years that we enjoyed Responsible Government, but I have been taught this afternoon that I was wrong, and that Responsible Government no longer existed in this Dominion, since the advice of a Ministry, backed by a majority of 85 in a House of 180 members, has been refused, and has to be sent home to England to be reviewed. * * *

Now, the question is not merely as to the propriety of the verdict rendered by this House, or as to the conduct of Mr. Letellier, which is a dead question: but the question now is, should the House allow the Governor-General to refuse the advice of his Ministers?"

"That Sir John A. Macdonald, on the same question, further confirmed the belief that His Excellency had determined to refer the matter to England against the advice of his Ministers, by his omission, after these expressions of opinion, to state the facts as they really occurred, or to correct the impressions to which the course taken had given rise, and also by the use of the following words in reply to Mr. Ouimet:—

“With regard to the remarks of the Hon. gentleman and his statement, that the constitution had been infringed upon by the illustrious individual at the head of the Government, in taking the course he proposes, I must say I cannot agree with my hon. friend that there has been any infringement of the constitution. * * * * He, the representative of the Sovereign, says that he will ask for specific instructions from his and our Sovereign. There is nothing unconstitutional in it; I would have been pleased gratified, and I think it would have been well, had our advice been accepted.”

“That on the 7th April, four days afterwards, he had, for the first time, assumed in the House any measure of responsibility for the matter by the use of the following language:—‘I need scarcely say that the fact of our holding the position we do at this moment, shows that the Governor-General did not make the reference against our advice, and the fact of our remaining in office also shows that we hold ourselves responsible for the action of the Governor-General,’ but the House was still left under the impression that the reference to England was upon the initiative of His Excellency the Governor-General, instead of being suggested and advised by his Ministers.”

“That His Excellency the Governor-General, in his despatch of April 9th, to the Colonial Secretary, after quoting Sir John A. Macdonald’s statement, made on the 7th April, says:

“It will be seen that in referring the question of the dismissal of the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec to Her Majesty’s Government, I have not acted against the advice of my Ministers. * * * * This despatch has been read by Sir John A. Macdonald, who has pronounced the narrative of the conversations which have taken place between us to be accurate.”

“That in the opinion of this House the fact of submitting the advice of the Privy Council to the review of Her Majesty’s advisers in England upon questions which are purely of an administrative character, like that involved in the dismissal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, under the British North America Act, 1867, is subversive of the principles of Responsible Government granted to Canada.”

MR. OUIMET: My hon. friends and myself asked for the dismissal of the Hon. Mr. Letellier last year on two grounds. We first complained that he had acted as a partisan, and the documents that were laid before the House showed that he not only acted unfairly towards his legal advisers, but that, he even acted as a spy upon them, disclosing the secrets of State that existed between them. Our second ground of complaint was, and this is also revealed by the documents referred to, that the Hon. Mr. Letellier had made false representations in the documents containing his defence which he sent to His Excellency

the Governor-General. Without enlarging on these grounds of complaint, I will say that the result of our action, the result of the most serious consideration of the question before the House, was the affirmation of the principle laid down in the motion of the hon. member for Bagot, that the conduct of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier in dismissing his Ministry was unconstitutional and subversive of Responsible Government, and this was affirmed by a majority of eighty-five. What did this vote call for? I contended at the time, and I still contend, that the clear duty of the advisers of the Governor-General of this Dominion was to give their advice to the effect that the usefulness of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier was gone. This advice was given. It was not acted upon at once, and we did not at the time know the reason of the delay. But the correspondence that has been laid before the House, shows the reasons why His Excellency did not choose to act immediately upon that advice. His correspondence discloses the fact that the advice was given by the hon. Premier with a great deal of courage, because it imperilled his position as Prime Minister of this Dominion. Not knowing the circumstances, not knowing the difficulties under which the Government laboured at that time, I, for one, rose in this House and even uttered words of distrust of the Government, because I considered they were not going fast enough and were not complying with the wishes of the House by not pressing their advice and having the matter settled at once. We were informed of the reference to England, and had to comply with that reference. As I said at the time, we could not say anything about it. The hon. leader of the Opposition will remember that he himself and his friends, when the motion of the hon. member for Bagot was before the House, expressed their unwillingness to vote for the principle that is now affirmed in the Resolutions which he has brought before the House. We said at the time: We are alone; we cannot do anything; let us wait until an answer comes from the Imperial Government; if that answer affirms the principle that the Government was right in giving the advice they did, then we shall rest content, because then the very principle in the Resolution of the hon. member for Bagot

will be affirmed by the Imperial Government. This very principle, the most important principle in our Constitution will be affirmed by the highest authority in the British Empire, and the question will be settled for all time. Very fortunately, very happily—and I think we must congratulate ourselves on the result—the answer came and it was an affirmation of that very principle, namely, that in all local matters the decisions of the legal advisers of the Crown here are final, and must not be sent back to England to be revised by any one. But we have obtained another result—the affirmation of the first principle, we and the majority upheld in this House, that the Lieutenant-Governor acting in the same partisan spirit as Mr. Letellier acted, any Lieutenant-Governor that will prostitute his position to favour a political party, will not be maintained in his position. After having obtained those two results, what are we asked to do now by the hon. member for Lambton? We are asked to censure the very Government that obtained for us the two great objects we had in view last year. I do not think that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) is acting fairly towards the Government and himself, when he asks us to take a backward step, and by a vote of Want of Confidence against the Government, to affirm a principle which I recognise as right, but which last year, for political purposes he would not recognise as such.

MR. LAURIER: I have always felt that the action of Lieut.-Governor Letellier in the dismissal of his Ministers ought not to have been pronounced or decided upon by this Parliament. The Liberal Party have always held that on that action, whether right or wrong, the people of Quebec alone were competent to pronounce. I still adhere to that opinion. The late Lieut.-Governor for his action, whether right or wrong, has paid the dearest penalty that could be inflicted upon him, and has a right to expect that at least his motives should not be impugned, and that no improper intention should be attributed to him if none can be proved. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Ouimet) has stated that Lieut.-Governor Letellier rendered himself liable to dismissal in various

ways, and that he had divulged State secrets. I do not see evidence of those charges in any of the papers before the House. The only instance in which State secrets were revealed was furnished by the Premier last year, when the negotiations between His Excellency and his advisers, at Ottawa, were made known. His statement to the House was as follows:—

“ Sir John A. Macdonald waited on His Excellency the Governor-General, and informed him, that after the Resolution of the Senate in the last Session of Parliament, and the Resolution of the House of Commons during the present Session, it was the opinion of His Excellency's advisers, that the usefulness of the Hon. Mr. Letellier, as Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec was gone, and they advised that in the public interest it was expedient that he should be removed from his office. His Excellency was then pleased to state, that as the Federal system introduced by the British North America Act, 1867, was until then unknown in Great Britain or her Colonies, there were no precedents to guide us; that the decision in the present case would settle for the future the relations between the Dominion and the Provincial Governments, so far as the office of Lieutenant-Governor is concerned, and that he therefore deemed it expedient to submit the advice tendered to him, and the whole case with all the attendant circumstances, to Her Majesty's Government for their consideration and instructions.”

I protest, most energetically, against this statement, and say that the whole correspondence laid before the House, most carefully scanned, does not reveal one word in support of the Premier's assertion. To say the least, it would be a very inadequate motive, indeed, for such an act, involving such great risks, as the dismissal of his Ministers by the Lieutenant-Governor—the mere chance of the gaining a few seats in the Dominion Elections by the distribution of local patronage. However strong his political bias, that motive would scarcely prove a sufficient consideration for such an act, involving such serious consequences. This assertion is so much the more to be regretted that it was altogether uncalled for, according to the line of argument taken by the hon. Premier in his Memorandum. The doctrine that the Lieutenant-Governor can be removed not only for malfeasance or any offence, but simply for unpopularity, did not require the imputation of such a motive. If this doctrine be correct, the alleged wrong committed by the Lieutenant-Governor

was enough to warrant his dismissal. But since it is asserted that his motives were improper and partisan, I may be allowed to consider them. The facts ascertained before and since enforce the conviction that his motives were none other than set forth in his Memorandum, namely, to save the Province from a great impending calamity. I think his motives should be fairly recorded and not misrepresented. What was the state of the Province when he dismissed his Ministers? It had been brought to the verge of bankruptcy by the extravagance of successive Administrations. For the first time the Province had to face a deficit, which had to be met by the Lieutenant-Governor's advisers. Instead of trying to meet it by economy and retrenchment, they proposed additional taxation, to the extent of something like \$275,000. Another measure, graver, was introduced, a parallel for which it would be impossible to find unless in the time of King John. Certain municipalities had subscribed money to assist the construction of the Government Railways, having emitted debentures on certain conditions, the payment of which they declared had been demanded without the fulfilment of those conditions, accordingly they refused payment until ordered by the Courts. Then the Government proposed a measure dispensing with the tribunals, and constituting itself the sole judge of the fulfilment of those conditions of the subscriptions, by which the Lieutenant-Governor in Council was authorised to issue his warrant authorising a levy by distress in the case of non-payment. The Lieutenant-Governor had never been consulted in the matter, and had reason to fear the Bill would become law by connivance of the Legislature, at that time manipulated and domineered over by a railway ring. What was he to do? He could have followed two courses, either letting his advisers go on and the Province be plunged into difficulties, or stopping them and saving it. He chose the latter course, and dismissed his advisers, who had been clearly recreant in their duty to the people and the Crown. His motives have since been pronounced really partisan. But the conduct of the present Quebec Administration is the best justification and vindication of the motives of the Lieutenant-Governor.

When the Conservative Administration was dismissed in 1878, the party at once became very clamorous, pretending that the rights of the people had been trampled upon by the Crown, a cry much used during the ensuing Elections, during which the people were called upon to vindicate their rights. But they did not see the matter in that light, and notwithstanding the charges made against him, his Ministers obtained the largest number of supporters that a Liberal Government ever obtained in Quebec. At the following Elections the Conservative party were victorious, and consequently, a Conservative Government was installed in power once more. They had scarcely taken their seats when they called clamorously for the dismissal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier. Their triumph should have been complete, but they became more and more exacting till the Lieutenant-Governor was dismissed. Their vengeance was not satisfied, however, till their opponents were ousted from office, with the guilty connivance of the Legislative Council, which refused the Supplies, and the assistance of a traitor to his party, who has since got his reward. In this way was the Conservative party restored to power. It would seem then, that even the last desirable triumph had been secured; but yet there is something missing, something to restore them to the position they originally held. They have not yet resumed that policy of taxation for which they were dismissed. True, Mr. Letellier is dismissed and prostrate; his health is shattered by his anxieties; but he has the satisfaction of looking at his triumph, knowing that, even in the hour of Conservative vengeance, his opponents dare not restore the policy for which he dismissed them. Who, in the face of such results, will dare to say he was impelled to act as he did by the desire to serve his party and not his country. Had his object been to serve his party and not his country, he would have acted differently. Instead of nipping in the bud that nefarious, tyrannical legislation, he would have allowed his advisers full scope in their mad career, till an enraged people had risen and expelled them from office. However, Quebec is now delivered from the incubus with which it was threatened. Whatever may be the opinion of

lawyers as to the constitutionality of his course, he has the satisfaction of knowing that the grateful people of Quebec will remember that whatever he did was out of tenderness for them. Whether he acted constitutionally or not, I deny he was responsible to this Parliament for what he did. The question is—to whom was he responsible? It is asserted he was a Federal officer and responsible to this House. But though he was a Federal officer, and responsible, on some occasions, to this Parliament, it must be admitted he was responsible, on some occasions, to the people over whom he ruled. He could not have been responsible to two different tribunals for the same acts. If not, the question may be—where is the line to be drawn between his responsibility to the Dominion and the Quebec Legislature. In my judgment the only safe line is this: in all cases where the Lieutenant-Governor can be held responsible, he is amenable to this Parliament; but for all acts for which his advisers are responsible, he is responsible to the people of the Province. If this view be correct, it is the strongest possible condemnation of the course pursued by the Dominion Government, because the Government that punished Mr. Letellier have done the very thing for which they punished him. They say he trespassed beyond the limits of his prerogative, and, if so, they have exceeded their proper authority to reach him. He was not tried before the tribunal to which he was amenable, but a Star Chamber tribunal was authorised to try, condemn and punish him. I desire specially to call the attention of my Conservative friends from Quebec to the precedent they have been instrumental in creating—to the doctrine that the Lieutenant-Governor can be dismissed, not only for malfeasance, but simply at the will and pleasure of the Dominion Parliament, if it is of opinion that he is not popular or not up to his work. The doctrine laid down in the Memorandum of the Premier seems rather a hard doctrine for the Conservatives of Quebec, who, I am sure, would be scandalised by it were it propounded by any Liberal authority. If this doctrine is admitted, what becomes of the independence of Lieutenant-Governors, and, I may ask, what becomes

of their usefulness? Why, if this doctrine is admitted, their usefulness is gone for ever. There is no reason why we should have any more Lieutenant-Governors, because if this doctrine is admitted, the Lieutenant-Governor is reduced to a mere machine, to a mere automaton. He can give dinners and balls but he cannot go beyond that. If he is satisfied that that is his mission, if he is satisfied with doing nothing, if he is satisfied with never thinking of the business of the Province over which he is appointed to rule, if he is satisfied with simply showing his person to the greedy gaze of the loyal population, if he is content to make a speech put into his mouth at the opening and the close of each Session, if he is patient in receiving addresses and careful never to answer questions except in a meaningless way, then he has a chance to complete his term. But if he attempts to go beyond that he is liable to be immediately taken up, because his conduct may be objectionable to a part of the community, to a political minority it may be, and perhaps the minority of the province may belong to the majority of the Dominion, and thus the Lieutenant-Governor may be compelled to step down and out as Mr. Letellier was compelled to do. According to this doctrine the Lieutenant-Governor is placed on board the ship of State, not as a captain, not even as a common sailor, but simply as an ornament. For all the good he can now do he might just as well not be there. I am afraid my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec never expected this result when they first demanded the dismissal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier; but they set their heart upon it, and were prepared to go the full length in defence of a false principle. Now, with regard to this reference to England, I am afraid this must be a bitter pill to my hon. friends from Quebec on the other side of the House. We all remember, and my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet) has attempted to explain it, that when the announcement of this reference was made to England, last year, they were very clamorous and loud in their complaints that the Government of this country was afraid to deal with this question. When the announcement was made it was made in such terms as to convey the impression that

the reference had been made, not by the advisers of His Excellency, but by the Governor-General himself, against the advice of his Ministers. Then the indignation of my hon. friends opposite was very great; but when it became known, at a later period, that the reference had been made not by the Governor-General himself, but that it had been assented to by him on the advice of his Ministers, then by some magic process their indignation, instead of turning itself on the culprit, melted like snow under the warm rays of the sun. I have no doubt my hon. friends opposite, notwithstanding their conduct, are still of the same opinion that they were then. I have no doubt they still believe that if we are to enjoy in this country, to its full extent, the benefits of Responsible Government, we must be prepared to deal with these difficulties ourselves. But, as I just stated, they had set their heart upon the dismissal of Mr. Letellier, to obtain a party triumph, and to gain their object they were prepared to sacrifice all their dearest principles. They have obtained that triumph, Mr. Letellier has been dismissed, their revenge has been gratified, but they have established a precedent which I am afraid will some day be used against us. I can only hope that this precedent may never be followed, but if ever the Province of Quebec has to suffer from it we shall know whom to hold responsible for it.

Mr. HUNTINGTON: This subject is a very important one, and it has been discussed at great length in this House and by the people of this country, particularly by the people of Quebec, who, I suppose, have taken it much more to heart than any other portion of the Dominion. But we have discussed this subject—the Prime Minister has set me the example in saying so—we have, perhaps, discussed the subject as partisans. The Prime Minister has stated that Mr. Letellier left his place and went to Quebec as a partisan. He has no evidence of it. There is less evidence of it than that the hon. the Prime Minister himself acted entirely as a partisan throughout this matter. We have dealt with this question as partisans. We have exhausted the learning of this House, in order to show what were the merits of this question upon the one side or the other, and

we have had an exhibition, on both sides of the House, of that state of mind which is very properly termed in Lower Canada *trop de gèle*. But it is well that when we write and, perhaps, speak dubiously upon this subject, those who are to profit by their writings hereafter should be benefited by commentators, and it is well that when great parties are engaged in struggles of the kind which we witnessed in regard to this particular question, that there should be men outside of party men who take a constitutional view, a historical view, of this question, altogether outside the great seething cauldron of politics by which, perhaps, we are all more or less influenced. I desire to call attention to a view which has been taken of this matter by the most eminent authority upon parliamentary and constitutional subjects in this country, a man who stands high in the estimation of the constitutional writers of the world. I refer to Mr. Todd. I do not propose to read more than a few extracts from Mr. Todd's work.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HUNTINGTON: Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," but I dare say they do not want to cast any discredit upon that distinguished gentleman, and I introduce him only, because I have heard him so often represented, and as I believe he desires to be represented, as a man of high attainments and always thoroughly conscientious. He may be right or wrong, he may be a more prudent, a more careful and a more judicious judge of this question than the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) whose opinions, were his partisan feelings not concerned, would have great weight with me. But as an offset to that hon. gentleman's opinions, in the absence of the opinions of the hon. the Prime Minister, I will read a few paragraphs from Mr. Todd's work on the subject.

Mr. CASEY said he was astonished to hear this matter discussed as if it were Mr. Letellier who was on his trial. It was the Government who were now being tried for their action in referring the case to England for decision. It was remarkable that no Minister, or none of their supporters, had risen to defend that action. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) had indeed risen, but only to

excuse himself and friends for voting contrary to their expressed convictions of last year. His first excuse was, that he had new information since then. The only new information was that the reference was the acts of the hon. Premier and not the personal acts of the Governor-General. It seemed then that the hon. member was not willing to censure hon. Ministers for the same action for which he had been willing to censure the Governor-General. His second excuse was that the Government had secured by this reference the assertion of two great principles, namely, the impartiality of Lieutenant-Governors, and the non-interference of the Home Government with our Administration. As to the first there was great question whether it had been violated. If it had, it was sufficiently vindicated by the action of this House. As to the second, there had been no hint of its violation until it was violated by the Government by this very reference. And it was not only by the reference but by the remarks of the Premier during the debate last year, that this principle had been endangered. He quoted from the *Debates* to show that the hon. Premier had then argued that the Queen ruled as directly here as she did in London, and that our interests in this and other similar cases were as safe in her hands, that is in the hands of English Ministers, as they were in the hands of the Governor-General and his advisers. This was a direct denial of our autonomy in matters purely Canadian, and an attempt to reverse all precedents, and all theory now received on the subject. He quoted further from the *Debates* to show what strong ground had been taken against this action by several members opposite, while it had been supposed that the Governor-General alone was responsible for it, and argued that they could not now defend it, merely because it was proven to have been advised by Ministers. He challenged the Premier to defend himself. It was not only his policy which was called in question, but his personal action as an intermediary between the Governor-General and Parliament. He had been guilty, if not of misstatement, at least of that *suggestie falsé*, which was often worse, as being harder, to disprove. He had allowed the worse construction to be put on the

conduct of the Governor-General, and the most personal attacks on him to go unproved. In short, he was charged, and with *primâ facie* proof too, with conduct which, in the absence of explanation, seemed lacking in the ordinary courtesy and straightforwardness due to the head of our Executive, as well as contrary to all constitutional practice. The country would consider it scandalous if the hon. Premier allowed the vote to be taken without such explanations as he alone could give. If he did, it would be necessarily assumed that no expense or defence of that conduct was possible.

MR. CASGRAIN: The hon. member for Laval has attempted to justify the vote which he is about to give on the motion now before the House. He has a presentiment of the false position in which he will find himself, when brought face to face with his solemn declaration made at the time of the discussion on this subject last Session. In spite of all his efforts, the new declaration he has just made, while approving of the principles set forth in the motion, condemns him out of his own mouth. The success obtained by his party over Mr. Letellier, cannot excuse his change of opinion. The end does not justify the means. The reference to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which he found fault with, is and was a renunciation of our right to govern ourselves according to our Constitution. The two reasons of complaint that he has brought forward against the ex-Lieutenant-Governor, are not admitted in the statement of the alleged cause for removal, inasmuch as the only cause given is, that the usefulness of this personage had gone. Consequently, along with this vague reason disappear the various grievances gratuitously brought forward by the complainant. There is nothing easier than to assign a true and well-founded cause for the removal. The treatise, *ex professo*, upon the subject, by our esteemed author, Mr. Todd, contains an irrefutable summary of the various constitutional points which have been violated by the present Ministry. This work, together with the subject of it, will remain an historical monument which will place our descendants on their guard against following a precedent which had its origin simply in a blind adherence to party principles.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question.
 MR. CASGRAIN: Mr. Speaker, I call your attention, and that of the hon. the leader of the Government, to the noisy and disorderly conduct of those members of the House who are obstructing the proceedings and trying to stifle the debate. It is utterly impossible to proceed with the business of the House. I particularly desire to call the attention of the hon. the leader of the Government to the review of the whole of this Letellier matter—which has just been read in part by the hon. member for Shefford—contained in Mr. Todd's late book. The arguments urged by this eminent author have not been answered. The fact of their not being answered by the other side of the House show that these arguments are unanswerable. Sir, the hon. the Premier has committed a political error in conniving at this dismissal of Mr. Letellier, and he well knows it now. I regret that the debate on this most important question cannot be re-opened, affecting, as it does, so immediately the interests of the several Provinces of this Dominion. I therefore, resume my seat.

Motion made:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

Motion in amendment (Mr. Mackenzie) made and question proposed. [Vide page 1779.]

The House divided: Yeas, 49; nays, 119.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin	Haldow
Bain	Killam
Béchar	King
Blake	LaRue
Borden	Laurier
Bourassa	Macdonnell (N. Lanark)
Brown	Mackenzie
Burpee (St John)	Malouin
Burpee (Sunbury)	Mills
Cameron (South Huron)	Oliver
Cartwright	Oliver
Casey	Paterson (South Brant)
Casgrain	Pickard
Chandler	Rinfret
Charlton	Rogers
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Ross (West Middlesex)
Cockburn (West N'land)	Rymal
Dumont	Srivers
Fiset	Skinner
Fleming	Smith (Selkirk)
Flynn	Trow
Geoffrion	Weldon

Gillies
 Gillmor
 Gunn

Wiser
 Yee—49.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott	Langevin
Allison	Little
Arkel	Longley
Baby	Macdonald (King, P. E. I.)
Baker	Macdonald (Vict., B. C.)
Banferman	McDonald (Cape-Breton)
Barnard	McDonald (Pictou)
Beauchesne	McDonald (Vict., N. S.)
Benoit	Macmillan
Bergeron	McCallum
Bergin	McCuaig
Bill	McInnes
Bolduc	McKay
Boultsbee	McLennan
Bourbeau	McLeod
Bowell	McQuade
Brecken	McRory
Brooks	Massue
Bunting	Mernaer
Burham	Méthot
Carling	Mong-nais
Caron	Montplaisir
Cimon	Mousseau
Coiby	Muttart
Connell	O'Connor
Costigan	Orton
Coughlin	Quimet
Coupal	Perrault
Coursol	Pinsonneault
Currier	Platt
Cuthbert	Plumb
Daly	Pope (Queen's, P. E. I.)
Daoust	Richey
Desaulniers	Robertson (Hamilton)
Domville	Robinson
Drew	Ross (Dundas)
Dugas	Rouleau
Elliott	Routhier
Farrow	Royal
Fitsimmons	Ryan (Marquette)
Fortin	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Fulton	Shaw
Gigault	Sproule
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Stephenson
Girouard (Kent, N. B.)	Tassé
Grandbois	Tellier
Hackett	Thompson (Cariboo)
Haggart	Tilley
Hay	Tupper
Hooper	Vallée
Hurteau	Vannasse
Ives	Wade
Jackson	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Jones	Wallace (West York)
Kaulbach	White (Cardwell)
Keeler	White (E. Hastings)
Kilvert	White (North Renfrew)
Kirkpatrick	Williams
Krauz	Wright.—119.
Lane	

Motion resolved in the negative.

Main motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

XIII. RAILWAYS AND CANALS CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

Order for House to again resolve itself into Committee of Supply, *read*.

MR. MACKENZIE: Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I would like to ask the hon. the Finance Minister if he has made any arrangement with the Lords of the Treasury for the use of the unexpended guaranteed bonds of the Dominion for the purpose of security in his Banking Act.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: No; it is not necessary. We had Imperial authority for the issue. We have authority to use the money for any purpose we please, or to hold it if we think proper.

MR. MACKENZIE: When was that authority given?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: When I was in England, twelve months ago last December.

MR. MACKENZIE: To use the entire unexpended amount for any purpose?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Before we were authorised to issue the £2,290,000 of debentures, a statement was made of the expenditure, and it was stated that a subsequent memorandum would be given. The authority was given, and the debentures issued at that time.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then, in that case, you are not to state that the amount expended was expended for the purpose for which it was originally given.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It was shown that the expenditure was made for the public works for which it was issued. That was required before the debentures could be issued.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canals.

90 Lachine..... \$800,000

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: What is the exact date at which the Government expect to complete this work, and what is the total amount remaining to be expended?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: We expect that the vote here taken will complete this canal, of course with the ex-

ception of some \$840,000 that the additional basins are expected to cost if they are constructed. But the Government do not intend to proceed with that work at present. The vote will complete the works now under contract. The lower entrance will be from 18ft. to 19ft., there will be 14ft. of water up to Wellington bridge, and a depth of 12ft. through the canal up to Lachine. We expect to complete those contracts and to finish that expenditure up to July 1, 1880.

MR. BERGIN: The interest taken in the constituency which I represent, in the canal estimates, and the general anxiety throughout the country, as to the policy of the Government with regard to the canals, induce me to offer a few remarks on this subject. There has been a large expenditure during the past few years in pursuance of the policy of canal enlargement adopted in 1872, and which was carried out to a great extent by the late Government. The report of Mr. Page shows that \$10,233,320 has been expended on the Welland Canal, \$4,699,248 on the Lachine Canal, and \$412,916 on the Cornwall Canal. I understand that a large sum will be necessary to complete the works now in progress. Among the forwarders and commercial men of the country, the feeling is strong that it is necessary, at an early day, if we would successfully compete with our American neighbours for the carrying trade of the country, to enlarge the canals, at all events as far as Kingston. The Cornwall Canal works, I am sorry to say, have been a blunder from the beginning to the end. I wish I were satisfied it was merely a blunder. The work, it seems, was commenced at the wrong end. The chief complaint was, and is now, that there is not a sufficient supply of water. In 1872, the water at one time was as low as eight feet three inches, upon the sill at the guard lock, and in November last it was eight feet one inch. At no time ought it to be less than nine feet to admit of traffic, and to supply the necessary water for the mills on the canal. It looked at the close of the season, when forwarders were in the greatest hurry, as if navigation would close on the Cornwall Canal to vessels drawing nine feet. When they reached the head of the canal

MR. MACKENZIE.

they would be obliged to unload part of the cargo at a heavy expense. In consequence of this leading forwarders and manufacturers interested in the supply of water, addressed a memorial to the hon. the Minister of Canals who, I think, gave it all the attention in his power. It is, perhaps, not in the power of the Government to do immediately what the country requires towards increasing the power of those canals, but we think this matter ought to be brought before the public in order that the necessity for enlarging those water ways should be made clear to all. Large sums of money are being expended upon the railways of the country—and that is a policy in which I cheerfully acquiesce—but I think if it be possible the Government should do something within the next year towards increasing the capacity of our canals. The objection may again be made that this enlargement will not divert traffic from the American routes. This, I do not believe. The Americans are a sharp, business people, and when the opportunity offers to carry a large amount of grain from Chicago to tide water they will always choose the cheapest route. If the needed improvements were made in our canals, within five or six years we would secure the great bulk of the traffic from the western country to Montreal. That port is the key of our trade, and it will be the great rival port to New York. It is, therefore, in the interest of this country that great sacrifices should be made to build up that port. I understand from the estimates of the engineers that a little over \$1,500,000 is all that is needed to remove the obstructions now between Kingston and Cornwall. The estimate is for :

That Rock Shoal, Galops Rapids....	\$512,000
Willard's Shoal.....	13,000
Lake St. Francis, including lights, beacons and buoys.....	45,000
Deepening and enlarging channel at head of Beauharnois Canal.....	430,000
Deepening and improving channel through Lake St. Francis.	520,000

\$1,520,000

If this be the case there is no substantial reason why we should not have a 12ft. channel from Kingston to Montreal. If hon. members look upon the map, they will see that the St. Lawrence is the natural roadway to the seaboard. The distance in favour of Montreal against

New York by the Straits of Belle Isle is 223 miles. But we have another advantage in that route. Propellers leaving Chicago, laden with grain, can reach Montreal in eight or ten days, while grain-laden vessels, leaving on the same day for New York, would not reach their destination within twenty or twenty-two days. There is so great an advantage in point of time over the American route that a vessel leaving Chicago for Liverpool, namely, the St. Lawrence, could unload her cargo at Liverpool, and be well on her homeward trip, before a vessel which left on the same day for Liverpool, by way of New York, could leave the latter port. The question for us to consider is—how we are thus to secure this trade? I believe it is agreed that the proper course is to enlarge our canals, so as to admit of vessels carrying much larger cargoes than heretofore. The experience of forwarders has been that larger vessels, carrying larger cargoes, can be worked almost as cheaply as much smaller vessels, carrying much smaller cargoes. Steam vessels leaving Chicago with 60,000 bushels each, and each towing two consorts carrying 60,000 bushels each, can take grain to Buffalo for 2c. a bushel, the great expense of transporting grain to New York city, accruing for the distance between Buffalo and that capital. Here comes in the consideration of the question, whether it is possible to carry grain as cheaply by rail as by water. It is argued that because the New York Central Railway carried grain so cheaply last year and the year before, from Buffalo to New York—more cheaply than the Erie Canal—that it has been demonstrated that railways can compete successfully with the canals. I think this is entirely a misapprehension. The reason why the railways have carried grain more cheaply between those points is, the want of capacity of the canals, and consequently, the want of capacity of the vessels. The highest capacity of any vessel on the Welland Canal is 220 tons; the average is 208 to 210. One of the difficulties we have to contend with in fighting for this traffic with our United States neighbours is the cheapness with which grain is carried by the Erie Canal from Buffalo to New York, the chief reason for this being that, in nearly every instance, the owners of

the barges on those canals are the men who navigate them; they make them their homes, summer and winter, and have reduced the expense of working them to a minimum. Whereas, with us, the trade not being a legitimate one, as I shall show presently, our carrying trade is in the hands of companies, who are obliged to employ hands, many at high wages, and, consequently, they are not able to transport grain from Kingston to Montreal as cheaply as the men who, having a direct interest in the vessels and trade, are able to do so at a very much lower rate than men obliged to employ hired labour. To show that large vessels can carry grain much more cheaply than small, I may state that the New York Central Railway has placed on Lake Erie vessels of from 1,500 to 2,000 tons, that carry from 70,000 to 80,000 bushels, which have delivered freight at a cost to the railway of less than two-thirds of 1c. a bushel at Buffalo, for which they charge 2c.; and this has enabled them to lower the rates upon the New York Central from Buffalo to New York. The cost of carrying grain from Chicago to Kingston, by our vessels, is 10½c. a bushel; and the reason is, that we are not able to use vessels larger than from 16,000 to 19,000 bushels. The majority of the propellers carry from 16,500 to 17,000 bushels. With a very little addition to the labour, vessels might be worked, carrying from 70,000 to 80,000 bushels; and they are building, at this moment, at Milan, near Toledo, two vessels of a capacity of 100,000 or 120,000 bushels each, and consorts that will carry from 80,000 to 100,000 bushels each, and so alive are our American neighbours to the necessity of cultivating this trade, and of increasing the facilities of lake navigation, that they are now deepening every shallow point on the Lakes from 16 to 20 feet. They expect that within two years that Lake Erie will be navigable at that depth through its entire length, and that from Chicago to Buffalo vessels drawing 20 feet will be able to proceed. This improvement would give them an immense advantage. Our vessels have been built to the capacity of the old Welland Canal, with only 26 feet beam and about 138 to 140 feet keel, and very few exceed 400 tons measurement. But if all our canals be enlarged to the capacity of the Welland,

we shall be enabled to build vessels of 270 feet keel with 42 feet beam, carrying 60,000 bushels. Each propeller would tow two consorts each carrying 60,000 bushels, which would reduce freight so much that our forwarders would be able to deliver grain at Kingston for 5c. a bushel. Our large forwarders at Montreal would be able to take the grain to Kingston and deliver it there at such a rate as would enable us to compete tolerably successfully with the Erie Canal. But if our canals were enlarged to twelve feet, as they will be, we should be able to defy the competition of the Americans, and to deliver grain in Montreal at six cents a bushel, or, as cheap as it is possible for Americans to carry grain from Buffalo to the City of New York. Another important point, speed would be gained in the construction of those large vessels, which would have sufficient power in all ordinary weather to make ten miles an hour. Vessels of such power and speed can tow a couple of consorts, laden almost as heavily as themselves, at seven miles an hour. It has been objected to the enlargement of the canals from Kingston to Montreal, that it would be impossible, owing to the difficulties of navigation, for any of those propellers to tow two consorts of a capacity of 60,000 bushels each. But I am informed by navigators of our lakes and rivers, that it can be done when the improvements in the channel, foreshadowed in the report of the Chief Engineer of Canals, have been executed. I am told we cannot construct and use canals with twelve feet of water, because we can not remove the shoals, except at an expense of millions of dollars, between Cornwall and the mouth of the Beauharnois, and that within two or three miles of that canal there are shoals that could not be removed at an expense of much less than \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. I oppose to that the statement of the Chief Engineer of Canals, who thinks that \$1,500,000 would be sufficient to move all the obstructions between Kingston and the head of the Lachine Canal. The Americans are quite awake to the necessity of doing something further towards meeting our efforts towards enlarging our water-ways and obtaining possession, as I think we can and ought, of the great grain trade of the west. It is of more importance to us now than ever, because we have Manitoba and

the whole North-West, over 600,000 square miles of territory, of the wheat-producing region, which we hope will, within a very few years, pour into the lap of Europe the food it requires. Now is the time to obtain possession of this valuable trade, and not allow it to be diverted to American channels; for it is hard to turn trade out of well-worn grooves. The Americans are now acting on this principle and endeavouring to bring about a change in the feeling of the New York State Legislature, which, only a few years ago, forbade any further expenditure on the Erie Canal than was derived from its revenue. I believe the effort will be successful, and that within a year, we shall find the Americans endeavouring to increase the capacity of the Erie Canal and to deepen it one foot. We should take time by the forelock, use all the means at our disposal for the enlargement of our canals. The number and tonnage of Canadian sailing vessels and steamers reaching Montreal, from the lakes in 1878, was not much in excess of that of the American vessels. But the capacity of the American vessels was greater than that of our own. I have not been able to obtain a return of the tonnage for 1879, but I have it for 1878. I find that in that year there came in:

	No.	Tons.	Average Tons.
Canadian Steamers to Montreal.....	1971	28,440	140
Canadian Sailing Vessels to Montreal	665	102,945	154
American Steamers	47	9,385	199
American Sailing Vessels.....	404	67,978	168

This is not the only difficulty with which our trade has to contend; not only insufficient depth of the canals and obstructions in our rivers, but the Montreal harbour dues, necessitated by the debt incurred in deepening Lake St. Peter. I believe it has been admitted by the late Minister of Public Works, and the Premier of the late Government, that this is a Dominion work, and ought to be so regarded, and that the Dominion ought to assume the debt. I would earnestly urge on the Government the assumption of this debt as early as possible; it is something over \$80,000 a year. This is an immense tax on vessels arriving at Montreal, and one that diverts from that port large numbers, not only of

foreign, but of Canadian vessels. The case of the *Clifton*, a Canadian vessel of 300 tons, engaged in the Australian trade, recently brought before the hon. the Minister of Railways, illustrates the discouraging effect of those dues. The difference between the charges paid by the *Clifton* at New York, and paid at Montreal, would be \$328 on that small vessel. This difference is made up of harbour dues, tonnage dues, pilotage, towage, and other charges, which, practically, forbid foreign vessels coming to the port of Montreal. We must make Montreal, like New York, practically a free port, particularly as Buffalo is on the lakes a free port. We could then compete with them in foreign ports for cargoes to Canada and to the Western States, and we could carry inwards cheaper than they, and deliver our cargoes ten days sooner than by New York, Baltimore or Boston. When European vessel owners are asked to bring a cargo to Montreal, they demand a much larger freight on account of those great port charges which, being much higher than those at New York, induce vessel-owners to give it the preference, just as the owner of the *Clifton* goes to New York, in preference to Montreal, although the cargo he takes in that port is a Canadian cargo, including wooden houses and other Canadian products, which he sells in Australia, where he gets a cargo of wool, hides and other products, which he brings to New York, because it is the cheaper port. We not only lose the carrying of the products from Toronto to Montreal, but, in addition, the supply of those ships, the wages of the sailors, which are spent in New York, and all the other disbursements made in the carrying of those cargoes from New York to Toronto, and from Toronto to New York. In consequence of the present state of our canals, we are not encouraging our ship-owners to build and our ship-yards are closed. Why? In anticipation of the enlargement of our canals, it would not be wise or prudent for our ship-owners to build vessels of only the present capacity of the St. Lawrence canals, and they live in hopes that, within two or three years, the Government will enlarge the canals so that they can build vessels of the capacity of 60,000, 70,000 or 80,000 bushels. As a consequence of our shipyards being

closed, our ship carpenters and others are obliged to go to the United States to find employment, where the shipyards are in full blast. Large numbers of vessels that should be built in this country and employed here, are now built in the United States and employed on the other side of the line. While I am on this subject, I may call attention to the vote of \$50,000 for the purpose of encouraging trade with Brazil. With the member for St. John's, I regard this one of the best votes in the Estimates. If the port of Montreal continues to be practically closed, if the charges continue to be as excessive in the future as in the past, if no effort be made by us to remove those charges, it will be impossible for us to cultivate successfully this trade with Brazil. I think it is in the power of the Government, notwithstanding the state of the Revenue, to pay the interest on the debt incurred in deepening Lake St. Peter, or at all events to assume a large part of it, and thus assist Montreal towards doing away with her harbour dues. I think the Government might also direct their attention to the pilotage, which requires close looking after. I am told that on a vessel of 1,000 tons capacity, at least \$400 are charged as pilotage. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would do well to consider this matter, with a view of reducing these excessive charges. I believe something could be done in the matter of towage. I understand a tariff is about to be established in the port of Montreal for towage. I think it would be better to trust to competition which, in time, will enable vessels to be towed from Quebec to Montreal much more cheaply than at present. I believe the management of the pilotage might be so modified that cheaper pilots could be taken on. I do not see why a small vessel, properly manned, and going as a tug, should be compelled to take on a pilot from Quebec to Montreal. To give an idea of the vast trade we may expect from Brazil, I may refer to the article of coffee alone. Twelve million pounds of coffee were imported into the United States last year. A few years ago it cost \$12 a ton to import coffee to New York when they had harbour dues, but now that New York has been made practically a free port, the cost is only \$3 a ton. I said, a little while ago,

MR. BERGIN:

that our carrying trade in the main was not a legitimate trade. By means of the large vessels which the Americans own upon the upper lakes, and by reason of the cheapness with which they can bring grain to the port of Buffalo and transport it to New York, they have a very great advantage over us in competing for foreign markets. When a man wants to transport one or two million bushels of grain from Chicago to Liverpool, he naturally seeks the cheapest route. Our vessels are not able to bring freight from Chicago to Kingston for less than 10½c. a bushel, and in consequence our forwarders at Montreal are obliged, if they would get employment for their vessels, to send agents to foreign markets for freightage in competition with the American vessel owners. They are met at once with the cheapness of the American route, and in order to secure freight for their propellers and barges, they are obliged to purchase large quantities of grain themselves in the American market, trusting to the profit they may make upon the grain, and the profit they will make upon their cheaper barge transportation between Kingston and Montreal, to realise at all events, the interest on the money they have invested in these vessels. This, I contend, is not a legitimate carrying trade, but one which they have to pursue, despite all the advantages of our water route, arising principally from the exorbitant charges at the port of Montreal. I contend that even now, with our canals at 9ft., if we had a free port at Montreal, with the towage and pilotage reduced, as they might be, we would be able to compete more successfully with our American neighbours. I wish now to read the opinions of the foreign consuls at Montreal. Those gentlemen have particular facilities for acquiring knowledge of the difficulties of trade at that port. I find in the *Star* of last Friday, the result of interviews between the reporter of that journal and the different foreign consuls, and they are so interesting that, with the permission of the House, I will read them :

“ The prospects of our foreign trade, if the Government accedes to the wishes of the country, are unusually bright. The total number of ships (we are not now speaking of local traffic) which visited our port in 1879, was 612, with a tonnage of 506,929. Of these only 36 sailed under a foreign flag, as follows:—Nor-

wegian, 13; Austrian, 9; German, 6; American, 4; Swedish, 1; Italian, 1; Dutch, 1; Belgian 1. Total, 36. Their total tonnage was but 18,245.

“Mr. John F. Wulff, Consul for Demark, Sweden and Norway, was seen in his office in St. Sulpice street, when the following questions were propounded: Reporter—What do you think, Mr. Wulff, of the plan of reducing canal and wharfage dues, etc., and making of Montreal a free port? A. I can have but one thought on the subject. I state clearly and explicitly that Montreal would have the preference over New York with our vessel owners as soon as the reduced rates were telegraphed over to the other side. Previously, unless they had paying freight to bring out which they cannot always get, they could not make a voyage over here without loss, owing to the high charges exacted at this port. While you are here, Mr. Reporter, let me congratulate you most heartily on the stand the *Star* has taken in dealing with this question.

“Mr. W. C. Alunderloh, German Consul, was next visited. In answer to the usual question this gentleman said: ‘Most decidedly many vessels would come to Montreal, if charges were lower, not only from Germany, but also from Belgium, Italy, France and Austria. Probably you scarcely know how things are managed by our people. I will tell you. They have a record or guide of the expenses connected with ports all over the world, and before they decide to go anywhere they turn up this guide. If they find, on looking at the total result, that a greater proportion of their freight money is to be absorbed in expenses, they seek other ports. This a reason why many of them who like Montreal are driven to New York, Baltimore and Boston, where they are encouraged in every way possible. If the Government decides to reduce the charges it should act at once. All the foreign consuls here will then, without delay, despatch cablegrams to their respective Governments, who will in turn immediately publish the reduced list of charges on the other side at all the principal ports. You, of course, have published the exports of breadstuffs from America for the past year, but I may state that Germany alone imported in 1879, 65,000,000 cwts of wheat, barley, oats and maize, the greater portion of which might just as well have gone from the Canadian as the American seaboard. Further comment is unnecessary.’

“A. M. F. Gianelli, Consul of His Majesty the King of Italy, for Canada, said: ‘My views are that the charges of wharfage here are not out of the way for vessels. The great drawback, and what keeps away our vessels is the towage expenses, which have made it almost prohibitory to come here. The Beaver line of two boats has published a new tariff, which they call a 50 per cent. reduction over the tariff in existence in 1874, but even the amount charged by this tariff I consider 50 per cent. higher than it should be, for a sailing vessel to sustain expenditure. I calculate that a vessel of 600 tons register, drawing eighteen feet of water, according to this new tariff will have to pay from Quebec to Montreal and back to Quebec, \$483, and from the foot of the tra-

verse to Quebec and back, \$180, a total of \$663, which is a little over \$1 per registered ton, or 8d per quarter on her carrying capacity. By this it is evident that no merchants can expect to get a vessel the same price as at New York, Philadelphia or Baltimore. Pilotage in some instances has been considered too high, but I think the difference between us and the neighbouring ports of the United States is very little, hence it is not an item of much consideration for a ship owner. For instance. From a reliable memorandum I have kept of a 559 ton register sailing vessel, the rates compare as follows;—Montreal, \$186.81; New York, \$146.06; Philadelphia, \$157.50.’

“Merchants consider that more attention should be paid to smaller sailing vessels which do the greater part of the outport trade on the Continent. It is suggested that the Government subsidise a line of tow boats and fix a uniform towage tariff. To each tow-boat should be attached a branch pilot, and in this way it may be found possible to do away with the necessity for a pilot in cases where a vessel is under tow.”

I will say no more except to remark upon the necessity of enlarging the Cornwall canal at the head for the purpose of supplying our mills with water. We ran great risk last year in having over 1,000 hands thrown out of employment at Cornwall in consequence of the low water. We know, of course, that water for navigation was the principle object in building the canals, but Mr. Page has furnished a report which shows that at a cost of \$250,000 or \$300,000 the blunder made by the late hon. Minister of Public Works in building the locks at the lower end of the canal before he had made the entry at the head of the canal larger so as to admit a sufficient supply of water, can be remedied. There can be no doubt it was the greatest piece of absurdity in the world to build locks of the capacity of 12 or 14 feet at the foot of the canal when the supply would not average 9 feet at the head. I must, therefore, urge upon the hon. the Minister the desirability of enlarging the head of the Cornwall Canal so as to give us a further supply of water for all purposes.

MR. KEELER: In looking over the Estimates for the present year, I am disappointed in not seeing a sum allotted for the construction of the Murray Canal. I think that during the present Session, I have presented no less than twenty-five petitions to this House in favour of that long neglected, but very necessary, work—those petitions are from every city, county, township, town and village in the

vicinity of the canal, and I earnestly call the attention of the Government to their prayers. In addition to our old arguments and reasons for the Murray Canal, we have another in the recently developed and rapidly increasing iron ore trade of Hastings. I find by a Return brought down yesterday by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bowell), that no less than 6,294 tons of iron ore were exported during the three months of January, February and March last, from Belleville to Cleveland, Ohio. Now this iron ore trade, if we take these three months as an average—and they are much below it, I am sure—shows a yearly shipment of 25,000 tons, valued at \$58,000, a business of itself sufficient to pay a fair rate of interest on the cost of the canal, and a business, too, which would be immensely extended, if facilities were afforded to it by reducing the distance by 150 miles to Cleveland, by opening the “short cut” I propose. I have a telegram from Belleville in my hand, which says:

“250 tons per day of iron ore and 150 tons of golden ore are now being shipped, and expect to double this amount next month. With Murray Canal we could largely increase these figures, and yet have plenty iron ore for smelting works—vessels bringing back coal from Cleveland.”

I claim the right of the people whom I have the honor to speak for, to this work being done—not as a favour, but as the payment of a sacred debt of the Dominion to the locality. It was in the year 1796, when Governor Simcoe was the ruler of Upper Canada, that this Murray Canal was first surveyed and sixty-four acres of land reserved, and still reserved, for its site, with an appropriation also of some 6,000 acres in concessions B and C of the Township of Murray, from which the canal takes its name, was made for the purpose of dredging across the short neck of soft earth—only a mile and a-half wide—which divides the waters of Presqu Isle Bay from those of the Bay of Quinté. These 6,000 acres of land were sold, by the Government in 1815, for \$12 per acre, amounting to \$72,000, which, with simple interest at 6 per cent. for sixty-five years now sums up to the nice little lump of \$352,000, an ample amount to do the work. Another very strong argument, in favour of the construction of this canal, I find in a recent article in one of the

MR. KEELER.

Belleville papers, which is as follows:—

“Another fact which shows the necessity for the cutting of a canal through the narrow isthmus which separates one of the best harbours of refuge on Lake Ontario, from the perfectly sheltered waters of the Bay of Quinté, is afforded in the wrecking of the schooner *David Andrews*, with a cargo of grain destined for Toronto. This event took place during a heavy gale on Sunday morning the 11th inst., and the result is the loss of a vessel valued at \$4,000 and cargo worth about \$7,500, or a total loss of \$11,500. That no loss of life is to be added to the loss of property, is entirely owing to the efficient exertions of the Oswego life-saving crew, who appear to have discharged their duty ably and well. That this disaster would not have occurred, had the Murray Canal been built, is quite clear. In such case the schooner, which was bound from Belleville to Toronto with 10,500 bushels of rye, would, instead of having to go eastward and coast around the whole of the peninsula of Prince Edward—the most dangerous coast on the whole lake during south or south-west winds—have proceeded to the head of the bay and through the canal, thus not only shortening her journey by 150 miles, but escaping the very dangers which proved her destruction. Thence she would have been enabled to proceed on her way to Toronto, as winds were westerly and north-westerly, and in all probability the vessel would have been enabled to complete her trip without detention.”

That is only one of the many similar articles which I could read to show the necessity of proceeding with this canal. I desire, before I sit down, to say a word or two in regard to the Trent Valley Canal, in which I have taken great interest for many years, and upon which subject this House has frequently heard from me—over forty petitions for its construction having been presented during this Session to this Parliament, from nearly every municipal corporation between Lake Huron and Kingston. I do not intend pressing the Government to commence its construction this year, but as I am certain that within a very few years the outpouring of grain from our new country, to which so many thousands are now turning, will be so great that every outlet will be needed, and particularly the cheapest ones, for I feel convinced that our Government will be only performing its duty by completing the Trent navigation, which, in comparison to its cost, will furnish the shortest, cheapest, safest, and best channel between the wheat fields of the West and the ocean-going ships at Montreal. The result of the movement originated by

myself last year to prevent the Trent navigation being destroyed, as intended in its transfer to the Province of Ontario by the late Government, has been, I am happy to say, the rescinding of the Order in Council of October 8th, 1878, and the survey or examination by D. Stark, Civil Engineer, of the whole line of water highway between Lake Huron and the Bay of Quinté at Trenton, with a view to deciding whether it is capable of being made one of the outlets for the Great North-Western country. Mr. Stark's report is in the highest degree favourable, and has impressed the Government with a proper sense of its very great importance as a link in the chain of communication across the continent; and from the assurances we have received I feel satisfied that, at no very distant day, this grand project will have the best attention of the Government. I might also state that this canal, or navigation as it should be called, only requires 59½ miles to complete it, and that instead of requiring an expenditure, as the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) said a few days ago, of \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 it will only require as shown by the last engineer's estimate \$2,400,000, and I would like to see a sum put down for the Trent Valley Canal in the Supplementary Estimates for this year, but if not, that it will be done next year. I do not see any item in the Estimates for surveys of the Murray Canal, which I think should be made, so that, as soon as the hon. the Minister of Railways considers that the Government can expend the money for the construction of that work, there should be no delay. There is an item, however, under the head "Surveys;" if that means for the instrumental survey of the Trent Valley Canal—I refer to vote 103—I shall be very glad. In view of the impatience of the House at this late hour, I will not trespass further at present.

MR. McCUAIG: There can be no doubt large sums of money has been expended in the improvement of our canal system, with the view of securing cheap transport from the west to the ocean *via* the River St. Lawrence, in competition with the American route *via* the Erie Canal and New York. The race of competition led to the reduction of canal tolls on the Erie Canal from 6½c. per bushel

on wheat to 1c., and it is now contended that the canal tolls on our own canals should be abolished and Montreal declared a free port, it we hope to secure the transportation of western produce, and to accomplish this many hon. members of this House are urging the Government to assume, in addition, the indebtedness of the Montreal Harbour Trust, alleged to have been contracted in deepening the Lake St. Peter, between Montreal and Quebec. Sir, I protest against such a policy at the present moment. We are unable to throw away revenues or to assume new liabilities, and it is ungenerous in hon. members of this House to urge this on the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, in view of the large expenditure to which the faith of the Dominion was pledged for the construction of the Pacific Railway. I respect the merchants of Montreal, their energy, enterprise and public spirit. It was a wise thing, in its way, to have a transshipping port at Montreal, as near the canal as possible, but, after all, nature had formed Quebec for our transshipping port, and the obstacles of nature would eventually overcome any attempt to fix this point at Montreal. Cheapness of transport from Kingston to Montreal or Quebec could only be secured by transshipment from large upper lake craft, carrying from 60,000 to 80,000 bushels of wheat through the enlarged Welland Canal from the far west, at Kingston, into river barges of from 20,000 to 30,000 bushels capacity, and the establishment of a Government steam-tug service, between Kingston and Montreal and Quebec, the same as was originally given to the eminent and wealthy firm of Calvin and Son, of Garden Island, by the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, many years ago, and which contributed so largely to the popularity of the St. Lawrence route, by the prompt and faithful performance of the conditions of the contract for their service by that firm, creating thereby confidence that all property arriving at Kingston, would reach Montreal within twenty-four hours after its departure from that port. As an illustration of cost, a barge capable of carrying 20,000 bushels of wheat costs \$10,000, or fifty cents per bushel burthen; a schooner capable of carrying the same quantity of grain on the lakes

costs \$20,000, or \$1 per bushel burthen, but she can only carry 15,000 bushels on the River St. Lawrence, thus increasing the cost to \$1.33½ a bushel burthen; a propellor capable of carrying 14,000 bushels, will cost \$30,000, or \$4 per bushel burthen. The cost of running a barge one month, making two trips between Kingston and Montreal, carrying 40,000 bushels, is \$100; the cost of running a schooner, one month, making two trips, carrying 30,000 bushels, is \$432; the cost of running a propellor, making four trips, carrying 30,000 bushels, instead of 40,000 bushels, is \$1,500. A seaworthy craft for the lakes must necessarily have twice as much weight of timber, iron, fastenings, etc., in her construction, as a barge that is calculated for the River St. Lawrence, and as you increase the weight to make a craft suitable for lake navigation, you consequently increase the cost of building, and the cost of carrying per bushel. This strength not being necessary on the river, a cheaper craft is built, carrying more, and doing the work more economically and satisfactorily than a lake craft can. Now, in regard to the Murray Canal, which I know will be of great benefit to that peninsula. There is 90 per cent of iron in the ore in that neighbourhood, and what we want is cheap transport. If we have not the coal to smelt this ore, we should have some means of getting the ore to a place where it can be smelted, and I think the canal will be a great help in that direction. Reference has been made to the Trent Valley Canal. Now we are spending \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000 to complete the Welland Canal, and we no sooner get half through with it than this other scheme is brought up in opposition. The whole argument is so absurd that it can have no effect upon the Government or the country.

MR. McCALLUM: I would like to say a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward county in regard to the deepening of Lake St. Peter. The people of Montreal have spent a large amount of money to make Montreal an Atlantic port, and my hon. friend says it is unreasonable to ask the Government to assume this debt. We must deal with this question as we find it now. We have competitors for the trade of the West, and if the assumption of that debt

MR. McCALLUM.

would give us the trade of that territory the Government should do it. The policy of the country, so far as the enlargement of the canal is concerned, was decided previous to Confederation, and I would like now to impress upon the Government the necessity of reducing the tolls and harbour dues at Montreal, in order to give us the trade of the West. So far as the tolls of the canals are concerned there has been no reduction since 1863. They take a different view of such matters in New York State where a present of \$1,500,000 was made to get the western trade, and they would give as much more to keep that trade. In 1860 it cost 27 cents per bushel to take wheat from Chicago to New York, and the canal tolls were 5c. 2 mills a bushel. Last year it cost only 9c. 2 mills per bushel from Chicago to New York, and the canal tolls was 1c. per bushel. There have been great blunders in regard to the enlargement of the canals, and I do not blame any one in particular for them. I think it was a mistake to spend any of the money of the people in deepening the Detroit River before our canals were enlarged. To show the importance of this question, I will read a statement of the Comptroller of New York State, which will give an idea of its importance better than any words of mine. The report reads:

“It is said that the increased tonnage on the canals in 1877, caused the loading of one thousand vessels at the port of New York, and as the average amount expended by a sea-going vessel while in port, is \$2,000 the increased canal traffic caused \$2,000,000 to be expended by sea-going vessels alone. It is also estimated that the total gain to the State was \$12,000,000, due wholly to the increased business of 1877.”

Here is the opinion of a New York merchant on the same subject:

“Two hundred thousand bushels of corn in Chicago was seeking a market at the seaboard. An application came to a firm in New York in these words: ‘Will you advance on 200,000 bushels of corn to be shipped to Baltimore?’ They answered: ‘Yes, but why to Baltimore in preference to New York?’ The reply came; ‘Transportation to Baltimore is half-cent per bushel less than to New York,’ and so the corn went to Baltimore, because the sum of \$1,000 could be saved in transportation charges, and New York capital followed it there because it was idle, and Baltimore offered it employment. The merchant referred to, summed up this transaction in this wise: Six vessels bound in Baltimore six cargoes of corn and Baltimore received the inward cargoes of these

six vessels, because she could supply them with return freight. If the corn in question had come to New York, at the same rate of transportation as was charged to Baltimore, \$13,000 would have been the actual amount contributed for transportation within the borders of our State. In consequence of the toll imposed, the corn in question was turned from New York to Baltimore, and not only did the State fail to receive any toll whatsoever, but the industrial classes of the State failed to receive the sum of \$13,000, which otherwise would have come into their possession. This sum of \$13,000 only represents the measure of the positive known loss. The loss arising from the non-arrival of the six vessels at the port of New York, with their incoming cargoes, the handling and storing of these cargoes, and their final sale and transportation, can only be a matter of conjecture, but must also be taken into the estimate of the total loss sustained. Nor is this all. Baltimore, by giving return cargoes to these six vessels, will induce a return on their part to her port with six additional companions, to the continued detriment of the foreign commerce of New York."

The report of the Canal Commission, some years ago, was to the effect that we should have 12ft. of water on the Welland Canal, but it has been urged from time to time that it should be deepened to 14ft. I have repeatedly urged the Government to let the rock-cutting, and complete the aqueduct first, and it is unfortunate for the carrying trade of this country that such a course was not taken. But I do not anticipate any trouble in using the canal with the old aqueduct, and twelve feet of water. I think the hon. Minister made a mistake last year when, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Lambton, whether he was going to open the canal with twelve feet of water, he stated it would not be opened until there was a depth of fourteen feet.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: That was quite a mistake.

MR. McCALLUM: I thought it was, and I refer to it now in order that it may be rectified. I hope the hon. Minister will take into consideration the absolute necessity of raising the locks from Thorold to Port Dalhousie, so as to be able to give 14ft. water. It would not cost a great deal of money. A feeder was deepened, all except five or six culverts, at the cost \$150,000 to \$200,000. The intention was to sink the culverts level with the balance of the canal, and I suppose it would cost \$20,000 to do this work. If that were done this spring we could open

the canal and send our vessels by the feeder. I hope and trust the Government will not allow another winter to go over without putting down the culverts to the level of the canal, which will give us three feet more water. I do not see an amount in the Estimates for Port Maitland Harbour, which is in a very bad condition. It would be money saved to the country if an appropriation was made to improve that harbour this year. A break in the pier took place last fall, and the harbour is filling in with sand. It may cost \$100,000 next year; and it is a very important harbour, the most important on Lake Erie, at the head of the feeder of the Welland Canal, at the mouth of the Grand River into which vessels can run five miles. Where it enters the lake one of the piers was carried away by a storm a year ago last fall, and I called the attention of the Government to the fact in the interest of economy. They should bring down, in the Supplementary Estimates, money enough to secure that improvement, and The engineer can explain its necessity. I hope this will be done in the interest of the country.

MR. ROSS (Dundas): We are all agreed as to the propriety of enlarging and improving our canals as fast as possible, that policy having been agreed upon by both parties years ago. This was thought necessary in the true interest of the country. Much money has already been spent for the purpose. I suppose the work of improvement of the Welland Canal will be completed in a year or two. I have never heard anyone deny it should be deepened to the extent originally contemplated, twelve feet, and subsequently to fourteen feet on the mitre sills. The same policy was obtained with reference to the Lachine Canal. Having proceeded so far, in a progressive spirit, would it be wise to halt now? I do not consider the Government have that intention; but on account of the financial stringency they may not proceed with the work as rapidly as they might otherwise desire. There is a feeling abroad that railway will supersede water transit. That is the point to be considered. When we get the canals completed, we may consider the means of working them to the best advantage. There is no use

of mystifying this subject with extraneous matters. Suppose we did not complete the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals, we should have the Welland in use for larger vessels than could pass through them—the St. Lawrence Canals—and the advantage would be directly to the Americans. Not only would the opposite ports of the United States benefit, but we should have, at Ogdensburg, a competition for the trade now going to Montreal, and I fear a successful one. There is now, I understand, under contract at Ogdensburg, a large elevator with that object. Vessels of the enlarged kind would stop at that point, and Montreal would be left in the distance. We should have the Williamsburgh Canal improved, to give us 12ft. or 13ft. of water on the mitre sills. I would also suggest, in the interest of the forwarding and carrying trade, that this House give an indication that these works will be proceeded with. We should first enlarge every lock, and obtain the dimensions of the locks as contemplated, if we do not go on with excavation work. We should have at the Williamsburgh section 10ft. or 12ft. of water, which would enable the larger class of vessels, carrying 40,000 bushels, and of 270ft. keel, for carrying grain from Kingston to Montreal or Quebec, to be prepared for the trade. The forwarders could thus get their craft ready. This would entail a very much smaller expenditure compared with the total outlay on the canals. Many of the locks would not require to be otherwise altered than lengthened. If vessels, after loading and coming to Kingston, could pass down the St. Lawrence, with 10ft. or 12ft. of water, they could deliver at Montreal cargoes of 40,000 bushels. An hon. member has spoken of vessels carrying 70,000 bushels of grain. I have the best authority for saying that they would be unwieldy, and their working, with such cargoes, impracticable. Vessels suited to the lakes would not be so suited to rivers filled with rapids. Captains and pilots would not undertake the risk of running vessels of 70,000 bushels through narrow river channels. A large amount of money would be imperilled by the crippling of such vessels, and high rates of insurance involved. This would be an impediment to the St. Lawrence trade. No forwarder

would construct such large vessels. Vessels of 40,000 bushels capacity are all that can be considered safe in the St. Lawrence navigation. At present vessels of 25,000 bushels capacity even now are not considered so safe as those carrying 15,000 to 20,000 bushels. The canal improvements should proceed as fast as possible. If the eastward trip could be easily made, and without delays, there would be no check to investing in a larger class of vessels. We have water enough in our canals now for the present, except the Williamsburgh Canal, but it is absolutely necessary that some money should be spent at the Morrisburgh and Williamsburgh sections for the removal of the impediments existing. We have not over 6ft. 9in. on the mitre sills at certain periods. Those impediments should not be left a day longer than possible. The Report of the Local Engineer shows that, with an expenditure of \$30,000 or \$40,000, an additional foot of depth could be obtained, which would be a great improvement. We should pay great attention to the reports of our professional men on such subjects. The able Report of the Chief Engineer, Mr. Page, is condensed in a very short article in the *Globe*, which I will read :

“The Report of Mr. John Page, Chief Engineer of Canals, is a very elaborate and able document, showing exactly the condition of the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals in February last, and setting forth the results which may be expected to ensue on their completion. The locks on the Canadian route will be 270 feet long and 45 feet wide, with 14 feet of water on mitre sills. Vessels of ordinary build, carrying fully 1,000 tons burden, will be able to pass through such locks; but as the tendency is to increase the breadth and sectional area of freight vessels, Mr. Page believes that the Canals will be navigated by craft of 1,500 tons burthen. As the Erie Canal, with only 6 feet of water on the sills, carried more freight in 1878 and 1879 than during any previous two years, it is plain that water routes can compete successfully with railways. The improved Canadian canals will have immense advantages over the Erie Canal, and as the railways require renewal of plant, the time is not distant, Mr. Page thinks, when they will be compelled to give up the system of carrying freight at rates so low that no dividend is paid to ordinary stock-holders. Then we may expect that the St. Lawrence route will gain an enormous traffic. The real competition between rail and water lines now begins at the lower end of Lake Erie. The railways run in connection with the large vessels engaged between western and eastern ports. This shows that the railways are unable to compete, on

routes where large vessels can be used, and as the completion of the Canadian canals 'will practically extend ocean navigation to the head of Lake Superior' the St. Lawrence route will stand at an advantage over any known freight line, will carry the produce of the western grain fields, and 'open up accessible markets for the coal fields of Nova Scotia.' Such are the anticipations of Mr. Page, a cautious man, of very long experience and great information. Much more reliance may be placed on his judgment than on that of the gloomy prophets who can never foresee a good result for any Canadian enterprise."

It will be observed this condensed review of the able Report of the Chief Officer shows conclusively that the enlargement is a most desirable enterprise, and concludes with a very sound admonition to beware of gloomy prospects. We have two great enterprises on hand: the Pacific Railway and the improvement of our Canals. There is no use of faintheartedness in regard to them; they must go on. The work on the Railway, if economically and judiciously conducted on sound commercial principles or basis, will, before many years, come to a satisfactory completion. As to the Canals, I think it is the duty of the Government to exhaust every means to proceed with their improvement. We have now 10ft. of water all through to Montreal, except only one section. With enlarged locks of 270ft. in length, we should have all required for a long time. With regard to expenditures, I look upon the Government as an individual; neither should make unprofitable investments. We should remember that good water ways and water power are not only useful for navigation and trade, but for manufacturing purposes as well. The feeling in my county is that our magnificent opportunity should be to call forth the energies of our people. Why is it not utilised? It is objected that those canals were constructed only for the transport trade. Is it possible that reasonable men—men in their senses—would confine themselves to only a partial and limited use of their finest resources and opportunities. The Government, moreover, should not allow private parties to appropriate or monopolise this water power, to the exclusion of general enterprise. Sufficient land, at points of water power, should be appropriated, that it may be used to the general advantage, on reasonable terms. At two points in my county there is water enough

running to waste to drive three times the present machinery employed, which is constructed on our old worn out plan. I believe it is sound policy for the Government to acquire these water powers, and by letting them to parties who are able to erect manufactures upon them and pay a reasonable rent; they will get three times more interest on the investment than they can get from the canals. I feel very keenly in this matter. I feel that we ought to go on with that work, and I believe if the plan is adopted, as I suggest, we can get a larger class of vessels afloat at an early day at a very much smaller expense than by any other plan, in the meantime, and we can enlarge the canals from time to time as necessity may require. If we leave the St. Lawrence Canals in their present condition with their short locks, a large amount of our trade will be diverted to Ogdensburg and other American ports. If we make this improvement on the canals it will enable us to compete with the American carrying trade. It is not to be expected that either the water channel or the railway can secure a monopoly of the carrying trade. This route will certainly command a very large share of the trade of this country. No unnecessary time should be lost, as trade once diverted is difficult to regain.

MR. BURNHAM: I am in favour of the scheme known as the Trent Valley Canal, advocated by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Keeler). From the large deputation that waited on the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and the number of petitions presented to the House in favour of this scheme, I think it should receive the serious consideration of the Government. The hon. member for Prince Edward county (Mr. McCuaig) objects to the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals, and states that small vessels are required in carrying grain that could go below Kingston. By opening up the water communication from Georgian Bay to Lake Ontario, by the proposed route, barges can be brought from Lake Huron to Montreal direct, and as the hon. member for Prince Edward county has stated, the cost of running barges is very much less than that of sailing vessels. The large vessels that are used in the upper lakes can tranship their cargo for Montreal, at the terminus of the canal at Lake Huron, saving a

distance of nearly four hundred miles from Chicago to Montreal, over the route from Chicago to Buffalo, and thence to New York by the Erie Canal. It has been said that railroads are going to do all the work of transshipment on this continent. I think that experience shows that canals will always command a large share of the carrying trade. The Erie Canal, at the present time, carries about one-half of the grain that is shipped from Buffalo. The benefit of canals in the United States is shown by the fact that when the Erie Canal is closed in winter, railway freights from Chicago to New York immediately go up from \$1.20 to \$7 a ton. There is no pooling with canals as there is with railways, and, therefore, they will have the effect of keeping down the cost of transportation. I desire to impress on the hon. Minister the necessity of taking this matter into consideration. A competent engineer has reported that this scheme can be accomplished at a cost of \$2,500,000, and it will surely be worth that much to this country. I do not believe, as has been stated by the hon. member for Prince Edward county, that this country is in such a deplorable state that it cannot engage in public works for the benefit of the whole country. I think our finances are in such a condition as will warrant the Government in undertaking this great public work, and thus secure the carrying trade from the Western States to our own sea-port of Montreal.

MR. WRIGHT: It is refreshing to find the attention of the House and country called to the development of our magnificent water stretches. We have had so much discussion with regard to railroads that it is pleasant to find our attention drawn to another and hardly less important subject—that of our canals. The Senate have been devoting their attention, in a most excellent manner, to the consideration of the great scheme of the Panama Canal. Nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken to-night appears to have his special canal scheme. One hon. gentleman rises to advocate the advantages of the St. Lawrence route, and other hon. gentlemen, in a most laudable way have been devoting themselves to the advocacy of canals through their own section. I should like to have a word to say with regard to our Ottawa

MR. BURNHAM:

system. Many hon. members of the House will remember that not many years ago a great deal of attention was called to that line, which really is the shortest to the Great West by about 400 miles. The Government has taken steps to improve that line of communication, and they have commenced work at Carillon, and have enlarged the canal at Ste. Anne's, and have commenced the construction of the Culbute Canal, all pointing in the direction of that great scheme. I think the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals will give some of his attention to the construction of this great work, and that before next Session he will have decided upon some definite plan for pushing this great work to completion.

MR. RYAN (Montreal, Centre): The hon. member for Prince Edward was one of a deputation which came from Montreal and from the West to represent the necessity of securing a large portion of the trade of the Great West by the St. Lawrence route during the ensuing season. In order to accomplish that there has been great pressure brought to bear upon the Government, not only from Montreal but from people engaged in the shipping trade in Ontario, who are very deeply interested in this matter. What we desire is that the Government should take off the toll of the canals of the country and, at the same time, assume the debt which has been incurred for deepening Lake St. Peter, and by that means we would be able to attract a much larger number of sea-going vessels to Montreal than in the past. I did not come here to ask for Montreal any particular advantage from this Government. I hold, and I believe it was held by the late hon. Premier in 1877, that the deepening of the channel through Lake St. Peter was as much a public work as the construction of any of the canals in this Dominion, and that it ought to be charged to the Consolidated Revenue instead of to the port of Montreal. The advantage will not be confined to Montreal but will benefit largely Ontario through the cheapening of freight, and when the cost of transport is lessened the value of produce is increased in the same proportion. Ontario will benefit much more than Quebec by this plan. It will enable those engaged in the shipping trade to secure a much larger portion of

the carrying trade of the Great West, and of the Great North-West of the United States. The total charge will not probably amount to more than \$80,000 or \$100,000 a year. That being done the people of Montreal will find their way to assume the debt which has been incurred in giving the necessary accommodation at that port. They have incurred a large sum of money in deepening the channel at Montreal, and in building the most complete system of docks which exist in America. I have no hesitation in saying there are better facilities for loading and discharging vessels at Montreal than exists in any other part of this continent. If the Government will assume the debt of deepening the great highway of the St. Lawrence and charge it to the Consolidated Revenue, then I believe the citizens of Montreal will be willing to assume the debt incurred in deepening the harbour at that city. They desire to make Montreal a free port, which, if done, will largely increase the volume of trade of this country. The hon. member for Prince Edward County (Mr. McCuaig), in everything that he dealt with, found nothing but absurdities. He said it was absurd to suppose that trade could be attracted to Montreal, and that the natural port of Canada was Quebec; but no one knows better than the hon. gentleman himself that Montreal has already secured the chief part of the carrying trade of this country, and that is due principally to the enterprise of the merchants of Montreal, who do not stand with their arms folded until business comes to them; but they go up to the Great West, and employ vessels to bring grain to Montreal. They do this at their own risk. Sometimes it is attended with loss, and at other times with profit, but the result is that it has done much to build up the carrying trade of the country, and give employment to a large number of people. The hon. gentleman told us it was absurd to think of bringing vessels containing a certain number of bushels of grain below Kingston, and that at that point the grain should be transhipped to barges, which might come to Montreal and Quebec. I do not profess to be acquainted with the management of vessels, but I prefer to believe the statements of those who are largely engaged in the carrying trade to the statement of the hon. gentle-

man. I have heard it said by men who have a great deal of capital invested in that trade, that they would prefer to make the entire trip from Chicago to Montreal in six days, than to be detained three or four days at Kingston in making a transshipment of their cargoes. The hon. gentleman stated that it is perfectly impossible for any vessel containing a certain quantity of grain to navigate the St. Lawrence below Kingston with any safety. As soon as the Welland Canal is completed, then a class of vessels carrying at least 50,000 bushels of grain can proceed direct from Chicago to Montreal, and at the same time tow two convoys carrying 60,000 bushels each. That is the statement of a practical man, and for my part, I prefer to believe it rather than that of the hon. gentleman, who has stated here that everything was absurd which did not happen to chime in with his views and notions of things. I am not aware that Montreal has ever done anything to offend my hon. friend, but I am not at all surprised he should take that line of argument, and find it very absurd to think of carrying grain direct to Montreal, because he has a scheme of his own which he thinks would be much better.

Mr. BOULTBEE: It has been made to treat the proposition of constructing the Ontario and Huron Ship Canal with some degree of ridicule, but it has been by gentlemen who have not understood the magnitude or importance of the subject. The gentleman to whose genius that plan owes its being, Mr. Capreal, is one of the cleverest men in this country. When he designed the Ontario and Simcoe Railway, the project was looked upon as much more wild and chimerical than this one is at present. No financial aid is required from the Government for this scheme. All that has been desired from the beginning, and all that is desired now, is that the Government should give in aid of the undertaking a certain amount of land in the North-West. It seems peculiarly appropriate that such an enterprise should be aided in such a way. That canal would shorten the distance from the Far West by something like 500 miles. From its importance, as a means of transporting the breadstuffs and other produce from the West to the seaboard, it is easily seen how important

it is that that link of communication should be established, if it can be. It was first estimated that it would cost \$40,000,000, but recent inventions, in the shape of a hydraulic lift-lock, have demonstrated that that canal can now be built for less than \$20,000,000. I wish to urge upon the Government that they should take some means of ascertaining whether the scheme put forward of this canal is possible, and to state whether they can give a reasonable amount of land to enable the promoters to carry out the undertaking. If this land is furnished by the Government the necessary capital will be forthcoming within three months, and the work commenced within twelve months.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier): I do not rise for the purpose of adding anything to what has been so well said on the importance of making the St. Lawrence route as cheap as possible. I desire to say a word or two in reference to an unfair advantage which I believe exists in the carrying out of the provisions of the Washington Treaty. It is very well known that American vessels use the St. Lawrence canals, and the other canals of the Dominion, on a footing of equality with Canadian vessels. It is also well known that Canadian vessels are not allowed to use the States' canals, especially the canals of the State of New York, on an equal footing with American vessels. It is said that this course is authorised by the Treaty of Washington, but the Treaty does not appear to me to sustain that construction. Article 27 says:

"The Government or Her Britannic Majesty engages to urge upon the Government of the Dominion of Canada to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other Canals in the Dominion, on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion; and the Government of the United States engages that the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty shall enjoy the use of the St. Clair Flats Canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States; and further engages to urge upon the State Governments to secure to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty the use of several State Canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by or contiguous to the boundary line between the possessions of the high contracting parties on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States."

There is not the slightest doubt that we are denied the privilege of Canadian ves-

sels reaching Lake Champlain without paying a license, the which is not exacted from American vessels. The use of the Whitehall Canal by Canadian vessels is entirely prohibited, owing to some Customs regulations. This course, I contend, is not justified under the Washington Treaty, and steps ought to be taken by the Government to put down this American monopoly.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I regret that at this late hour in the evening it will be impossible for me to notice as fully as I ought to do the remarks that have fallen from hon. gentlemen, but I will briefly refer to some of them. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) has urged very strongly some measures being taken to carry out the works at Cornwall, especially with a view to give increased water power. There is no doubt that is a very important object, but of course there is a limit to the expenditure by which that object could be attained. The exertions of the late Government have been mainly expended in the effort to enlarge the Welland and the Lachine Canals, and they seem to have arrived at the conclusion that so far as the intervening St. Lawrence Canals were concerned, it would not be desirable to incur a larger expenditure than would be involved in carrying out the original scheme, until the result of enlarging these two canals is known. The present Government have adopted that policy, and proposed to complete the contract made in reference to the enlargement of the Welland Canal, complete the works at Lachine, and also carry out another undertaking to which the late Government committed themselves—the removing of the obstructions at Galops Rapids by chain steam tug. These are now all the contracts in operation, and it is proposed to confine the expenditure to these works. The same remarks I have made in reference to the hon. member for Cornwall, apply also to the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Ross.) A very strong case has been made out for the increase of water power there. I have not had an opportunity of submitting a report made by the Local Engineer to the Chief Engineer, but I expect to be able to do so at an early day. I am afraid, however, it will hardly be in our power, during the present Session, to meet

the views of the hon. members for Dundas or Cornwall, in relation to that matter, important as it is. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Keeler) I am not at all surprised that attention should have been directed to both the Trent and Murray Canals. So far as I am able to judge, I think a comparatively small sum of money will greatly shorten the distance between the Georgian Bay and the Bay of Quinté. If the trade of the North-West becomes as important as it is expected, no doubt the construction of these works will attract public attention. One of the most influential deputations I have ever seen in the city of Ottawa, waited upon the Government, with the view of pressing upon them the necessity of dealing with the Trent navigation. An engineer, who had examined the work, reported that it would not involve great expenditure, and I have no doubt it would soon become a question as to how far it will be desirable to survey with a view to shortening the line of communication from the Georgian Bay and grain barge navigation from the Georgian Bay to Montreal. The Murray Canal is a work that could be completed at the smallest cost of almost any public work required to attain so large a result; and I only regret that the great obligations resting upon the Government—that there are so many other matters that cannot possibly admit of any postponement—which render it impossible to seriously look at the question, as to whether it would or would not be desirable to spend the small sum required to obtain this large result. The development of the adjacent mineral districts, the great advantage of facilitating transport, by obtaining 100 miles of barge navigation in exchange for a circuitous and dangerous navigation over a route where very many shipwrecks have occurred, would render it desirable, if in the power of the Government, to consider and ascertain at how small a cost that work could be done. I am afraid it will not be in the power of the Government to put in the Estimates the cost of these works. With reference to the opening of the Welland Canal, and the hope expressed by the hon. member for Monk (Mr. McCallum), I am assured that a great many persons who profess to

understand the subject thoroughly, seem to entertain no doubt that the Welland Canal may be opened through the old aqueduct. There is some doubt upon that matter, but, at all events, we intend to try the experiment. The gates and appliances will be placed under contract and proceeded with as rapidly as possible, and so soon as the works to be finished by the next season are completed, and the gates are in position, the experiment will be tried as to whether we can operate the Welland Canal through the old aqueduct. The new aqueduct being delayed by serious obstacles, we cannot hope to have that work completed by the next season; therefore, it will be advisable to operate, if possible, through the old aqueduct until the new aqueduct is constructed. The Government will be obliged to consider what expenditure is necessary to prevent the pier at Maitland sustaining serious damage, connected as it is with the maintenance of supply from the Grand River.

MR. MACKENZIE: What is it used for now?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER; That is one of the questions under consideration. The feeder is very useful until the canal is ready to be opened. We have been depending upon the feeder for the old Welland Canal; it runs through a great circuit of country, and it may be desirable to keep it open. I think I have replied to the principle remarks necessary to be answered. I may say, with reference to the whole question—and a very important question it is—discussed so ably by hon. gentlemen on both sides, that it has necessarily been engaging the attention of the Government; but it was our duty to complete those works first and ascertain the result, so far as we could, as to the extension of our trade by the facilities thus given. But at the same time every one will recognise the importance of seriously considering how we may best promote the interests of and facilitate the trade and traffic of the country, and so cheapen transit over these great arteries of communication or trade as to render them as attractive as possible, and enable us to compete successfully with rival routes. We have not come to decided conclusions, great and important as these considerations are, but

they are engaging, and will engage, the serious attention of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not think it necessary to offer any criticisms, because the hon. gentleman has come to the same conclusion that I had with regard to the item respecting Canals; but the hon. gentleman took some credit to himself for the production of this enormous document.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I did not. All that I said was, that it would be unnecessary to detain the Committee, as I had placed the volume before the House. The credit is entirely due to the engineer, not to myself.

MR. MACKENZIE: I find that the book contains 100 pages of report, and that the remaining 600 pages are devoted to rubbish, in the shape of specifications of works all finished, and of no interest to us at the present time. It is mere waste of time and money to publish these 600 pages. The 100 pages are all very well. With regard to the complaint made by the hon. member for Cornwall and the hon. member for Dundas, that there was not sufficient water let into the canal, the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals must be aware of the difficulties encountered with some canals in consequence of this water power being let. I think it a great mistake, and during my own term of office, I steadily avoided letting this power. It involves not only a difficulty in collecting the rent in case of stoppage, but also the risk of having to pay damages. I would strongly recommend any Government not to encourage the furnishing of water power. I recollect a great difficulty in connection with the Welland Canal; the lessees complained of the water being cut off without proper notice; an arbitration, and consequent large expenses, were the result. I think it a great mistake to countenance any more of it than can be possibly helped. I thought the hon. Minister of Canals was going to give us a statement of the amounts required to finish the respective canals; he was good enough to send me a statement of the amounts that had been spent. It should have been in his report. Mr. Page evidently thought it was there, for he makes a reference to it. The total expenditure on the Welland Canal up to the 1st January, was \$10,500,000 as near

as may be seen. The estimate of Mr. Page was \$12,000,000. Can the hon. Minister tell if it is likely to keep within that amount? Mr. Page is generally accurate. His estimate for the Lachine Canal was under \$6,000,000, and I see according to the expenditure that his estimate was about correct. Can the hon. gentleman tell how much will be required for the Lachine and Welland Canals?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am afraid that Mr. Page's estimate will be found below the actual expenditure to the extent of some \$500,000 or \$600,000 to complete the Welland Canal for the twelve feet navigation. With reference to the Lachine Canal, the present estimate now asked for will complete that work. I regret the criticisms of the hon. gentleman in reference to the volume published by the Chief Engineer of Canals, which volume he has characterised as rubbish, with the exception of a small portion. I think the Chief Engineer of Canals is known to be a remarkably able man, who has been able so far to carry to completion one of the most gigantic and most creditable works not only in Canada, but in any country in the world, and that a description of that work is entitled to some other appellation than that applied to it by the hon. gentleman. I think everything connected with that work, the specifications and everything attract the attention of foreign countries. Gentlemen of the highest attainments from England and France and the United States, all the most distinguished and scientific engineers in the world who have inspected this work, have expressed their unqualified admiration of it. No one could expect that such a remark would be made, of a description of a work which has cost him so much labour, to a volume which is calculated to hand down to posterity the details of a work of so much importance and which reflects so much credit upon the Chief Engineer.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not apply my remarks to Mr. Page's work or to his report, but to these other 600 pages which are not a description of the work; and I do not suppose that Mr. Page got these specifications and documents printed in the volume. I have too high an opinion of him. He may have been asked to do

it. It is a huge volume ; there are a few pages devoted to Mr. Page's Report proper, but the rest of the volume is of no use to any person here, or any person abroad.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : I can quite understand now why the hon. gentleman should have applied such a term to this volume. He supposed that I had suggested it. All I suggested is contained in my letter as it appears in this volume. In this letter I asked Mr. Page to furnish for the information of Parliament, a detailed and careful statement of the progress of the works upon the Welland, St. Lawrence, Lachine and Ottawa Canals. In view of the great expenditure of public money, it was thought it would be interesting to have the fullest and most thorough information on this subject. I never made a suggestion as to what should or should not be put into the Report. I knew that Mr. Page was infinitely more capable than I was of knowing what was required, in order to give the House the information that was wanted. Although I have looked over the volume with great care, I have arrived at a different conclusion to that formed by the hon. gentleman, and I think the time will come when everything in the volume will be at all events regarded as matter of great historic interest.

MR. MCCALLUM : The hon. member for Lambton wants to know what use the feeder is. It is of the utmost importance to keep up the feeder, until it is a known fact that Lake Erie's level will be a success. I trust the hon. Minister will put an amount in the Supplementary Estimates to secure this work. The hon. member also claimed that it was a waste of money to publish the Government Engineer's Report. I think the people will look upon it as money well expended, and will not regard the hon. gentleman's attempt to discredit Mr. Page, an officer of whom he thought highly, when in office, and under whose wing the hon. gentleman often sheltered himself.

MR. MACKENZIE : I did not say a word in disparagement of Mr. Page. I always considered him one of the best engineers on the continent, and one of the most efficient public servants, but I am not to be deterred from criticising a lot of worthless papers on that account. There is nothing interesting in these papers,

and a good deal of the matter is not printed for the first time. The hon. gentleman from Monk is always harping about this everlasting feeder. I think he is more concerned about feeding Maitland than feeding the canal.

MR. ROSS (Dundas) : I must express my extreme regret at some of the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton. Every statement that hon. gentleman makes goes to the country, and he should not be too sweeping in his remarks. While the excessive letting of water power on the Lachine Canal may have been a mistake, we should not conclude that like mistakes are about to be made in regard to other canals. The Williamsburgh Canal is not used for vessels going eastward, and the hon. gentleman should recollect that a very small quantity of water is now used on these canals. He should also remember that a slight current is not a disadvantage, because it gives steerage way to and assists steamers and vessels. On these canals there is no reason why a moderate and reasonable amount of water power should not be used. It would do no damage to the works, and would encourage industries and give employment to labourers and machinists. While the people in my county have the highest opinion of the Government, we will have a less exalted opinion of their fairness and justice if they refuse to give us the privilege and encouragement asked for. I should not ask, nor do my constituents expect or demand, ought from the Government, that may not be deemed in the interest of the whole country. One hundred or more persons actively engaged in the industrial pursuits of our Dominion, is quite of as much consideration at this point as any other in Canada ; our demand is simple justice, and not undue advantage or preference.

MR. MACDONELL (North Lanark) : I thoroughly agree with the object sought by the hon. member for Dundas, but I am afraid he is trying to make a little political capital out of the utterances of the hon. member for Lambton. That hon. gentleman simply said that an increase of the water power on the Williamsburgh Canal might interfere with its navigation. I for one would not like to see that result, owing to an increase of the water power. The object of the

canals was navigation, and that object should not be interfered with for the purpose of building up manufacturing establishments. But I know the canal in question, and the increased water asked for would, on the contrary, improve its navigation. I am of the opinion that Eastern Ontario will be the manufacturing centre of this Dominion, and it should be the object of the Government to do everything in its power to encourage the building of manufacturing establishments in this section. If large manufactures were established in Morinsburgh, they would also be of material assistance to the large factories in the county of Lanark, in so far as procuring skilled operatives is concerned, and would also prevent a large number of operatives from going to the United States. With reference to the general subject of Canals, I may say that the principle object of building the Ottawa Canals was to shorten the water route between Montreal and Chicago by 520 miles. The Culbute was to be one of the canals connecting Georgian Bay with Montreal. At the time that work was projected there was no intention of building the Pacific Railway, but now we have railway communication from Lake Nipissing to Montreal, which is about 100 miles shorter than the river route, the whole usefulness of the Ottawa canals, so far as communication between Chicago and Montreal is concerned, has disappeared. The building of certain dams on the Flat Rapids should be discontinued, owing to the large amount of damage those dams will cause in the future. Instead, therefore, of expending money on this system of canals, I would suggest that it be transferred to the canal of my hon. friend for Dundas, which is a work of vast importance to that part of the country.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew): The Culbute Canal will give uninterrupted communication for a distance of 120 miles, and I cannot agree with the opinion of the last speaker that it will be of no benefit to the country. The Ottawa River system has already been referred to in the course of the debate, but the hon. Minister did not deem it worth his while to notice the allusions thereto. It is a scheme which ought to receive the careful attention of the Government, but I do not propose to urge that now because I

MR. MACDONELL.

find hon. gentlemen on one side advocating the enlargement of the St. Lawrence and Welland Canals, and others opposed to them urging the total abolition of tolls upon those canals. The expenditure on those works has been \$30,000,000, while the net revenue has been \$3,800,000, or about one-eighth of the total outlay; and it seems to me that when so small a result is attained from so vast an expenditure, it would not be proper to urge the Government to undertake works of the same character. I think the time has arrived when the Government ought to consider whether it may not be well to stay their hands in expenditures on those works on the Welland and the St. Lawrence Canals. I do not urge the stoppage of expenditure absolutely necessary to carry out work already begun, but it would be well for the Government, completing those works, to consider whether it would not be right to defer expenditure for some considerable time further, until we ascertain whether greater results have been obtained from such expenditure than is shown up to the present time. It has been urged that expenditure on these works, although not producing a direct revenue, produced indirect benefits. If that were true, I think the additional expenditure would be justifiable, but when we find that the proportion of grain shipped from Montreal, as compared with the shipments from other North American ports, has declined from 10 per cent. of the whole quantity in 1873 to $5\frac{3}{10}$ per cent. in 1878. During the time that an expenditure of \$15,000,000 was being made on those works, I repeat, in my opinion, it is time the Government should consider well whether it ought not to put a stop to such expenditures altogether.

Vote agreed to.

91 Cornwall.....	\$ 80,000
92 St. Lawrence.....	80,000
93 Welland.....	800,000
94 Ste. Anne's Lock and Canal.....	150,000
95 Carillon Lock and Canal.....	300,000

MR. MACKENZIE asked for explanations as to the manner under which the contract was let to Mr. McNamee, and with respect to the giving of contracts to parties from whom tenders were not received.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The original contractors were Messrs. Cooke

and Company, from whom the contract was taken. After some time tenders were invited by the late Government for the construction of the work. Tenders were in the office when I became Minister, and the contract was awarded by me to Messrs. McNamee and Company, who were the lowest tenderers. Before signing the contract the Government considered the whole question of expenditure, and decided that, for the present, they would defer entering into these contracts. Consequently, McNamee and Company were notified of that decision, and their deposit was returned. Subsequently, during last Session, it was decided that the works were suffering so much damage that they should be gone on with. A very strong recommendation was made by the Chief Engineer, that very considerable loss would result from their not being proceeded with; that not only would actual expenditure be lost, but damage experienced in connection with the works in their unfinished state. It was decided then that we should proceed with the work, and I took a vote from Parliament for the purpose. McNamee and Company notified the Government that they would not take the work again on the terms of their former tender. Of course we were not in a position to hold them to the tender having returned their deposit. They stated, also, that the work had, in the meantime sustained considerable damage, and we were not in a position to hold them to their contract. In the meantime, Cooke and Company made a strong representation to the Government that their contract had been unfairly taken out of their hands by the late Government, and that they had a very strong and large claim against the Government; and on that ground they also offered to take this work at their former tender and complete it. The Government, in view therefore of the fact that McNamee and Company had withdrawn, and that these parties, whether rightly or wrongly, were urging a claim against us, and the fact that the terms of their contract would be as favourable as we could expect to get the work performed for, informed them that if they were to associate themselves with parties possessed of skill and resources sufficient to warrant the Government in considering the proposition favourably, it should be

done. They then submitted the proposition to divide the work into two sections: the canal and the dam and slide. The dam and slide was the part supposed to involve much the greater difficulty. They proposed to transfer it to Messrs. McNamee and Company. The Government sanctioned that proposal, and allowed the work to be divided, but in such a way as to bring the whole contract under the terms of the original contract to Messrs. Cooke and Company; and we found that the prices contained in the original contract or tender with Cooke and Company were lower than those of the next tender to McNamee and Company. We referred the question to the Chief Engineer, who reported strongly against our having anything to do with Cooke and Company. His previous experience with them led to a strong opinion against them as contractors, but his principle objection to our entertaining the proposal to re-let the work to them, and which was a less sum than the next lowest tender was, that their price was altogether inadequate, and that the work could not be performed for that amount. The Government then felt that if they gave sufficient security for the proper performance of the work, they would not be warranted in refusing to grant them the contract on the ground stated by the Chief Engineer, that the contractors were taking it altogether too low. I am glad to be able to state that, having let the work, not by private contract, but under the original contract, and under the lowest we had before us, and when labour was at its very lowest, and, having divided the work in that way, the work has not only progressed most satisfactorily, but the Government have every reason to believe it will be completed within the terms of the contract, and at lower prices than could have been accomplished in any other way. I feel that the course taken by the Government will admit of the most thorough scrutiny at the hands of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the House.

Vote agreed to.

96 Grenville \$250,000

MR. MACKENZIE: Is this work carried on under the old contract—by the yard?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The extension of the work has not been let. The vote taken last year for this service

has been expended, so far as any expenditure has been made under the contract made by the hon. gentleman himself.

MR. MACKENZIE No ?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes; and in precisely the manner in which he made it. Every dollar expended on this work has been spent under the contract made by the late Government. No change has been made, and whatever work has been performed has been strictly in accord with that contract. Mr. Goodwin, the contractor claimed that he was entitled to an extension of his contract on two grounds: First, that this proposed work was an extension and that he had certain claims under the arbitration granted him, Mr. Page being selected as the sole arbitrator, both parties having to abide by the decision.

MR. MACKENZIE: That was not our arrangement.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The arrangement to have Mr. Page as sole arbitrator was made between the hon. member for Lamiton, as Minister, and the contractor, and sanctioned by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was leader, and the matter stands in this position. Mr. Goodwin says that the work was an extension, being part of unfinished work which he then had, and he offered my predecessor to waive his claims under the arbitration if the extension was given to him. Mr. Goodwin made the same proposal to myself, and I have looked thoroughly into the question—and the legal officers of the Department prepared a general summarised statement of the whole question—and have satisfied myself that the work could not be regarded as an extension of his contract; and that, in the second place, it would be impossible to take it up as a question complicated with any other claims. In the meantime, Mr. Page not being able to prepare the plans and specifications of this work, and settle exactly the alignments of the new work, and the work that was required to be done, until late in the season, and as the work required to be done could be in summer, there was no object in letting the contract until Parliament had again voted the money. I propose, therefore, if this money is voted to advertise the work to public competition, and to obtain its con-

struction precisely the same way as other work.

MR. MACKENZIE: I will ask the hon. gentleman to bring down a memorandum relating to these contracts he refers to, before concurrence is taken, and also the Order in Council of September, 1873, referred to.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I will place in the hands of the hon. gentleman all the papers relating to the subject.

Vote agreed to.

97 Culbute	\$ 4,000
98 St. Peter	17,400
99 Miscellaneous	10,000

MR. KILLAM asked was any of this sum to be expended on the Baie Verte Canal scheme.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said the hon. gentleman and his political friends in Opposition not only withdrew the vote for the Baie Verte Canal, but expended a considerable sum to render the reconsideration of the work impossible so far as they could.

MR. KILLAM said he hoped the hon. the Minister of Railways would laugh at such impossibilities. He had assured his electors that this is one of the works that would be taken up.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said that if the late Government had proceeded with this work, it might now have been discharging important services to this country.

MR. ANGLIN asked why the Government did not go on with it now.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): The late Government spent all the money.

MR. PLUMB: Are there not too many deficits.

MR. ANGLIN said that repeated promises and assurances were given by the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals that this work, which he described as a very important one, would be undertaken; and he did not believe that the people who relied on that hon. Minister would be satisfied with his present assertions or excuses for the postponement of this work. The late Government would have gone on and completed the surveys, but their predecessors rendered that impossible. The matter can be taken up again now, for nothing that was then available has ceased to be available, and everything remains pretty much as it was when the survey was made.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was five years the First Commoner of the land, yet during all that time I never heard him utter a syllable about the Baie Verte Canal. Why did not the late hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries get this canal built? Does it not go through part of his county. Surely the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) ought not to find fault when he knows in his heart that his Government left no money in the Treasury with which the work could be done.

Vote agreed to.

XIII. RAILWAYS AND CANALS CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Chambly Canal.

100 Purchase of a building to be used for the Collector's office, St. John..... \$1,000

Welland Canal,

101 { Rebuilding superstructure of Toli Bridge Dunville..... \$12,000
To rebuild a bridge on the line of Canal Street Dunville..... 5,500

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The bridge at Dunville is necessary to restore to the public conveniences which were lost by the construction of the canal. I took pains to ascertain that the bridge is necessary.

MR. MACKENZIE: I took pains to ascertain that it was not necessary.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I will furnish the fullest information on concurrence.

MR. MCCALLUM: The hon. gentleman appears to be very particular about this item. I know at a former time his engineer reported against it, but the engineer of the present Government has reported in favour of this bridge as necessary in the interests of the public. This \$12,000 is to rebuild the old bridge. By building this bridge the Government will get rid of the necessity of keeping up no less than three other bridges.

Vote agreed to.

Burlington Bay Canal.

102 Renewal of piers..... \$10,000

Miscellaneous.

103 { Miscellaneous works not otherwise provided for..... \$5,000
Arbitrations and Awards..... 5,000
Surveys and inspections..... 10,000

Maintenance and Repairs.

198 Repairs and working expenses... \$331,820
199 Salaries and Contingencies of Canal Officers..... 32,620

XXXVI. PUBLIC WORKS.

Maintenance and Repairs.

200 Collection of Slide and Boom dues. \$20,745
201 Repairs and Working Expenses, Harbours and Slides..... 74,900
202 Telegraph Lines between Prince Edward Island and the Mainland..... 2,000
203 Telegraph Lines, British Columbia, via Nanaimo and Point Grey... 21,300
204 Agent and Contingencies, British Columbia..... 4,000

XXXVII. MISCELLANEOUS.

179 *Canada Gazette*..... 4,000
180 Miscellaneous Printing..... 10,000
181 Unforeseen Expenses: Expenditure thereof to be under Order in Council, and a detailed statement to be laid before Parliament during the first fifteen days of the next Session..... 50,000
182 Commutation in lieu of remission of duties on articles imported for the use of the Army and Navy. 4,000
183 For the expenses of Government in the North-West Territories.. 17,000

MR. SCHULTZ: I take advantage of the first opportunity I have had this Session, of bringing some of the matters connected with the Department of the Interior before the Committee and the Government. Of these, there is first the very vexatious question of the St. Peter's Reserve, the non settlement of which is damaging to the Indians and others who are upon it, as well as to the settlement of the neighbourhood on all sides. It was understood and believed that the late Minister of the Interior had solved the question by the recognition of all rights claimed in the settlement belt portion of the reserve, and the preserving of the part outside intact for the Indians of the band. I believe that, after a thorough personal investigation, he came to conclusions which it was unfortunate he did not put upon record, but no doubt the evidences which decided him are still on file, and the matter after ten years of vexatious delay should now be finally settled. If the evidence on record is not sufficient, I think it is incumbent on the Department to at once send an agent to take evidence on the spot. Again, Sir, closely bordering on this reserve is another vexed question. Certain lands in the neighbouring parish of St. Clements

were, when the Railroad crossing was fixed at Selkirk, expropriated, in so far as notifying the owners of the intention of the Government to take the lands. This, of course, stopped all improvement and forbade all sales; and I am sorry to have to say, because it applies as much to the present as to the late Administration, that not one single penny has been paid to the parties who owned these lands. One of the sufferers in this respect, Mr. James Taylor, has for years been prevented from using his lands. He might have sold at a large price, but could not; he might have built upon and improved the land himself, but dared not; and it is an act of injustice, pure and simple, to allow cases like these to remain unsettled. Something should be done, and at once, especially as the hon. the Minister of Railways has distinctly announced that the crossing might be delayed but was not changed. I am sorry that I have also to call attention to the distribution of the 1,400,000 acres of land given to our half-breed population just ten years ago. What excuse can there possibly be for the delay in the giving to some of them what was guaranteed by Act of Parliament at that time. I said during the last Administration that the delay was unjustifiable; I say now that it is shameful. Give these people what belongs to them. Patent the river lots at once, and without the circumlocution and expense attendant upon the patenting of the outer two miles, and settle all these long delayed matters. I have only one word more to say in connection with the Province, which is to ask the Government and the Committee to remember our large contributions to the Revenue, to remember that we are weak in numbers in this House, and that the necessities of a country new as ours is, is great, and not to grudge these increases in the postal and other services which do so much to develop a new country. Although it is unusual, I have always held that this House should aid our Provincial highways, for reasons I have often before urged, and the present system of municipalities would ensure the certainty of any aid we gave them being expended by them for this purpose in the way most likely to be of service to our people. It should always be remembered, when the

Mr. SCHULTZ.

expenditure in connection with this Province comes up, that its people have been under a great disadvantage from their want of rail communication till last year. The new settlements have been hemmed in by reserves of all kinds and their development checked, and, although a step has been taken in the direction of the relief of those who have made homesteads on Railway lands, yet the utmost liberality should be shown to them as to all others who are honestly trying to make homes for their own and not for speculative purposes. Lastly, Sir, the question of the Hudson's Bay lands should receive immediate consideration. Settlers who go in in advance of surveys have no guide as to the lands they take, and the present regulations leave them at the mercy of this Corporation if the survey shows them to be on the Hudson's Bay lands. Our Great North-West is now felt to be the hope of the Dominion, and, if we want to allow free play for its destiny, we must avoid all things which will hamper, and do everything which will aid, those who in this new country are helping us to build up our common country.

184	For the expenses of Government in the District of Keewatin....	\$5,000
185	To meet the expenses estimated to be required to put in force the Act respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors.	5,000

XXV. INDIANS.

Manitola and the North-West.

167	Annuities under Treaties Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, and commutation of Annuities.....	\$216,191
168	Agricultural Implements, Cattle, Seed Grain, Tools, Ammunition, and Twine, etc., furnished under Treaties.....	67,460

Mr. PATERSON (South Brant) said, in reference to the contracts for supplies, that formerly the custom had been to ask for contracts for supplies to be delivered at Winnipeg, but this year tenders had been asked requiring the articles to be delivered at the places specified in the advertisement. There were thirty-one different places, separated by hundreds, not a thousand or more miles, and eighty-one different articles to be tendered for. This, he thought, would tend to limit competition in tendering for these supplies, a result which he regarded as very undesirable. Parties

desiring to tender in his own city, found it impossible to put in a tender unless they could deliver the supplies at Winnipeg, as heretofore. He desired to hear the reasons of the hon. First Minister for making this change.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the system had been altered as the hon. gentleman had stated. It was inconvenient to appoint any one place convenient for distributing the articles on account of the vast distances the different points were apart from each other. The working of the system during this year had shown that, by getting satisfactory security for the performance of the contracts, certainty, safety and speed were obtained, and that the articles were delivered on quite as reasonable terms as they were provided last year. He was satisfied it was going to be successful; but if it failed he could revert to the old system.

MR. KIRKPATRICK agreed with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). Contractors for the supplies could ascertain the rates of freight from places in the Lower Provinces, or Ontario, or Quebec, to Winnipeg, but beyond Winnipeg they could not. He thought it was better to collect at Winnipeg, or some other point, all the articles for distribution. Every man who tendered to send out each article must add a large percentage to cover the cost of making a separate contract.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) pointed out that one man tendering for the whole of the articles of one particular class, to be delivered at Winnipeg, would put them in at the lowest figures; there would be one train load to Winnipeg and then at Winnipeg they could be distributed to the different points. He would like to know how many tenders were received in accordance with the terms of tender, and how many offered to tender at Winnipeg. He was told, too, that in one or two cases the contracts had stipulated for articles of American manufacture.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he could not supply all the information asked for just now, but would do so on concurrence. There was no such stipulation or limitation in regard to American manufactures. With regard to the giving of the contracts for large supplies to one person, so as to enable that person to have an order for a number of articles of the

same sort, the Government had to consider only the interest of the public, and the means of securing speed, economy, and the smallest possible risk. As to having one point from which to distribute the articles, it was out of the question, on account of the different points being so widely separated. The hon. gentleman does not understand the geography of the country. He has lost all sense of distance in making that suggestion. The harness contract for Edmonton and St. Albans, at the very extremity, you may say, of that region, is furnished by Ontario men from Hamilton.

MR. ANGLIN: It is desirable that we should have more information in regard to the farm teachers. I think a great many hon. members would like to know how this experiment is being carried out.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The farm instructors were only sent out this year, and are just at the commencement of their labours. The farm building is put on an unsurveyed lot on the outside of the reserve, so that the farm will not belong to the Indians, but to the Government. The Farm Instructor will, of course, help to support himself, by cultivating the lot assigned to him. He will see the Indians at their work; point out the best way of breaking up the soil, ploughing, reaping, etc. I hope next year substantial proof will appear of the worth of this experiment. Mr. Dewdney, who has charge as Commissioner, will be able to transmit for Parliament next Session a full account from each reserve of the progress of the Indians, and of the success or ill-success of the scheme.

MR. ANGLIN: Is any attempt being made to assign to each Indian family special portion of land, or is the reserve to be held in common?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The reserves are held by the Indians in common, but by arrangement among themselves the different families have their own houses. By degrees, probably they will own the houses and the ground, but the title is in the Crown as trustee. The general principle of all the Indian laws has been to give the Indians the feelings of proprietorship, by letting each have his own house and a piece of ground to cultivate as his own. Although the experiment to get them to enfranchise

themselves has not fructified very greatly, yet that operation, I believe, is still going slowly on. As a rule, the Indian prefers to remain a member of his band—to be under the tutelage of the Government, rather than to walk alone as white men do. How to get the Indian to become a freeholder, and enjoy the privileges of civilised life, seems a question almost impossible of solution. But that object will be constantly kept in view by the Government.

Vote agreed to.

173 Surveys of Indian Reserves \$15,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the surveys are still going on. As the Indians come in and agree to settle, the lands will be surveyed or them. There are a great many lands scattered over that vast country who have not yet come in.

Vote agreed to.

174 Wages of Farmers and their

Assistants \$36,430

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There are two Government farmers at \$730; ten assistants at \$420, seventeen farmers at \$730; fifty-one assistants at \$360—in all making \$36,430.

MR. ROYAL: I believe those farm instructors, appointed as they are, and having no immediate nor consistent supervision of any of the officers of the Department in the North-West Territories, are pretty much left to themselves, or to the instructions from Ottawa. They are like an *imperium in imperio*, and rather left to follow their own ideas in dealing with the Indians. The agents of the Department follow their instructions, and know to what extent, dealing with the Indians, they may go beyond them. The farm instructors may be very good, but there may be danger of their authority or efforts to civilise the Indians clashing with those of the agents. I do not believe, in the appointment of those instructors, that every consideration was given to the nature, or, perhaps, to the religion of the Indians. The instructors, to some extent, feed the Indians with whom they are in daily contact, and have

much influence over them, and I believe that branch of the Department ought to be connected in such a manner with head-quarters as to have those instructors placed under more immediate and strict supervision of some officers, Indian agents or others. I understand new appointments will be made, and hope we shall not see the same similarity in the names or place of origin of the appointees, that we notice in the present list. Complaints have been made on this score which will doubtless receive the attention of the Government. These officers ought to be married men, and well known by their moderation of ideas.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Those farm instructors are not altogether independent of the Indian agents, who are the chief officers in their own divisions. They will have a general supervision over the farm instructors. Besides there is an inspector of those instructors appointed, Mr. Wadsworth, a most valuable and able man, I believe. He is to visit every farm and see how the instructors attend to their duties, and report them if inefficient. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Royal) speaks about the origin of those instructors. There are few French names on the list. We should have been glad last year to get some instructors from Lower Canada, but applications were not made till late in the season. I shall see to the selection of instructors willing to go from Quebec. Experience will show we ought to get, in future, farm instructors who have some experience in the North-West, if possible. The persons already selected were believed to understand their business, that being the first requisite. After a while some of them got dissatisfied and desired to resign; so we have all the trouble and expense of sending men to the North-West who soon go into other business. As much as possible hereafter, we shall select instructors who understand the country and the ways of the Indians.

MR. ROYAL: I regret that in the appointments made, for the benefit of the North-West Indians, of officers placed in connection with the Indians, not enough regard has been paid to the half-breed population. Now, with respect to these farm instructors I see there is only one half-breed appointed, Mr. Setter, of St. Andrew's. I

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

am sure that if the Government had taken time to enquire, they could have selected from various parts of Manitoba a good number of farm instructors whose language and whose relations with the Indians, render them peculiarly efficient in that occupation. As far as farming qualities or teaching qualities are concerned, I believe the Government could have selected many half-breeds, just as good persons for farm instructors, as any of those they have appointed. More than one advantage would have been derived from such appointments. There is a feeling in the community of half-breeds, who were the first settlers of the country that they are completely excluded from the offices of the Government. There is as much intelligence, proportionately speaking, among the half-breeds as amongst any other class of the population, and they are peculiarly adapted for dealing with the Indians, being related to them in language, and in many cases by ties of consanguinity. If this were done, we would have less trouble with the Indians, and our expenses in that direction would be reduced.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there would be nineteen farms opposite the two Government farms.

Vote agreed to.

175 Sioux in Manitoba and North-West.....	\$7,000
176 Buildings for Commissioner, house, office and storehouse.....	12,000

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This vote is taken for the purpose of providing a residence and office for the Indian Superintendent, and also for the land office. It is supposed that by another year land in that quarter will be all taken up, and Winnipeg will not be the best place for the head-quarters of the chief land agency. The Government have not selected any place as yet, but this is a vote simply to build at such place as may be fixed upon. It is important that this place should be somewhere on the line of Railway or near it. At the same place it is proposed to have the head-quarters of the Mounted Police. They are scattered all over the Territory, and although their distribution might have been well enough at one time, it is found to be not altogether satisfactory, and there is a great

want of discipline from their being so much scattered. They are stationed all along from Fort McLeod and Fort Walsh to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. In case of trouble, the great mass of the Indians are between the posts as now stationed, and these police are designed to protect the population that is going in there. We do not expect any outbreak among the Indians, but the force is there for the purpose of putting it down should any occur. It has been suggested that near the Touchwood Hills would be the best place for the Chief of the Force to be stationed. It is in contemplation to repair and refit the buildings at Fort Pelly for that purpose. The Superintendent has been there ever since he was appointed. He went there in May last, passing by Fort Benton, and examining all the posts in the vicinity. He went over a great portion of that country, and returned here during the present winter to confer with the Department. By the terms of his appointment, he must be a resident in the Territory.

Vote agreed to.

177	{	General Expenses, Manitoba Superintendency.....	\$25,000
		General Expenses, North-West Superintendency.....	36,430

XXVI. NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

178	{	Pay of Force, including Staff, and extra pay to Farmers, Gardeners and Artisans.....	\$118,000
		Rations.....	45,000
		Forage.....	40,000
		Fuel and Light.....	5,000
		Clothing.....	22,000
		Repairs and renewals, replacement of horses, arms and ammunition.....	30,000
		Medicines and medical comforts.....	1,500
		Books and stationery.....	1,000
		Transport and freight charges, Guides, Teamsters, etc.....	24,500
		Contingencies.....	3,000

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Hon. gentlemen will see that here we have effected a very considerable saving. The pay of the men has been diminished without in any way affecting the efficiency of the Force. The pay was too good, and too many young gentlemen got into the Force who were above their business. We found it infinitely better to get farmers' sons able and willing to work. The farms around the stations, I am afraid, have not been very successful. One of the most disheartening

circumstances connected with this subject is the high price of forage, but it is hoped that the removal of the headquarters from the frontier will remove, to a certain extent, this difficulty and enable the men to obtain supplies from the settlers going into the country.

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, there was no danger of the men being blockaded in their posts and the posts, were made depots for provisions for the relief of famine-stricken Indians. The average cost for each man and horse was \$1,000 per annum. The present estimate was based on the calculation of \$860 for man and horse, the pay of the men being 40c. per day.

MR. ROYAL: The other day, upon a motion that I made with respect to papers to be supplied to this House, in connection with this, I stated some facts with great reluctance. It is my duty, however painful, to impart to this House the information that came into my possession in regard to the various services of these Territories, and more especially concerning the North-West Mounted Police. I know very well that the Force being scattered over large distances is a reason why there should be some lack of discipline or want of proper authority. Of course our administration of the North-West Territories is rather experimental, and we have to pay for our own experience; but I believe that whenever there is a fault, a remedy should be brought to it. We ought to know all about our Police Force in the North-West, and what reliance can be placed in that Force in case of an emergency. I will read the notes of a person who has visited the various forts occupied by the North-West Mounted Police Force during the last fall. We will see whether that force can sustain the first efforts of the enemy, and how long they could stand being attacked, and what efficiency there is in the Force. [Letter read giving a very good account of the position of the forts, accoutrements, ammunition, arms, horses, saddlery, discipline and behaviour of the Force towards the Indians and half-breeds.] I will now read an extract from a newspaper published in Winnipeg on the 10th March. [Extract read.] A great part of this is unfortunately owing to the conduct

of the men in our pay. A few days later the *Winnipeg Times* published an article from which I will read extracts. [Extracts read.] Painful as such utterances are on my part, because they are against a force whose object was to protect the Indian and keep the "fire water" away from him, it becomes my duty to make them. I have stated those facts from my place in the House. I have read notes taken by a perfectly disinterested gentleman, who saw things from a truly Canadian point of view. This is no charge against the Government, because those abuses were in existence before they came into power. I do not blame any Government for their existence, but I have simply placed before the House the facts which have come into my possession in regard to this subject, and which may well induce the Government to make a change into the system of that Force, and have a small military force under strict discipline instead of what we have now, cost so much and do so little good.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is rather a formidable indictment against the Mounted Police. I do not know who the person is, but if he is truly a Canadian he ought to sign his name to the document, and give the information on his responsibility to the Government, in order that the faults of which he has complained should be remedied. I may say that I do not believe one-half of the statement; I do not believe it is true. I am quite satisfied it is not true. At the same time I may say that I do not think the Force is in so satisfactory a state as it ought to be. It is too much scattered. The points were chosen years and years ago, when the Force was first sent out to meet the supposed exigencies of that time. Everybody knows that troops degenerate in discipline when they are not under sufficient check. The great fault has been that the officers have not been removed. Both officers and men have lived at the same points year after year, and some of the officers, especially those of a commercial or speculative turn of mind, have been employing themselves looking after herds of cattle, etc., and have thrown off the soldier too much to indulge in such pursuits. It is proposed to keep the men

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

together in the future by means of larger head-quarters, and different posts at which small bodies of men may be kept. They should, however, be removed every year, except, perhaps, some of the leading men, such as the Commissioner and Assistant-Commissioner, who, one or both may, perhaps, be at head-quarters permanently. In regard to the supplies, it is true that the arms of the men are not uniform. Different descriptions of arms were sent out, but they are all efficient weapons. When there are changes we can secure uniformity in that respect; but so long as the arms they have got are sufficient for any purpose, there is no use in going to the expense of setting aside the present arms for new. They have got several descriptions of carbines, including the Snider, and 100 Spencer rifles. It was found the Indians were armed with repeating rifles, which I suppose is the reason for their being supplied to the Force. I think the Force has not been kept up to the mark, but every attempt will be made to improve its discipline and efficiency. Some examples may be made for any gross dereliction of duty, as to the general charge of immorality as regards the dealings of members of the Force with Indian women. I hope the stories are grossly exaggerated. With any force of 300 young men, there would be cases of immorality, but every effort should be made to restrict the evil. I believe great success has attended the efforts of the Force to keep out ardent spirits, in the absence of which some people have been taking themselves to Painkiller and Eau de Cologne, but of course that cannot be prevented. Such beverages will not likely tempt a body of troops, who are scattered over a territory in small bodies, and can in no way obstruct the settlement, there being no settlers at many of their stations.

MR. DAWSON: I may say of the Indians generally, all over the continent, in their native state, and before the whites came among them, that they have been a very moral people. Their irregularities described are probably due to the presence of immoral whites. The Indians are generally moral, orderly and well behaved.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

THE OPPOSITION LEADERSHIP.

MR. MACKENZIE: I desire to say a word or two with regard to my personal

relations to the House. I, yesterday, determined to withdraw from the position as leader of the Opposition, and for this time forth I will speak and act for no person but myself.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Of course we, on this side of the House, have nothing to say to such a decision. But all I can say is that I hope the hon. gentleman who takes the place of the hon. member for Lambton and his party, will display the same ability, earnestness and zeal for what he thinks and believes to be for the good of the country as have been displayed by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat.

House adjourned at
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 28th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK. COMMUNICATION.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY communicated to the House—

That on a Report dated the 11th February, 1880, from the hon. the Minister of Finance, stating that he has had under consideration Despatches received from the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia on the subject of the advances proposed to be made by the Dominion Government for the construction of the Graving Dock at Esquimalt, and that in order to arrive at a settlement of the question, he has had several interviews with the hon. the Attorney-General of the Province, who has been deputed to confer with the Dominion Government in connection with the same subject.

The Minister states, that he has given the subject his most careful consideration, and that in his opinion it is desirable to modify the Order in Council of the 13th November last, and to submit one in accordance with certain provisions and conditions set forth in his Report, hereto attached.

The Committee recommend that the said Report be approved and acted upon, and that copies of this Minute be transmitted to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and to the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia.

Approved, February 12th, 1880.

(Signed) L. R. MASSON.
(Signed) LORNE.

REPORTING OF THE DEBATES.

COMMITTEE'S REPORT CONCURRED IN.

MR. STEPHENSON moved that the Third Report of the Select Committee, appointed to supervise the Official

Report of the Debates of this House during this present Session, be concurred in.

MR. BLAKE: Is that the Report about the new system?

MR. STEPHENSON: Yes. I may state that the Committee, after a great deal of consideration, arrived at this conclusion. The reports do not give satisfaction, as they are made at present, to the members, and we concluded this was a better plan to adopt. It involves about the same expenditure as that incurred at present, and the reporters, being under the direct control of the House, would do their work more efficiently and the reports would be more satisfactory. So far as the printing is concerned, we propose to adhere to the present plan and have that done by tender and public competition. After mature consideration we propose to adopt this plan also as an experiment.

MR. BLAKE: How is it proposed to appoint the reporters?

MR. STEPHENSON: They will be appointed by the Committee, of course to be approved by the House.

MR. BLAKE: Does the hon. gentleman think there is now time enough to obtain tenders for the other things?

MR. STEPHENSON: Yes; that was our object in presenting the Report as early as we have done, thinking we could make arrangements before the close of the Session to secure an efficient staff of reporters, and also securing the printing by contract.

MR. JONES: I think the way in which the reporting is done at present is a great mistake, for it undoubtedly causes long speeches to be made in the House. The system of sending back speeches to members to eliminate or change what they may not like, is a wrong one. If the speeches are to be reported they should be reported *verbatim et literatim*. If that were done, we would not have those long speeches to which we have to listen, and which are sometimes quite unnecessary. I think there should be a change. I do not think it is right that a member on the floor, when he has given his sentiments in the heat of the debate, should be allowed some four or five days afterwards to eliminate what he has said from his speech, and what he believes to be the truth. I think some

change should be made, because I know perfectly well that very important remarks made in this House and reported in the newspapers have been eliminated from the *Hansard*. The system is wrong. The Official Report should be done away with, or the speeches reported *verbatim et literatim*. In that case we should not have so many speeches, of so little value, at great expense to the country. I shall gladly support any motion that will tend to that result.

MR. STEPHENSON: The object of the Committee in making this recommendation was that the very next day members should have the report of their speeches laid on their desks in broadsheet form. They should then be allowed three days for revision. The objection mentioned by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Jones) was considered in the Committee, and the impression that prevailed was, that the fault does not so much lie with the reporters as with hon. members themselves; they are the chief offenders. If the reporters were allowed to take down the reports *verbatim*, and have them printed in that form, we could have the edition issued much earlier than at present. But when members feel that they have the privilege of making extensive alterations, as at present, delays may naturally be expected. Members ought not to interfere with the reporters, and it is necessary that the reporters should be made responsible to somebody, and that somebody should be made responsible for what they do. Holding these views, the Committee desire the existing system changed, and the reporters made servants of the House. We propose this arrangement with the view to meeting the objection mentioned. It is an experiment and we have either to adopt it and give it a fair trial, or resolve on the other plan of doing away with official reporting altogether. A great many members do not feel disposed to do away with it; and I think we might adopt a system that has proved successful elsewhere. We think this system could be worked out successfully, at all events it is worth a trial; and we present it to the House for consideration with a view to having it worked out in the best possible way.

MR. VALLÉE said the *Hansard* was not a faithful report of the Debates in this

House. If that was so to what end was it published? He believed that it was perfectly useless to devote so large a sum to the publication of the Debates when they were not faithfully reported. Either the Debates must be reported as they were delivered in the House, or the *Hansard* must be published in some other manner, and members must rely on the press of the country. He, for one, was in favour of the abolition of the *Hansard*. He considered that the sum paid each year for the publication of the Debates of this House was uselessly expended, because it did not serve to procure them a correct account of what passed in the House. He thought they ought rather to give a certain sum to the journals of each party, in order to engage them to reproduce what each member of each party said in the House.

MR. BLAKE: I was one of those who supported the proposition for a *Hansard* when it was first mooted, and warmly opposed the theoretical objection that was then made that it would prolong the debates of the House. I did not believe that would be the result, because my opinion was that, if any hon. gentleman desired to attain and retain a place of consideration in this House, he would soon learn that it was not by making long speeches. I was of the opinion, as I expressed it then, that the inducement to make long speeches, which was afforded by the publication of the *Hansard*, would not be strong enough to overhear that consideration to which I have referred. I must confess that experience has not wholly justified my views, and I do believe that a good many protracted speeches are made now which would not have been made or, at any rate, protracted to such an extent, if it had not been for the fact of a system of official reporting. I have, therefore, for some time wavered in the opinion that, on the whole, it was conducive to the discharge of the business of this House that we should have this system. I feel the very great difficulties under which we labour, which are unseparable from holding the seat of Government in this place. The principle newspapers of the country are published far from the scene of our debates, and it is perfectly impossible for them to report our speeches even at reasonable length, as a rule, and more particularly when the

Session gets to the heat of its business, with discussions taking place at a late hour. That state of things would continue if the *Hansard* were abolished. But I believe that the evil to which I have referred, is a growing evil, and that we may expect, from year to year, speeches to be made which would not have been made if not for the publishing of the Official Report. It is confessed the present system has not been successful, the complaints made every Session are that the contract system has not been working very satisfactorily. An experiment is now proposed to be tried, and for my part, I am not indisposed to assent to the Report, if no adverse motion with reference to it is made. We shall see what the result of the new plan will be. But I say, frankly, that unless there is a very great improvement under that new scheme in the result as to the reports of the debates, and unless I find that the evil to which I have referred diminishes instead of increasing, as at present, I shall not be, the Session after next, an advocate for the continuance of the *Hansard*.

MR. CASEY: The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has pointed out a real evil in connection with *Hansard*, that it leads, occasionally, to undue verbosity. It is quite possible, on the other hand, that the *Hansard*, which secures the reporting and publishing of the speeches in this House may, at times, secure a due discussion of questions that otherwise might not be duly discussed. Of course we all know that what is said in the House is intended to influence public opinion outside of it as well as hon. members. As to this reporting scheme, as a whole, there may be differences of opinion, but I think there can be none as to the desirability of having proof-sheets of our speeches the day after they are made. But, as to making the reporters servants of the House and country, I feel considerable doubt. In the first place, I fear they would simply be an addition to the Sessional staff, and it is possible that political influence might have as much to do with their appointment as efficiency, which might produce serious inconvenience. In the second place, I am informed by practical men, that it would be scarcely possible to have what is proposed done, with only the staff proposed. The Govern-

ment or House of Commons rarely gets as much work from its employés as a private contractor would; so it is not likely that they will get this reporting done as economically as a private contractor could. On the whole, the chances are that it would be cheaper to contract with some person for the reporting *en bloc*, than have it done by our own officials. If it is determined to have more work done than now—and this scheme involves it—the cost will be greater. I think it would be much wiser to ask tenders on the basis of such extra work. These tenders should be asked for now, leaving the rest of the scheme over for some time. I am informed that the Committee requested the present contractor to draw up a detailed scheme for their information, which he did. I am not aware whether they have fully considered it. I see they have made no allusion to it. I think this information would be of use to the House as well as to the Committee in considering the question, and that it ought to be laid before us. I think it would be well to postpone that part of the Report recommending that the reporters be employed and paid by the House till next Session.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) : I think that the experience in regard to the *Hansard* has been, on the whole, satisfactory, although some difficulties have been experienced in the working of the system, and one of the chief has been referred to by the hon. member for South Leeds. The object of this Report, as I understand, is to do away with those difficulties. Every member who speaks in the House, under the new system, will not have an opportunity of revising his speech until it appears in the papers, and every member has had a copy laid on his desk. Therefore, any changes made afterwards anything that was said being struck out by the hon. member, who would have desired not to have said it, could be contrasted with the printed evidence or report on the Table. This seems to be a matter of very great consequence. No doubt a very great evil has arisen from the tendency on the part of some members, in revising their speeches, to forget that the privilege of revision does not include the privilege of excluding anything, which, having said, they may desire not to have said. In my own case, I was led

Mr. CASEY.

into an error which I would have been glad to exclude from the *Hansard*. I did exclude it from the journal with which I have been connected, but did not exclude it from the *Hansard*, for the reason that its having been commented objectionably upon, I had no right to exclude it from this record. What we want is a record of what is actually said in Parliament, not a record of the afterthought of members who may not have spoken as they desired to speak. Then there is another feature with regard to the *Hansard* itself. We cannot hope to have full reports of Parliament in the newspapers. That is simply impossible. We may have the speeches of leading members; those who occupy prominent positions on either side of the House will always have their speeches reported in the newspapers with tolerable accuracy and fullness. But a newspaper cannot hold a full report, and it means simply this; that speeches quite as valuable as those of the leading members on the Ministerial or Opposition benches, but delivered by hon. gentlemen who are not in the habit of addressing the House, are not reported at all. They are lost to their constituents, and they are lost to the country. Therefore, it seems to me important that an Official Record of this kind should be kept up for that purpose. As to the tendency of *Hansard* to induce long debates, anyone who looks back to the Parliamentary history of Canada will remember a great deal longer speeches some years ago than we have now. I can remember very well when a prominent gentleman in this country, who was a member of this House, used to speak from five to seven hours, and many other members addressed the House at great length. Those speeches were always reported in full. It seems to me that this change is worth trying, at any rate. It is worth an effort to see whether we cannot get an Official Report, which will really be a Report of what is said in Parliament; and if we can do that under this system for one Session, then I think we will have accomplished something worth the money which is expended on the *Hansard*.

Mr. PLUMB: Every hon. gentleman who is in the habit of addressing the House, will feel that it will a great relief to him to have a plan adopted which will lead to

the improvement of the Reports of the Official *Debates*. No doubt these Reports are necessary, and the idea that they tend to increase the length of speeches, I think, is an entire mistake. What we desire is, as far as possible, such a Report as will relieve us from the difficulty of endeavouring to grope our way through the reporters' manuscript to make out what we have said, and to try to find out what our meaning was from the notes which are sent to us, which are often obscure, and seem to have been taken hurriedly. These Reports have been, I regret to say, this year, very imperfect. I have found, and I presume every hon. gentleman has found, who has revised those notes, that he was obliged to exercise his utmost skill in endeavoring to discover how it happens that the reporter put into his mouth exactly the opposite of what he intended to say; and this may lead to an enormous abuse, that of permitting extensive alterations, an abuse which I presume everybody desires to prevent. I trust that if the system is continued, it will be the decision of the House to secure the very best talent, to have the Reports promptly made, and to have them published in the way the Chairman of the Printing Committee suggested, which, I think, is the true way, and then the members will be permitted to make such revisions as are necessary to convey their true meaning. For one, I believe the mode which has been suggested is in the right direction, and that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is quite mistaken when he supposes that we will achieve that which we desire to achieve by making a contract at all. I think the staff should be under the control of the House. I trust that next year we shall have a thorough reform in the reporting of the Debates. My remarks have been made not with any feeling of unkindness towards the reporters. On the contrary, I think they have been over-tasked, and I think many of the complaints have arisen from the fact that the arrangements, and not the reporters, were at fault; but I feel bound, in all candour, to state that I would rather see the system of official reporting abolished altogether, than see it carried on hereafter as it has been this Session.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) : One of the greatest faults of the old contract system was that the contractor having a lump sum for the reporting, a special inducement was held out to him to secure cheap men, or pay a low rate for the reporting. Consequently, it sometimes happened that the staff was not composed of the best men to be found in that profession. Under the new system we have fixed the minimum salary at \$1,000, and a salary of \$1,500 for the chief, believing that at these figures, we can get the best talent and the most experienced stencographers in the country. Their being officers of the House will give dignity as well as permanency to their employment, which will dispose these gentlemen to make it their ambition to qualify themselves as thoroughly as possible for their work, to remain a number of years in the service, and by their experience, if by no other means, secure that efficiency which will qualify them for the discharge of their duty well. It is the system which was adopted many years ago in the United States. The reporters there are permanent officers, and I think the chief reporter at Washington was once a reporter in the gallery of our own House, and he receives a very liberal salary. Under their system, of course, it is much easier to report their debates than ours. Still, I believe a staff of six will be able to give us a full enough report of our Debates, will secure us more accurate reports than we have already yet secured, and make the Official Report of the debates more satisfactory and more reliable than they have been under the old system. It is useless to prolong the debate, but I am glad to see that the sense of the House, as far as yet expressed, concurs in the Report of the Committee. I hope that before the House rises the whole system will be put on a satisfactory basis.

Motion agreed to and Report concurred in.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

The following Bill was, with leave of the House, *withdrawn* :—

Bill (No. 66) To incorporate the Quebec and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Domville).

Ordered, that the fees paid on the said Bill, less the cost of printing and translation, be refunded, in accordance with the recommenda-

tion of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.—(Mr. Domville).

BILL INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 117) To repeal the Act 42 Vic., cap. 5, for granting an annual subsidy towards certain telegraphic communication.—(Mr. Langevin).

KING'S COUNTY, N.S.—GASPEREAUX RIVER FISHERIES.

QUESTION.

MR. BORDEN enquired, Whether the Government has received any communication from the Municipal Council of King's County, N.S., alleging the injurious effect upon the Fisheries of the Gasperaux River of a certain mill dam situated thereon, and asking the interference of the Government to protect said Fisheries; and what action, if any, the Government has taken or intends to take in the matter?

MR. POPE (P. E. I.): In reply to the hon. gentleman I desire to say that a petition, complaining of the injurious effects of this dam and asking for its removal, has been received, and that such steps as may be deemed necessary to the protection of the Fisheries will be taken in the matter.

MANITOBA TICKET AGENCIES.

QUESTION.

MR. BOURBEAU enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to come to an arrangement with the Railway and Navigation Companies, for the establishment, in the country parts of Canada, of agencies for the sale of tickets to Manitoba; which would be of great advantage to those intending to emigrate to the North-West, and would assist in preventing the emigration now directed towards the United States?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said it was not thought necessary to take any special measures for establishing such agencies.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY STOCK ON THE LEVIS AND KENNEBEC RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. LAURIER enquired, Is it with the consent of the Government that a certain quantity of the rolling-stock of the Intercolonial Railway is now used by a certain company styling itself the

"Lévis and Kennebec Railway Company," on the line of the Lévis and Kennebec Railway; if so, what quantity and description of stock is the said company so using, for what time, and on what conditions?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: None of the Intercolonial Railway rolling-stock is used by the Lévis and Kennebec Railway in any other way than rolling-stock is used by other railways, that is, in the way of the usual interchange of cars under the ordinary mileage terms.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—SUPREME COURT JUDGES' SALARIES.

REMARKS.

Order for the House to again Resolve itself into Committee of Supply, read.

MR. BRECKEN: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to call the attention of the House to the position occupied by the Judges of the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island. The salaries of the Judges on Prince Edward Island entering the Union were as follows: Chief Justice, \$3,000; Assistant Judge and Master of the Rolls, \$2,500; Assistant Judge and Vice-Chancellor, \$2,500, and the usual allowances for travelling expenses, namely, \$200 a year. I consider that this arrangement is nothing more or less than an unmerited slight cast on our Judges. On the score of legal attainments and ability, I think our Judges will compare very favourably with the Judges in many parts of the Dominion. The nature and character of the causes that come before our Supreme Court are very frequently as difficult and intricate as those which engage the attention of the Courts in other parts of the Dominion. Our Judges require to be learned and upright men; and although our Province is small in area, it is the most densely populated Province in the Dominion. I do not contend that our Judges should receive salaries equal to those paid to the Supreme Court Judges of the larger Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but I would like to be informed by those who fixed the salaries of the Prince Edward Island Judges, upon what basis they acted. It certainly could not have been that our Bench is inferior to that of the other Maritime Provinces, or to that of British Columbia or Manitoba.

The business which engages the time of our Supreme Court, I venture to say, is much more difficult, and requires as much, if not a greater, amount of legal talent to dispose of them properly than is required to dispose of suits in those far distant Provinces. If population was the basis, then we have been most unjustly treated. At the last Census, in 1871, Prince Edward Island had a population of 90,021. Our Chief Justice receives \$3,000; Puisne Judges, \$2,500. At the last Census we had a population of 94,021. The decade has nearly passed, and when the Census is taken next year, it will be found that we have a population of over 100,000, and allow me to assure this House that our people are as intelligent and well educated. We are not like our British Columbian friends, we have very few Indians. When I look at British Columbia with its 50,000 white population, and Manitoba with its 11,853 white people, and when I reflect that the Chief Justice of British Columbia receives \$5,000, and two Puisne or Assistant Judges, \$4,000 each, and that in Manitoba the Bench are paid at the same rate, I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have just cause to complain of the gross injustice that is being done to Prince Edward Island. I claim that our Judges should be paid at the same rate as the Judges of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, they are as hard worked. The Judges of the two last named are paid as follows: Chief Justice, \$5,000; each Puisne Judge, \$4,000; Equity Judge, \$5,000. The cost of living has, of late years, much increased on the Island, and I assure you it is hard work for our Judges to live and maintain their dignity in a manner becoming their position in the community. I know that the present Government are not responsible for placing these salaries at such a small amount. I appeal with confidence to the right hon. the leader of Government and his colleagues to put this matter right. All I ask for is justice.

MR. DOMVILLE: I think I have as much reason to complain as the hon. gentleman. I have about one-third as many people in my county as he has got in his whole Province, and yet we have no Lieutenant-Governor, Upper or Lower House, and no member of the House of

Commons besides myself. I have not, so far, obtained any large concessions for my county, but I trust that when the hon. gentleman brings his many complaints before the Government, in regard to the Island, he will remember King's County.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think King's County should be satisfied with having my hon. friend instead of all the officials mentioned. I will not enter into a discussion of this subject at this period of the Session. It was before the House last Session and during the previous Parliament; but I think the time has come, or is approaching, when the whole question of legal salaries will be reconsidered. It is the intention of the Government during the Recess to consider the whole question of judicial salaries, not only those of the Supreme Court Judges, but of all the tribunals whose Judges are appointed by the Dominion Government, with a view to laying down some general principles and submitting it to the consideration of Parliament, next Session. In such case the claims of the Judges of the Superior Courts of Prince Edward Island will, of course, be fully considered. I can say no more at present. Although the Province is small, the dignity, responsibility and rank of its Judges are the same as those of other parts of the Dominion. But the question of salary, and the question of rank and position are two separate and distinct propositions, and have to be considered from altogether a different point of view. I shall be glad if the result of our consideration will be to meet the views of my hon. friend, and to increase the salaries of the Superior Court Judges of Prince Edward Island.

MR. BLAKE: I was not personally responsible for the action of the late Government in fixing the salaries of the Judges, but it was my duty to defend that proposition in subsequent Sessions, and I do not think the hon. member put the question entirely and fairly before the House, when he stated a slight had been offered to Prince Edward Island. It is necessary, in the present state of the case, that this question should be restated. As I have had occasion before to state, you must, in the public interest, pay such salaries as will enable us to acquire the best material to make judges of. The question is: What salary is

requisite to bring to the Bench the material best adapted to fill those situations. In all countries it is found that the dignity, the relief, the ease and the security of the position, coupled with the very serious advantage of a retiring allowance after a reasonable term of service, suffice to enable Governments to obtain from the Bar men whose professional incomes average larger than the salary they receive on going on the Bench. The scale of professional emoluments varies in different Provinces in accordance with the character of the transactions which enter into litigation, the general habits of the people, and the general expenses of living. Consequently we have always more or less to consider these matters, when we are fixing what shall be the fair salary of a Judge. I disagree altogether with the view—and I understand the hon. the First Minister to disagree with it—that any slight was offered to any Province or to the judicial official of any Province because his salary was placed at a lower grade than the salary of an analogous official in another Province. His dignity may be the same, his rank may be the same, and the duties he has to perform may be relatively the same, but the price to be paid for his services is to be governed by those considerations to which I have alluded. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brecken) alleges that a slight has been offered to Prince Edward Island because the salary since Confederation has been fixed at \$3,000. Just before Confederation, the Legislature of Prince Edward Island had relieved its Supreme Court Judges of a very considerable portion of their duties, and imposed upon the Dominion a considerable additional annual charge, by creating no less than three County Court Judges—creating them in anticipation of the Union, and because the salaries would afterwards be paid here and not by the Island. Therefore, the Supreme Court Judges had less duties to discharge than formerly. The Legislature of the Province, when there was that happy combination of responsibility involved in the right to appoint, and the payment being invested in the same persons, had fixed the salaries of those high judicial officers at what they thought was necessary. I think the salary of the Chief Justice was \$1,900 a year. His

duties were very much diminished, as I have pointed out, and yet he is positively insulted because the Parliament of Canada raised his salary from \$1,900 to \$3,000. I do not mean to say that it would not be proper to raise those salaries consistently with the principles which I have just sketched, because the expenses of living may have increased very much on the Island. If that is the case, however, the hon. gentleman has lent his powerful assistance in bringing about that result, and it may be necessary that the salaries of the Judges and their officers should be considered in regard to the changed circumstances of the Province. But it may be rather hard for us to be told by my hon. friend, when he has helped to impose upon the country and his own people additional cost of living, that the country is, therefore, to increase the salaries in order that the increased cost of living may be borne. Before Confederation, the salaries in Prince Edward Island were fixed with a due regard to frugality. The Attorney-General received \$2,000, and the Premier, I think, got \$650 a year. I merely state that to show that formerly in that Province the officials did not require such large salaries to enable them to live comfortably and happily. It is since that time circumstances have occurred to alter the scale of living or professional emoluments, to change those circumstances to which I have referred as governing judicial salaries. I do not see any reason why those salaries should be increased. I object to the view that, because British Columbia or Manitoba are extremely expensive Provinces to live in and larger salaries are needed, we should apply the same scale of salaries to other Provinces. In Ontario and Quebec where professional emoluments are much larger, a larger salary is required to get fit men from the Bar to become Judges, but no country should fix the salaries of Judges at a less price, having regard to the circumstances of the country, than will secure fit and able men for judicial positions.

MR. BRECKEN: Perhaps the House will allow me one or two words in explanation of the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for West Durham. The hon. gentleman is in error in thinking that the duties per-

formed by the County Court Judges were taken from the shoulders of the Supreme Court Judges. Before the County Courts were established, we had Courts of Commissioners for the collection of small debts. The Island was divided into small districts, and four or five laymen constituted the Bench in each case. Naturally, the jurisdiction of the County Courts was much larger than the jurisdiction of those lay Commissioners, but ninety-nine cases out of 100 brought before the County Courts are cases which would have been brought before the Commissioners. It is a delusion to think that the duties of the Supreme Court have been lightened since the constitution of those Courts. But why should we not have County Courts as well as the rest of the Dominion? One of the main arguments used when we were asked to come into the Union was that we would become a part of this great Dominion, and enjoy all the benefits and privileges of its great institutions, and now we are taunted with not having remained in the state of primitive simplicity in which we were before. Allusion has been made to the salary of the Chief Justice. Previous to our enjoying Responsible Government our Chief Justice was paid from England, and was in receipt of £1,100 a year. In 1851, Responsible Government was introduced to the Island, and popular rights were advocated for the first time, and one of the planks of the platform was, that public men should serve their country for a shilling a day and find themselves. That was one of the main reasons why the salaries were fixed so small. I believe in the principle that has always been advocated in England that, if any class of public servants should be independent and placed above suspicion and temptation, it is the Judges of the Supreme Court. They have to decide upon the dearest and most highly-prized rights of our fellow beings. The lives and property of men are at their disposal, and hang upon their breath. It is not the amount of labour, or the length of the docket, but the amount of legal lore they ought to possess, that should be taken into account in fixing the salaries; and to give those Judges \$3,000 a year is to cast an insult and slight upon the intelligence of the Province I come from. The hon. member for West Durham has mysteriously hinted that I have had

something to do with the increase in the cost of living in Prince Edward Island. Our complaint is that the National Policy, to which the hon. gentleman undoubtedly alluded, has not done us much harm, but it has not done us much good. We have not derived the benefits from it that our friends from Upper Canada have derived. The National Policy is not injuring us very much, but it is a little inconvenient for those who have been in the habit of trading with the Old Country. The extra duty almost amounts to prohibition of trade with England, but we can get the articles we need from the Dominion, and perhaps the greatest inconvenience that can arise will be that merchants will have to break their old trade and commercial relations, and trade more extensively with the Dominion. Surely, the hon. member for West Durham, who must have at heart the welfare and prosperity of the country, cannot complain if that is one of the results of the National Policy. We do not expect that the great National Policy is to be moulded to suit our little Province, but we do expect that owing to our exceptional position, if we stand by and see the larger Provinces prospering, we should not be sneered and laughed at when we come forward with our little demands, but substantial justice should be meted out to us.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is quite understood that if any hon. member has a grievance, by a little courtesy, a short conversation may be allowed to take place, strictly on the grievance. We were rather getting off the track, dealing with other subjects, and I hope, now that attention has been called to it, we shall get back to the question before the Chair.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The remarks from my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Brecken), might be easily summarised; his conclusion seems to be this: That while the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government has done no good to his Province—while he does not want to be a partisan against his friends in office, and condemn them—while he is willing to take the position that the Island should be disposed, even to suffer, if necessary, for the general good—yet he thinks when its representatives ask for increased salaries for the Island officials, the fact of

the Island's disposition to suffer for the general good, shall secure an increase of the salaries without any noise being made. If those remarks of the hon. gentleman had been applied all round, I do not think it would be necessary to notice it. But, if there is any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House whom I should be indisposed severely to criticise it would be himself. He comes and speaks for Prince Edward Island where the Judges at one time were well enough paid. He looks at Ontario and sees a higher scale of remuneration in that Province, and says—lift us up to that level. He does not feel that he is a member of this Parliament for the Dominion.

MR. BRECKEN: I do feel that.

MR. HUNTINGTON: He does not forget that he is a Prince Edward Islander. There are those who tell us that the Dominion cow is running dry, and if he is to milk her in the sense of Prince Edward Island advantage, altogether—if he is not to discuss this expenditure from a Dominion point of view—he will set an example which, if followed by members less distinguished but equally devoted to their Provinces, must prove mischievous. His example would favour this course: that we should all come here as Prince Edward Islanders, British Columbians, Quebecers, Nova Scotians or Ontario men, as representatives of the different Provinces, simply, having no special regard for the Dominion except in the sense a state with a treasury to be kept filled for the purpose of those Provinces. This idea is so clearly visible in the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that I must hold him up—and I am sorry to have to do it—as a fearful example of the evil we must avoid in this respect: and while we implore the Provinces to remember that the Dominion Treasury, notwithstanding the benefits of the National Policy, is not altogether so full that it cannot be depleted, we beg the representatives of the different Provinces to remember that they are not Provincial representatives solely and exclusively, but are responsible for such legislation as may be economical, and may commend itself to the men who desire a just, fair and safe administration of the affairs of the country. Nobody desires to deal unfairly with Prince Edward Island, or any

other Province; but what I have felt hurt at and am disinclined to press too much on the hon. gentleman, is that he has expressed himself as an Islander, whose duty it was to get all he could get out of the Dominion—an example likely to be followed by others, to the endangering of the prosperity of the country.

CIVIL SERVICE EXPENDITURE.

MOTION OF WANT OF CONFIDENCE.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT:

I am not quite certain as to the strict correction of the constitutional principle laid down by the hon. the First Minister, but waiving that point I propose to submit a motion, following the precedent set by himself in a previous Session. He may not consider it a vote of Want of Confidence—I hope he will not and that the motion will be adopted. It will be recollected that, in former days, we used to hear a great deal from the hon. gentlemen opposite, when the Liberal party was in office, about the necessity of diminishing our expenditure. Some of their motions are on record protesting against the expenditure of the late Government and calling for its diminution. Since their accession to office, I do not find that that expenditure has diminished or is likely to diminish. The Returns for the last year, and the Estimates for the present and next year, show no reasonable ground for expecting any diminution. Now, among the votes demanded are three or four items specially objected to by hon. gentlemen opposite when we were in office. On many occasions they objected to the amount asked for the Civil Service, Superannuation, Indians, Post Office and Civil Government. In the year 1878, the last during which we held office, the total expenditure for Superannuation amounted to \$106,000, the estimate for it at present is \$142,000 or nearly 35 per cent. in addition; for Indians, in 1878, the expenditure was \$428,000, while last night, we passed through simply a vote for \$650,000 for the same purpose; for Post Offices, in 1878, the expenditure was \$1,724,000, in the Estimates for 1881, the vote demanded is \$1,852,000, being an increase of \$128,000; for Civil Government, in 1878, we expended \$823,000, and for 1881, we are asked to expend \$917,000. Now, I am not going to ana-

MR. HUNTINGTON.

lyse this sum in detail, or assert that in all these cases there has necessarily been extravagance, but I do assert that we have been very unfairly censured for the expenses that were incurred in the light of those identical Estimates now brought down. I intend to devote my remarks almost exclusively to the contemplated increase for Civil Government. This is one of the most difficult departmental charges to reduce, when you have once sanctioned a considerable increase in it. If the House will look through the detailed accounts for the last half dozen years, they will see that, whereas, the late Government in entering office, found the expenditure for this service very nearly \$900,000, they succeeded in three or four years in reducing it by about \$75,000, to the sum of \$823,000. All our good work is being undone, however, that item being now increased by about \$90,000 as contrasted with the actual expenditure for 1878. I call attention to this, more particularly, for these two reasons: First, as I have stated above, because this is an item which hon. Ministers find it extremely difficult to reduce, if once they sanction additional expenditure; and secondly, because when they make an increase in the Civil Service Staff, they likewise provide for an increase in the Superannuation Estimate, to which many members used to object very strongly during the late Government, and also incur a steady annual increase of \$50 a year for each new officer. This increase of \$90,000 is not in the sums authorised by the Statute, but in a vote of something very little over \$600,000—an increase of something like 16 per cent. on the former expenditure. I am sorry to say that another illusion, which hon. gentlemen opposite, in former days, indulged in, has been thus ruthlessly dissipated. We were told by them often that the moment they took our places they would in some mode contrive to make a great saving in the General Expenditure. The present hon. Finance Minister was of opinion that \$22,500,000, or thereabouts, ought to be amply sufficient for all the purposes of Government. I am not disposed to condemn him too severely for having discovered that estimate to be wholly inadequate. Many causes will contribute to keep up our expenditure for some years at a very high average; but it

is on that ground that I deprecate the present attempt to increase those services in the way now proposed. Under the head of Civil Government the amount as put for the several services, with, I think, but one exception, shows a considerable increase in each case, the exception being in the office of the Queen's Privy Council, in which, owing to a death, some reduction has been made. The total increase, as compared with the Estimates for 1880, amounts to no less than \$57,277. There is a nominal decrease of about \$13,000 in one estimate, but this was in connection with the extension of the staff, for which votes were taken, rather as a matter of precaution than with any special view necessarily to expand the service. I am very much afraid that the increase, which is most marked in almost every single item, is going to continue, and that unless the House choose to apply some decided check, they will find themselves involved in very much greater expenditures than they have any idea of. I desire to call attention to the position in which we stand, as compared with the position in 1874-75, and the comparisons I propose to take are entirely independent of what are called miscellaneous receipts, and also of the corresponding charges on the other side. I shall deal with what may be considered our actual income and deduct our fixed charges, and compare the result for those several years. I think those results are sufficiently startling to make it worth while for the House to pause before they sanction any increase, which can possibly be avoided, to our annual expenditure. In 1874 our total receipts from the three great items of income—Customs, Excise, and Stamps, amounted in round numbers to \$20,121,000. Our fixed charges: Interest on Sinking Fund, Management of Debt, Subsidies, and Cost of Collections, amounted to \$11,121,000. In other words after deducting fixed charges from our true income, we had available for all purposes in 1874, the sum of \$9,000,000. In 1875, our total income from these sources was \$20,664,000. The charges against it in like manner amounted to \$12,007,000, and our practical income available to all purposes, to \$8,658,000; but in 1878 our income was but \$17,841,000, while our fixed charges ran up to \$12,589,000, leaving us for all purposes but \$5,252,000. In 1879 our in-

come was \$18,476,000, and fixed charges were \$12,883,000; income for all purposes, \$5,593,000. I fear there is but small chance that we shall receive any greater net income the present year, while our charges will be quite as great, if not higher; and even if all the Finance Minister's Estimates are realised it is quite clear, when you come to deduct the fixed charges, our total income for all purposes will still be less by a couple of millions than the income we possessed in 1874-75. I need not say that is an extremely unsatisfactory position, and although it is no part of my present purpose to enter into the question of how far the present Ministers are to blame, or their predecessors, for this state of things, I think it is well worth the attention of the House to consider whether, in such circumstances, when our available income has fallen, in four or five years, from \$9,000,000 to \$5,593,000, this is precisely the time we should choose to add to the expenditure for Civil Government an annual charge of \$90,000 as compared with 1878, and of \$50,000 or \$60,000 as compared with last year. If any reforms were to be made, it could only be by our cutting down the total vote, and leaving the hon. gentlemen opposite to so adjust the expenditure for Civil Government, as to save the sum which the House may deem expedient. I am aware that a large portion of this expenditure has been caused by the creation of two distinct Departments, one for Railways and the other for Public Works, in place of the old single Department. I do not think it can be contended that those two Departments will have, in future, more work to do or as much as when the hon. member for Lambton was Premier. We are not in a position to say positively how far the calculations of the hon. the Finance Minister are likely to be realised, but if any indication is to be obtained from the Returns recently made, I fear the total for the present year will very slightly, if at all, exceed the income for the past year, and the consequence will be we shall have \$5,500,000 or \$6,000,000 only available, out of which no less than \$900,000 are claimed for Civil Government, and \$600,000 for Legislation, leaving us very little more than \$4,500,000 for all other purposes. I admit that, relatively to the

enormous sums we have been dealing with, a proposal to save \$50, \$60 or \$70 a year may not appear to hon. gentlemen opposite or their supporters much worth considering. After all is said and done, the little saving I propose to effect will be only about one-tenth of the annual interest of the sum that will probably be sunk in contracts recently entered into in British Columbia. It will only be about one-twenty-fifth part of the sum which we throw away for the purpose of establishing one or two sugar refineries in the Dominion, and about one-hundredth part of the sum which we voluntarily fine ourselves each year for the purpose of encouraging a few manufactures. But we are content with the day of small things. We have tried to effect large economies, and we could not do it. With a view of meeting the views of the hon. gentlemen who were not able to vote for the motion of the hon. member for West Durham, but who may still object to swelling unnecessarily the expenses of Civil Government, I propose, bearing in mind their own previous declarations, their own oft-repeated assaults upon myself and my hon. friends around me, I propose, in direct accordance with their own protestations, now to give them an opportunity for reducing what I must consider the excessive vote demanded for the purposes of Civil Government. One of two results, at any rate, must happen: either we shall be able to put a timely check on the extravagances we deplore, or else those hon. gentlemen will be able to give the public some tolerably clear proof of the value of their professions, and their desires for economy in the matter of Civil Government. I, therefore, propose to move in amendment:

That all the words after "that" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"It be Resolved, That the total expenditure made under the Supply Act for the purposes of Civil Government for the year ending 30th June, 1878, was \$609,969; that it is now proposed to expend for the same purposes the sum of \$700,185, for the year ending 30th June, 1881; that it is inexpedient in the present position of finances that the scale of expenditure should be increased by the large sum of over \$90,000; and that the sum proposed to be voted, be reduced to a total amount not exceeding \$630,000."

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman, who has made this motion, to some

statements I have made in this House which have not been and cannot be controverted. On the occasion of my second exposition of the Finances of the Dominion, I made some statements on the subject. There were exceptional expenditures made in the years from 1873 to 1879. It we take this from the Estimates for the next year, the practical result is, that the expenditure next year will be between \$1,000,000 and \$300,000 less than the year referred to. The hon. gentleman has called attention to a statement I made on one occasion, and which I repeat now, that in my judgment there was no reason why the average expenditure for 1873-74 and 1874-75 should have exceeded \$22,500,000. It has been held that the expenditure properly belonging to the year 1873-74 should not have exceeded that sum, and I am satisfied for the two years previous, by the reduction in the expenditure on Public Works, it might have been kept within that figure. But I have never said that now, when we are engaged in enlarging the Canals and constructing the Pacific Railway, the expenditure can be confined to that figure. I would like to know, when the hon. gentleman refers to \$609,000 as the expenditure for Civil Service in 1878, if he includes Contingencies.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: It includes the exact sum authorised by the Supply Bill, and the exact sum that was spent. I am speaking of the annual expenditure, not that which was simply authorised.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I asked the question because the hon. gentlemen opposite expended a larger sum under the head of Contingencies than was expended last year or is proposed to be expended this year, because a larger number of salaries were transferred from Contingencies to the Permanent List. But the hon. gentleman took credit for making a large reduction in the year 1874-75 of \$75,000; that was by dropping the bonus that had been given to employes in the previous year. In 1873, the sum of \$75,000 was voted for the purpose of increasing the salaries of the officials generally, for the reason that the cost of living had increased since the salaries were fixed in 1867. That additional sum was continued for two years in 1873-74 and 1874-75. We find in

1875-76 an expenditure of \$909,000, against an estimated expenditure at the present time of \$917,415. The hon. gentleman says they reduced the expenditure in one year. They did that, I presume, by striking off that \$75,000 of bounts. I believe, however, the Session previous a Bill was introduced which increased the salaries of the Civil Service, but it was abandoned for some reason or other. The hon. gentleman takes exception to the increase since 1878-79, but he must know perfectly well that under the Civil Service Act there is an increase of \$50 a year for certain officers, which very largely increased the expenditure from year to year, and that must continue, unless Parliament deems it well to amend that Act so as to make the salaries stationary. The other increases, under the head of Civil Government, are caused in various ways. In the first place, they assisted, by the statutory addition of \$50 per annum to the salaries of the clerks, until they reach a certain sum. Another cause of the increase is the opening up of the North-West, which involves an increase in the work of the Government. Then increases have been incurred by reason of the division of the Department of Public Works into the Department of Railways and the Department of Public Works. In the same Departments several salaries which have been charged to capital now come under Civil Government. That makes an apparent increase in the expenses of the Civil Government; but the fact is that the salaries were paid before, although they did not appear under the head of Civil Government, to which the motion under consideration applies. Another increase is caused by the necessity of having an additional clerk in the Audit Department, and another is made necessary by the increase in the circulation of Dominion notes. But these increases will be more than compensated for by the increase in the Revenue which, will be derived from the increased circulation. The circulation itself will give the Government \$100,000 a year, and the release of the two millions of reserve in gold will give another \$100,000. From this has to be deducted \$25,000 for printing the notes and the other things, which leaves a revenue of \$175,000, a sum large enough to pay the interest on the much

abused expenditure in British Columbia. I quite agree that it is desirable to retrench, but while members opposite are loudly in favour of a reduction, they themselves proposed increases. For instance, they, through the Library Committee, increased the salaries of the clerks, and increased the salary of the messenger. They proposed to give the messenger connected with the Library \$850 per annum for instance, or \$50 more than he is now getting, while the highest salary for a messenger was \$500. When in office, too, hon. gentlemen opposite paid certain messengers their \$500 per annum, and \$100 additional from Contingencies. Besides all this the introducer of the motion, when in office, and when Canada was, as he called it, a cheap country to live in, had the power to reduce salaries if he had desired to do so. But he did not offer to do so. He proposed rather to make increases under all these circumstances. I do not think the proposition of the hon. gentleman should be sustained.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: The hon. the Finance Minister asked for an explanation of the clause of the increase in 1874-75 and 1875-76. The answer is simply this: That when that hon. gentleman was in office in 1873, he originated an immense number of minor public works, causing an increased expenditure of \$1,116,000 in 1874-75; \$1,106,000 in 1875-76; and \$587,000 in 1876-77. That was the reason why there was such a comparison in his favour.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): This is a very important motion—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question; carried.

MR. WHITE: I will stand here till 12 o'clock to-night, but I will have my say. There is no member, that has been a member of this House for five years past, but knows how the present Administration, when in Opposition, advocated a reduction in expenditure, how they brought up motion after motion that it was the duty of the Government of the day not to increase the expenditure in the Civil Service, and I think now that it is the duty of this Government to make some reduction in the Civil Service salaries instead of the increases that are made. I do not think

the Government are so much to blame in this matter. Members of rural constituencies should not assist the city members in getting on extra clerks in the Civil Service, and increasing salaries to those who are already in the Service; but they say: "we want an increase of salary for this officer or the other officer," and so far as Ministers are concerned, they are pressed by hon. members of this House. I believe that the Judges, the members of the Civil Service, the Speaker of the House, and the Speaker of the Senate, the members of the Government, and all the members of the Senate and of this House of Commons, could very well do with a reduction of 10 per cent. all round, and save a large amount of money to the taxpayers of this country. I believe this could be done, and it is the duty of this Government, with their majority of 80, to do it. This is a motion which involves a Want of Confidence.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh; question; carried.

MR. WHITE: You can go on, gentlemen, with your interruptions. You cannot put me down. I am too many years here to be scared. When you are ready to stop your interruptions, I am ready to go on. This is a motion of Want of Confidence, and I am sorry that it is, for I should have liked to have voted for it. But the hon. the Minister of Finance has promised to permit no increases to take place. I will vote for the Government on the promise that he will not only not make any increase, but that he will make a decrease. On that understanding I will vote against the motion. I do not think that the mechanics, and farmers, and merchants are getting any better off, and I hope and trust that the Government, if they want my support, will make the decrease that I have just mentioned.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question; carried.

MR. WHITE: Oh, hon. gentlemen over there can go on with their noises. I will be bound to say it hurts their boots more than my conscience. It does not hurt me a bit. I know, and I repeat, that the rural members and the city members are to blame; they are too willing to ask for increases of different officers; and they go to the Ministers and they beg, and scold, and

plead in order to get these increases. I hope the members of the rural districts, and all of us, will not allow the Civil Service to rule the country. This motion comes with a bad grace from the late Minister of Finance, for when the present party now in power pressed his Government not to increase the number of Civil servants, he paid no attention to their advice, but increased the number of employes in every Department, and largely increased their salaries. But the electors punished him and other members of his party and drove them from power, because they did not carry out the promises made previous to their getting the reins of Government. I hope that my hon. friend will take warning and administer the affairs of the country in a manner that will be satisfactory to the taxpayers.

MR. BOULTBEE: I would like to see economy carried out. I would like to see it begun with the members. It is certainly my impression that the money expended in the Civil Service is over large. If we increase in wealth, and extend our borders, we may get a population sufficient to bear it; but if the country is going to prosper, attention must be given to economy. But the present motion is ill-moved by the Opposition, for there has been no period in the history of this country when its finances have been so disastrously or so recklessly managed as under the hon. mover himself, notwithstanding the professions of economy made by the hon. gentleman on the hustings before getting into power; when they did come into office there was a larger increase than ever before or since. I have full confidence in the present Finance Minister. I believe him to be honest, and that he will act judiciously and right in reference to the Civil Service expenses. I have no objection, at any time, to vote for a reduction of our indemnity, but I shall certainly vote against this motion.

MR. CASEY: The Government promised by the Speech from the Throne, and afterwards through the mover of the Address in reply to it, that some measure of reform for our Civil Service should be introduced. Has the Government abandoned the measure so promised, and if so, why? But for that promise I would have introduced a Bill on the subject myself.

MR. ANGLIN: It is very easy to understand why hon. gentlemen want to shut down discussion on this subject; it is unpleasant for many hon. gentlemen on the other side and for some on this side. The hon. the Finance Minister very skillfully contrasted the total expenditure of the late Government with that of the previous Administration, in order to lead to the conclusion that the late Government had been extravagant; but that is not relevant to the question before the House. The hon. member for Centre Huron asks this House to declare that the extraordinary increase in the expenses of the Civil Service for last year and this year and the coming year is such an increase as the means and necessities of the country do not justify.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Question; carried.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I shall have to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to exercise your authority to stop this noise, if we are to finish the business of the House before the first of June. We cannot get on with these careless and exceedingly improper interruptions.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. members will give order. If I am not supported by the members, I shall be powerless.

MR. ANGLIN: I do not care much, personally, about these interruptions, but I hope for the dignity of this House, Mr. Speaker, that your request will prove effectual, and no resort to any special measure will be necessary. The hon. the Finance Minister skillfully, but not successfully tried to divert attention from this Resolution. He spoke of the abolition of some officers in the Lower Provinces, and the removal of the officers to Ottawa, and of the transfer of several officers whose pay was charged to Contingencies to the permanent staff; but as the total amount of Contingencies and Salaries of every sort are included in the total figures given in the amendment, there can be no force at all in the hon. gentleman's argument. He complained that the late Government did not reduce the pay of the Civil servants when money was low, and went further than it does now. The late Government did economise. There was a bonus of \$75,000.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The bonus was only intended for one year.

MR. BLAKE: Not at all.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : It was a bonus, and not an annuity.

MR. ANGLIN : The late Government did not see fit to give the bonus, but they did not go to work to reduce salaries large or small ; they treated the Civil servants with courtesy and kindness, and they were very badly repaid. They did economise, nevertheless. The hon. the Minister of Finance spoke further of the cost of taking care of the Indians in the North-West, and of the great grant which he regarded as an offset to be realised out of his new issue of paper money, all which was quite irrelevant to the question under consideration. Sir, what he said of the Dominion paper issue is no answer to the charge made by the motion in your hands. If we are able to save a larger amount by the issue of this paper money, that is not a reason why we should waste an amount equal to it. It was really unworthy of the hon. gentleman's position to argue vehemently and earnestly that as we are to save so much by the issue of more paper money the House must consider this an unreasonable motion. The question is simply this : Is it, or is it not, desirable or justiable that the expenditure on account of the Civil Service should be increased so largely as it has been this year and last. The expenditures during the last few years, from 1873, was as follows :—

1873-74.....	\$893,685
1874-75.....	909,265
1875-76.....	841,995
1876-77.....	812,193
1877-78.....	823,359

This House ought to declare, under the present circumstances of the country, when great deficits are staring us in the face, that such an increase in the Civil Service expenditure is not to be justified.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : With respect to the Civil Service Act, I would simply say that it was put into the Speech from the Throne, and the Government had full intention of pressing the Bill this Session. The Bill was carefully prepared. Most exhaustive evidence was collected on the subject with respect to the Civil servants, not only of England, but of France and Germany. The Bill was in the hands of my hon. colleague before Parliament met, but we found, as the Session went on, that we could not well press the measure and get through in any

reasonable time. It is a subject of importance, but not one of pressing importance, and, therefore, we have given preference to the other measures which have been before the House, and which have been discussed at such length, giving a due portion of the time, as it was our bounden duty to do, to the measures and questions in the hands of private members. Still the subject has received, and will continue to receive, the attention of the Government, and, if the hon. gentleman will allow me, after the Session, I will give him confidentially a copy of the Bill it was the intention of the Government to bring down. With respect to the discussion as to the increased expenditure, I think my hon. friend, the Finance Minister has answered that. I am not at all surprised at the late hon. Minister of Finance making this motion, because it comes with peculiar grace from him. It is an old saying : "There is no one so zealous as a convert—no man is so virtuous as a reformed rake;" and I think the hon. gentleman has shown his new-born zeal in the cause of economy. It is very new-born—the baby is not very old, because, if I remember aright, when he was Finance Minister, in 1873, he introduced a measure which the whole force of the Government was to be employed in carrying, and yet that measure was not carried. Strange to say, it was a measure affecting the expenditure on the Civil Service. In his speech to-day, the hon. gentleman said his remarks were to be especially directed to that subject. Now, I hold in my hand the Bill the hon. gentleman introduced on March 8, 1875, and when I call attention to its provisions the House will scarcely believe that it was introduced by a Finance Minister who was bound to restrain the undue liberality of his colleagues who were not so directly responsible for the public expenditure as himself. In the Act introduced in my time, 1868, a third class clerk was to receive a salary of \$400 a year. That is a reasonable amount. We discussed the matter at the time, and some thought \$350 quite enough, but as a matter of liberality—and I dare say the Opposition of that day were just as economical as the present Opposition—we fixed the salary at the rate mentioned. The Bill of the hon.

gentleman opposite provided that a third class clerk should receive \$500 per annum, \$100 more than we provided. In three years, by the hon. gentleman's measure, the appointment of junior clerks alone would have made up more than the \$90,000 there has been so much talk about to-day. In our Act we provided that there should be an annual increase of \$50 until the salary reached \$650 and then it should stop; but starting with \$500 the hon. gentleman proposed to give an annual increase of \$50 until the salary reached \$750, and to shorten the pains of the poor man starving on this salary he was to step into the next grade after four years service instead of after five, as under our Act. With regard to second class clerks our extravagant provision was that the junior second class clerk should receive \$700 from the time he started, but the hon. gentleman provided that he should begin with \$800 a year and receive an annual increase of \$50, until his salary reached \$1,100. Our limit was \$1,000. Under our Act a first class clerk was to receive \$1,200, and that is the law now, but in his generosity the hon. gentleman wished to raise this amount to \$1,600. Let any arithmetician sit down and take the clerks appointed since this Bill was introduced until now, and he will find that the additional cost which would have been entailed upon the country by it, would amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars. It may be said that the Bill did not become law. That is no fault of the hon. gentleman. It was introduced as a Government measure, and pressed as a Government measure. It suddenly disappeared, because it was found that not only were the Opposition against it, but that there was a mutiny in his own camp. Yet five years after the introduction of this Bill, which largely, enormously, absurdly increased the Civil Service expenditure, he complains of the expenditure under the old economical Act which has increased owing to the gradual progress of the country. This is a specimen of a new-born economy, and, as I said before, is an illustration of the fact that nobody can be so virtuous as a reformed political rake.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE: When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, at Six o'clock, I was about stating the reasons for the vote I intend to give on the amendment before the Chair. I have said that, at the last General Elections when we were before the people, one of our delarations was that the expenditure of the past five years was out of proportion to the necessities of the country, and that if the Conservative party returned to power we should endeavour to reduce the expenditure to the measure of the circumstances of the country, and if possible keep it within the Revenue. I believe this question was successfully discussed, and had its influence with the people, and it led to an expression of Want of Confidence in the late Government on the part of the people. Now that we are in power, we believe it our duty to carry out our principles, and we are convinced that the Ministry have shown a considerable desire to fulfil their pledges in this respect. Let us look at some of the Departments? Take Public Works. We find that the Minister of Railways has reduced the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway for salaries over \$200,000. The staff was so large that the Government dispensed with 460 hands, and yet had enough left to do the work with equal advantage afterwards. In some of the other Departments we find there has been a commendable decrease in the expenditure, and while we believe that as time passes there will be a necessary increase in the expenditure, the object of every Government should be to not let it overstep the means and growth of the country, and the necessities of the case. Had this motion been brought forward in a proper spirit, and not exhibiting what those gentlemen pretend to experience—a burning zeal for economy, while in reality it is a motion of Want of Confidence in the Government—I believe the hon. members of this House would have supported it. But when we find that it is not honestly brought forward, and that the only excuse of the mover is that, when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House occupied the Opposition benches, they were in the habit of putting such motions, consequently, it is the duty of the Opposition now to mete

out to their opponents the treatment they received from them years before. That ought to be sufficient to induce hon. gentlemen to oppose it, for if it was wrong then it must be now. Two wrongs do not make a right. Again, if we had evidence that the expenditure was out of proportion to the necessities of the case, we should be in duty bound to support the proposition for its reduction. But the question now is, not whether this expenditure is in the interest of the country or not, but whether or not we are prepared to vote non-confidence in the Government, for this vote would be virtually a vote of Want of Confidence in the Government. They depend on the interest of the lesser questions to swallow up the interest of the greater, and thereby so blindfold the House as to induce it to support the motion. We should not then support such a buncombe amendment for the purpose of condemning the Government. The question is not whether the expenditure should be reduced by the small amount of \$21,000, as proposed by this amendment, or whether the interests of the country require this reduction, but whether we are prepared to vote a Want of Confidence in a Government which we believe able and desirous of conducting the affairs of the country to its best advantage. Are we prepared to reinstate a set of men whose Administration never was characterised by anything but extravagance? Are we prepared to condone the offences of the past, and overthrow a Government which is lifting the country out of the Slough of Despond in which for five years it was plunged? Are we prepared to sacrifice the interests of the country to lesser interests, for a change of Ministers in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite? I believe there is, in some Departments, room for economy, but I think the evidence given us of the economy of the present hon. Ministers, is sufficient to satisfy us that we are safe in their hands, and that their Administration is for the good of the country. Another reason why the amendment should be voted down is: I have before me a petition, signed by 119 members, to induce the Government to increase the salaries of the Messengers and Sessional clerks of this House, which petition is signed by the very gentlemen

who are pressing this motion and who are prepared to vote for it. What must be thought of men who are making this buncombe motion for the reduction of expenditure, and yet signing a petition to the Government asking it to increase this expenditure. I do not think it right to adopt the prayer of this petition at present. What could hon. gentlemen opposite give to the country in the place of this Government. It is a pitiable proposition to restore to power a party who are nominally and virtually without a leader, and whose numerical strength is so small that they scarcely command any influence, while they are torn by conflicting elements in their own ranks to an extent which still further reduces their power. It would be entirely inexpedient to vote Want of Confidence in the Government by supporting the present amendment. When any Resolution comes forward in a legitimate way, with the honest intention of promoting fair and judicious economy, it will be calmly and properly considered.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has characterised the late Government as extravagant. Well, all that the amendment asks is that we do not expend a larger sum for Civil Government than was expended by that extravagant Administration—that we may not spend \$20,000 more. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will find that the expenditure for Civil Government in 1873, as compared with that in 1878, did not show such an increase under the late Administration as has been proposed during the first two years of the present Government. I have risen, not for the purpose of answering the observations of the hon. gentleman, which I think sufficiently answer themselves, when he characterises the late Government as financially extravagant and at the same time supports a large increase. The amendment simply asks the present Administration not to exceed in expenditure the amount required by that Government. It will be obvious that the hon. gentleman's argument is not unanswerable. But I have chiefly risen for the purpose of pointing out the fallacy of the argument of the hon. leader of the House. He criticised a measure introduced by the hon. member for Centre Huron when that gentle-

MR. SPROULE

man was Finance Minister, and read a certain portion of a Bill to show that he proposed to place the salaries of the clerks of the Civil Service at a higher rate than they were fixed by the Administration. That is not the fact. The right hon. gentleman compares the salaries proposed by the hon. member for Centre Huron, not with the amount at which the late Government left those salaries, but with the amount under the Statute of 1868. He carefully concealed the fact that the hon. the Minister of Finance took the appropriation, which was intended to be a permanent appropriation, of \$75,000 to be distributed among these clerks with a view to supplementing those salaries. If the hon. the Premier will look at the expenditure that would have taken place under the Bill of the hon. member for Centre Huron, and compare it with the salaries fixed by the Statute of 1868, and with the supplementary amount asked for by the hon. gentlemen opposite when in power before, and which was voted by Parliament, he will see that these \$70,000 or \$75,000, for the salaries of clerks in the Civil Service, even supposing those appointed by the hon. gentlemen opposite had been allowed to remain, would have been greater than the expenditure under the Bill of the late Finance Minister. He did not propose to increase the salaries of the clerks, but left it for the Government to decide, according to its discretion, what the salaries of each officer should be. The hon. gentlemen opposite came down to the House, after fixing the salaries of the clerks at a particular sum, and said: "We want you to place \$70,000 at our disposal, so that we may reward those whom we think favourable to us more generously than those whom we think may not be in sympathy with us. We did not think, however, that that was a proper act; but the discretionary power, which the Administration possessed under this supplementary appropriation, was open to abuse, and would have been taken away by the Bill of my hon. friend from Centre Huron, had that measure become law. When he introduced his Bill, it was his intention to diminish the number of clerks in the Public Service. It was easy to increase the bonus and diminish the number of the officials, and to increase the amount of

payments without adding a dollar to the burdens of the people in this particular. This fact the hon. leader of the Government carefully concealed, with a view of making an erroneous impression on the minds of hon. gentlemen not in Parliament at the time. It is perfectly obvious that the salaries fixed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, with those supplementary sums added, were larger than they would have been under the Bill of the hon. member for Centre Huron. This Bill, however, was not passed, because the conclusion arrived at was, that those in the Civil Service were sufficiently paid. The salaries were, for this reason, left at the old figures, and the supplementary vote of \$70,000 was withdrawn, and now hon. Ministers proposed to ask a larger sum for the Public Service than was asked at any former period. The hon. the Finance Minister has referred to the increase in the cost of the Department of the Interior under the late Government. I do not know that there was any material increase. There has been no statement to show that any increase at present was necessary. A number of gentlemen were employed as extra clerks, and it was found, after some time, that the increase in the work of the Department would justify their being placed on the permanent list. The hon. the Finance Minister came down, last year, with an increased estimate and said there had been no material increase in the actual cost of the Department of the Interior, as they had simply transferred from the Sessional List to the Permanent Service those who had been some time employed as extra Departmental clerks. This, too, was the explanation of the hon. the First Minister. The sums formerly paid as Contingencies was no longer necessary for that purpose and there would have been, if the statement made by the leader of the Government last year was correct, a corresponding diminution in the Contingencies of his Department. If that be the case then there should be no increase in the annual cost of the Administration. I say such are the facts, and the hon. the Minister of Finance has not accounted for the increase in the cost of Civil Government by the explanations he has given. I rose mainly for the purpose of pointing out that the comparison between the Bill of 1868 and the one introduced by the late

Finance Minister in 1875, but which he did not press through Parliament, was not a fair comparison unless the House took into consideration the supplementary vote the hon. gentlemen opposite took in 1873, and which was distributed amongst the clerks in the Civil Service.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I am glad the ex-Finance Minister has made this motion, as I believe it will serve a valuable purpose. I believe the effect of that motion will not be lost upon the country. As we are all aware, men are differently constituted. One man is adapted for one vocation in life, and another man for another. One man may be an admirable servant, good tempered, industrious, and faithful in the discharge of his duties, but if his position is suddenly changed, and he becomes heir to a large fortune, he very often proves to be a most tyrannical, indolent, and extravagant master. So nature may have intended a man for a great author, he may write a book of great value to the world, yet he may be utterly incapable of criticising a book. Other persons who are incapable of writing a book may be able to make most valuable *critiques* of the works of others. Now, the motion that has just been made by the ex-Finance Minister will, I think, convince the people of this country that he is once more in his true position. While he was a most extravagant Finance Minister, with whom it was dangerous to entrust the finances of the country, as a critic of the works of others his true vocation appears, and his views having undergone a radical change, he becomes extremely valuable to the country in the position he at present occupies. This motion will deepen the impression on the public mind that it is in the interest of Canada that the hon. gentleman, instead of being Finance Minister, should remain ex-Finance Minister. I should suppose the hon. gentleman would be the last man in Parliament to lose himself in the attitude of an economist; I should suppose he would be the last man to have returned to the rôle he has adopted to-night. He used to occupy the same rôle before he was Finance Minister. He was an admirable critic. There was not a Budget brought down at a time when the Finance Minister of the day was able to meet Parliament, year after year, with an overwhelming surplus,

that the hon. gentleman did not hold forth in the most doleful tones about the great danger of expenditure, and the certainty of deficits. He was not successful as a prophet. None of those deficits appeared until the hon. gentleman himself obtained a position that enabled him to create them. Now, the hon. gentleman is drawing a contrast between the expenditure of the past Government, and the proposed expenditure of this one. Let me, for a moment, invite his attention to the fact that, when this increased expenditure took place before the *régime* of the late Administration, the financial condition of this country was such as to warrant the Government of the day dealing with the public expenditure in a very liberal manner. Year after year they met Parliament with a handsome surplus. The hon. gentleman at last obtained power, the great economist, who had been for years criticising the financial statements of his predecessor, finally himself obtained that high office. What was the result? Why, at a time when he declared himself, at the very outset, that the financial position of the country was a most deplorable one, he said to Parliament: It is necessary for me to impose \$3,000,000 additional taxes in order to carry on the Government of this country. Did he retrench? Did he adopt such a proposal as he has offered to the House to-night to limit the expenditure? Why, as I said on a former occasion, the Estimates submitted by the late Finance Minister, for the year ending 30th June, 1875, were between \$26,000,000 and \$27,000,000.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: No; you do not know the difference between a Supply Bill and an Estimate.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The hon. member may make the member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) believe that statement, but he will never make me accept it. The hon. member for South Huron wanted to know where I got my figures. I tell him I got them in the Public Accounts, brought down by the late Finance Minister. With a most disingenuous attempt to prevent this House from knowing what he was doing, the hon. gentleman brought down an Estimate such as no Minister of Finance, either before or since, ever ventured to place before the House. I ask hon. mem-

bers to turn up the Public Accounts for themselves, to the Estimate laid before this House for the year 1874-75, and they will find a total change in the manner of submitting that statement, such as completely bewildered the former Finance Minister (Sir Francis Hincks), who wrote me that it was impossible to understand the hon. gentleman's Estimates, and asked me if I could explain what they meant. I repeat the statement, and I am willing to go before the Public Accounts Committee and substantiate it, that the Estimates submitted to this House for the year 1874-75, as contained in the Estimates and embodied in the Supply Bill, were between 26,000,000 and 27,000,000. If the hon. gentleman from South Huron, who wanted the figures, will turn to the Public Accounts for 1875, he will find that the late Finance Minister departed from the system that had prevailed, before and since, in order to mystify the House, and prevent any member from discovering what the character of his Estimates was. His Estimates, as there given, show a statement there authorised for 1874-75, of \$24,803,285. If the hon. gentleman undertakes to question those figures, you have only to turn over a few pages further in the Sessional Papers for 1875, and you will find a Supplementary Estimate brought down by him, in the same volume, for the financial year ending 30th June, 1875, a Supplementary Estimate of \$1,783,787. Deduct \$94,150 as unprovided items for the year 1873-74, and you have a Supplementary Estimate left for that first year of \$1,689,636 or \$26,487,921.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: How much Capital?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Not a dollar of Capital.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Nonsense.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: That may do for the hon. member for South Huron, but it will not do for me. I will establish before any Committee of this House the accuracy of the statement I am making, that the hon. gentleman submitted Estimates to Parliament for the year 1874-75 of between \$26,000,000 and \$27,000,000 and embodied them in the Statutes. This is the great economist who was going to save this country; who,

when not Minister of Finance, was loud-mouthed in his demand for the most stringent economy, at a time when we were flush with revenue and were rolling up \$2,000,000 of a surplus annually. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) did make a mistake and so did I, in supposing the sum; the late hon. Finance Minister had voted for his first year was nearer \$26,000,000 than \$27,000,000; on the contrary, it was nearer \$27,000,000 than \$26,000,000, because you have to add to this \$26,487,921, \$111,690 of unprovided items for that year, making \$26,599,611. I would be doing an injustice to the hon. gentleman himself, if I did not place in bold relief the claim he has to the position he now occupies, and the necessity there is in the interests of this country that he should long be retained there, to criticise the acts of others rather than be placed in a position to trample under his feet all his professions of economy. At the very time this hon. gentleman brought down this enormous Estimate he was a party to putting a Bill upon the Statute-book to provide for the construction of the whole Canadian Pacific Railway by the Government, and no wonder he wanted \$3,000,000 of additional taxation. But the hon. gentleman managed to get rid of it all without constructing the Pacific Railway. Talk of economy! The hon. gentleman himself has made a statement that convicts him of extravagance such as no other Finance Minister ever was guilty of. He has himself given evidence of the fact that, notwithstanding all his professions of economy, no sooner did he obtain power than, in the second year after he had levied \$3,000,000 additional taxes, and discovered that it was not enough to enable him to make both ends meet and was leaving him with deficits, we find him making an expenditure in 1875-76 of \$24,448,372, or \$1,132,056, according to his own statement, over and above that expenditure on the part of his predecessor, which he had denounced as the greatest extravagance. Let him make up the account, as I have shown him it should really stand; let him deduct the sums he improperly placed in a comparative statement to the charge of the year 1873-74, and it will be found that this economical Finance Minister made an expenditure for that

year of \$2,140,000 over and above the largest expenditure with which he could fairly charge the previous Administration. The hon. gentleman has made three prominent points to-night. He will not go into the general question, for the reason that the further he gets into it the worse is the position in which he finds himself. He wants the Civil Government Estimate reduced. Well, what do the figures show in reference to that? They show that the largest expenditure made by the Administration preceding the last one was in 1873-74, \$883,685, which amount included the bonus of \$75,000 specially voted for that year. About \$25,000 of that was distributed in the Outside Service, which would leave \$50,000 for distribution among the officers of the Civil Service, at a time when the Government of the day were steadily presenting a surplus. Yet, we find this hon. gentleman, at a time when he said he must have \$3,000,000 of additional taxes to carry on the Government, introducing a Bill to provide for a still greater increase in the expenditure for the Civil Service; and his actual expenditure for the Civil Service, for 1874-75, was \$909,265, or \$25,580 more than that of his predecessors. The hon. gentleman makes a great point about Superannuation, but what do you suppose the hon. gentleman did? Our largest expenditure for Superannuation was in the year 1873-74, when it amounted to \$64,482; but the great economists on the Opposition benches increased that in 1877-78 to \$106,588. The largest Post Office expenditure for which we were responsible, amounted to \$1,387,270; while in 1877-78 it was increased to \$1,724,938, an increase of \$337,668. The hon. member for Centre Huron has thus given evidence that he is now sustaining his true rôle in criticising the acts of others, and that he should not be again trusted with the power he so abused during the Administration of the late Government.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in his remarks. I leave that for my hon. friend behind me. But we can extract honey, I will not say what from. There has been on the opposite side of the House, led by the hon. the leader of this House, a system of attacks upon my hon. friend from

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

Centre Huron, because he was a renegade because in 1873, when my hon. friend from Lambton formed his Government, the hon. member for Lennox joined him. I think the right hon. gentleman never waxed more eloquent than he did when he used the adjectives descriptive of the rascalities of my hon. friend from Huron. Now, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has made some extraordinary statements. He upbraids my hon. friend from Centre Huron because he found fault with the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, because he criticised their extravagance, and pursued the rôle of a man in Opposition to that Government in 1870, in 1871, in 1872; and later on he also pursued the rôle of an honest critic. The hon. gentleman must believe he was an honest critic, because he desires to keep him in Opposition in that position. If my hon. friend was opposed to the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, if he was a member of the Opposition which my hon. friend from Lambton led, the right hon. the leader of the Government has been traducing my hon. friend amid the wild and exultant cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. the Minister of Railways, with the simplicity of a child and the eloquence of an orator, has shown how unjust, how unfounded, and how unfair have been these accusations against my hon. friend.

MR. PLUMB: When we remember what the hon. ex-Finance Minister did from 1873 to the unfortunate day when he fell with his party, in 1878, we can have no difficulty in deciding upon the manner in which we will vote on the Resolution before the House. Why did not the hon. gentleman, when he brought forward that Resolution, cover the whole question of expenditure between 1874 and 1878? Why did not the hon. gentleman justify the enormous increases which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite in every item of the public expenditure? If the hon. gentleman thinks that within a week of Prorogation, when the House is impatient of financial discussion, he will be able to snatch a verdict from the House, he is mistaken. I am quite prepared to vote down the hon. gentleman's proposition, being, as I am assured, that I can satisfactorily explain my vote to my constituents.

Motion made :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

Motion in amendment (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) made and question proposed : [Vide p. 1826.]

The House divided: Yeas, 50 ; nays, 127.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin	Guthrie
Bain	Kiliam
Béchar	King
Blake	LaRue
Borden	Laurer
Bourassa	Macdonell (N. Lanark)
Brown	Mackenzie
Burpee (St. John)	McIsaac
Burpee (Sunbury)	Malcuin
Cameron (South Huron)	Mills
Cartwright	Oliver
Casey	Olivier
Casgrain	Paterson (S. Brant)
Chandler	Pickard
Charlton	Rinfret
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Robertson (Shelburne)
Coupal	Rogers
Dumont	Ross (West Middlesex)
Fiset	Rymal
Fleming	Scriver
Flynn	Skinner
Geoffrion	Trow
Gillies	Welton
Gillmor	Wiser
Gunn	Yeo.—50

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott	Lane
Allison	Langevin
Angers	Lantier
Arkell	Little
Baby	Longley
Baker	Macdonald (King's, PEI)
Bannerman	Macdonald (Victoria BC)
Barnard	MacDonald Cape Breton)
Beauchesne	McDonald (Pictou)
Benoit	Macmillan
Bergeron	McCailum
Bergin	McCuaig
Bill	Maddougall
Bolduc	McInnes
Boulbee	McKay
Bourbeau	McLennan
Bowell	McLeod
Brecken	McQuade
Brooks	McRory
Bunster	Masson
Bunting	Massue
Burnham	Merner
Carling	Méthot
Caron	Mongensis
Cimon	Montplaisir
Cockburn (W. N'th'd)	Mousseau
Colby	Muttart
Connell	O'Connor
Costigan	Orton
Coughlin	Quimet

Coursol	Patterson (Essex)
Carrier	Perrault
Cuthbert	Pinsonneault
Daly	Platt
Daoust	Plumb
Dawson	Poupore
DeCosmos	Richey
Desaulniers	Robertson (Hamilton)
Domville	Robinson
Douil	Rochester
Drew	Ross (Dundas)
Dugas	Rouleau
Elliott	Routhier
Farrow	Royal
Ferguson	Ryan (Marquette)
Fitzsimmons	Schultz
Fortin	Shaw
Fulton	Sproule
Gigault	Stephenson
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Teltier
Girouard (Kent)	Thompson (Cariboo)
Grandbois	Tilley
Hackett	Tupper
Haggart	Vallee
Hooper	Vanasee
Houde	Wade
Hureau	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Jackson	Wallace (W. York)
Jones	White (Cardwell)
Kaulbach	White (E. Hastings)
Keeler	White (North Renfrew)
Kilvert	Williams
Kirkpatrick	Wright.—127
Kranz	

PAIRS :

For—	Against—
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Strange.

Motion resolved in the negative.

Main motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

II. CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

1 Charges of Management.....\$36,250 00

III. CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

3 The Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.....\$14,392 50

4 The Department of Justice..... 13,900 00

5 The Department of Justice, Penitentiaries Branch..... 5,300 00

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CART WRIGHT,

MR McDONALD (Pictou) said \$500 had been added to the salary of the Inspector—an addition which the hon. gentleman would not think extravagant. An Accountant for the Penitentiaries, an office authorised by an Act of the Legislature, was to be appointed at a salary of \$1,200.

MR BLAKE said the duties of the Inspector were lightened by the proposal to appoint an Accountant, and as the Statutory salary was only \$2,000, and it

had already been increased to \$2,500, he did not see any justification for the proposed increase to \$2,750.

Vote agreed to.

6 The Department of Militia.....	\$37,010
7 The Department of the Secretary of State.....	33,155

In reply to SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. BOWELL said the apparent increase in the salaries of the officers in this Department was accounted for by the fact that five extra clerks had been put upon the Permanent List. Those persons were on the Temporary List and paid out of Contingencies when the present Government came into power. The number of messengers connected with the Department seemed excessive, but they had been connected with the Department either temporarily or permanently for a number of years.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said that item showed a handsome percentage of increase of late.

MR. BOWELL said the Contingencies Account for this branch, in 1873, was \$567, and the item gradually increased from the time hon. gentlemen opposite took office, from \$567 to about \$4,000 in 1878. It had, consequently, been reduced by the present Government. The hon. the Secretary of State intended keeping his Contingencies Account as low as possible.

8 The Department of Interior.....	\$60,850
-----------------------------------	----------

In reply to MR. MILLS,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the item should stand \$57,850, to which it had been reduced.

Vote agreed to.

9 The Office of the Auditor-General	\$18,275
10 The Department of Finance.....	53,715

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked for explanations as to the increase of \$3,785 in this item.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY replied that there had been a slight increase in salaries, and that with the increased issue of Dominion notes, additional officers might be required.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT enquired how much represented the \$50 per annum increase of officials' salaries?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said a large portion of the difference represented that \$50 increase, which was statutory. Besides, some of the officers might be en-

MR. BLAKE.

titled to promotion. He might furnish more particular information later.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said that more information was desirable.

Vote agreed to.

11 The Office of the Treasury Board	\$2,700 00
12 The Department of Inland Revenue	30,342 50

MR. BABY: The increase arises from the fact that two gentlemen in the Department, who have been extra clerks for a number of years, have been put upon the Permanent List this year. Then there is the ordinary Statutory allowance and the promotion of another clerk. When I came to the Department there were five extra clerks, and out of these two have been put upon the Permanent List. They were then, as now, at the head of their respective branches. The greatest economy prevails in the Department. The Auditor was astonished that economy was practiced to such an extent, and he actually wrote a letter calling the attention of my Deputy to that fact. Under the supervision of the Auditor no extra expenses will be incurred.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman, in this increase, has adopted a principle that was not acted upon in our day, which is, that the moment a clerk in any class reaches the head of his class, he is, as a matter of course, promoted into the next order without reference to the character of the duties he has to discharge. If that principle was acted upon, every clerk in a Department would, in the course of time, become a first-class clerk.

MR. BABY: Does the hon. gentleman think it would be proper to put at \$400 the salaries of two clerks at the head of their branches, and surely as efficient as any first class clerks, when they had men under them earning \$700? That is a Department in which we must have experienced officers.

MR. BLAKE: I think it would be an unfortunate thing if the Administration should act upon the principle that promotions should take place simply because men have been a certain number of years in the service. I think, however, that both Administrations have been too lax with respect to promotions, and even about the \$50 increase. I think it would be to the advantage of the Service if, in the future, each Department was to intimate that employes would not be con-

sidered as of right entitled even to the \$50 increase. The law only contemplated that that increase should take place when the conduct of the employé merited it. But when you come to this grading, it is of the highest consequence that we should lay down as a principle that a clerk is not entitled to run from one grade to another. There are many occupations in the Service in which the value of the services rendered can be no greater after ten years employment than in the beginning.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I agree with every word that has just fallen from my hon. friend. In the first place it is quite clear that, under the terms of the Act, it does not follow that when a person arrives at the head of his grade by length of service, he is to be promoted as a matter of course. I am afraid we shall have to share the blame between us on both sides of the House, as to that rule not being observed. It ought to be observed. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman about the Statutory increase. It has not worked well. Although it was intended that this increase should be given as a reward of merit, it has been felt throughout the Service that if any officer does not receive it it is because he does not deserve it. His pride is wounded, and he becomes a less valuable officer. I think the true plan would be to wipe away that provision altogether, and leave the matter of increase of salaries in the hands of the heads of the Departments. This subject has been pressed upon our attention during the past year. Immediately on Prorogation, it is the intention of the Government to apply themselves to the reorganisation of the Service, and to try to work out some scheme for Parliament next Session. I think great economy could be secured by a more scientific reorganisation.

MR. MACKENZIE : Does the hon. gentlemen contemplate adopting any of the suggestions contained in Dr. Playfair's Report. Copying should be done by clerks employed at \$5 a day. The cost of keeping second class clerks at copying is enormous. This is the point where real reform must come in. I had fully intended myself to have paid some attention to that particular part of Dr. Playfair's recommendation. I trust the hon. gentleman will give this matter his con-

sideration, as it will simplify the same very much.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I have read the Playfair Report and considered it with care, but there is a difference of opinion in England on that subject. There is a difficulty which exists in this country that does not exist in England. The gradation in position and the subdivision of labour is so great that there is no difficulty in getting any number of respectable men as copyists. Here, where we are all on the same plane, socially and otherwise, it is impossible to say : here is a class of men who cannot rise beyond a certain status. Still, it is quite true that it is absurd to keep a few clerks of high grade in the different Departments doing scribblers' work.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT : I think that kind of work might be done, to a considerable extent, and very well, by lady copyists.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I think the hon. gentleman has gone a very great way in solving that difficulty. You can always get a number of young ladies who could do that scribblers' work.

MR. CASEY : I hardly think the difficulty will be relieved by getting temporary copyists of this kind. It is not to be supposed that they would make it a life business. The young ladies would merely undertake it for a few years. I am very glad, however, to hear that the hon. gentleman intends to have a unatured measure brought down next Session, and I hope that his prediction in this respect will prove more fruitful than the prediction he made this year.

Vote agreed to.

13 The Department of Customs.....	\$31,705
14 The Department of the Postmaster-General	104,220

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. O'CONNOR said the increase was made up as follows:—Secretary's Branch: Assistant Chief Clerk, \$2,000; Junior Clerk, \$300; Statutory increases, \$1,850. Increase in Accountant's salary, \$400; three Clerks, \$1,900; Statutory increase, \$3,250. In the Money-Order Office: additional Clerk, \$300; Statutory increases \$2,750. In the Saving's Bank: two additional Clerks, \$700; Promotion and Statutory increase, \$1,050. The Statutory increases amounted altogether to

\$8,900. Of the eight Clerks appointed, six had been temporary and were made permanent, of the other two one was brought from St. John and the other from Halifax. On the Money-Order branches being abolished at those places, they were placed in the Department here at an increase, one being given \$900 and the other \$600.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said he thought that increase amounting to about \$15,000 was a very serious matter. We could hardly imagine that the business of the Post Office had increased so much as to require or warrant all this additional staff, especially having regard to the deficit between revenue and expenditure.

MR. HUNTINGTON called attention to the fact that for some years hon. gentlemen opposite were constantly attacking the Post Office Department under the late Administration, for its terrible extravagance. But there had been an improvement in this respect since the Department passed under its present management; there had been no reduction to show that they were justified in making those attacks. Those attacks were unjustifiable, as the hon. gentlemen found since they assumed the responsibilities of office. As the hon. the Postmaster-General had a facility of speech in defending himself and his colleagues, he (Mr. Huntington) hoped and expected to have heard him state that his party was mistaken in the attacks they had made when occupying the Opposition benches during the late Administration, and to have heard him acknowledge practically and candidly, that the Post Office Department had its difficulties in a financial way, and that it had been administered under the late Government as well as it could be, and not so as to justify the wholesale abuse heaped upon it by hon. gentlemen opposite at that time.

Vote agreed to.

15 The Department of Agriculture . .	\$32,450
16 The Department of Marine and Fisheries	28,310

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. POPE (Queen's, F.E.I.) said the hon. gentleman was right in stating that there appeared to be an increase of four clerks, but some had been in the Department for years. Instead of the amount

being in the Estimates, however, they had been paid out of Contingencies: the number of clerks had really been increased. This service was conducted more economically and better than any other Department of the Public Service. It had also been thought better to put two chief clerks instead of one, and place them on the same footing as in other Departments, such as the Post Office. The General Superintendent of Light-houses had been transferred to the Department of Railways and Canals, because, although valuable in the Fisheries Department, he would be still more useful in another Department.

Vote agreed to

17 The Department of Public Works . .	\$30,200
18 The Department of Railways and Canals	\$39,760

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. LANGÉVIN said that he himself, as Minister of Public Works, and the hon. the Minister of Railways, had each less work than their predecessors had, because the latter had in his time the whole Department to administer; but it was impossible for one man to do that thoroughly, for it was such an increasing Department. The division of the Department necessarily required the staff to be increased. It stood to reason that a complete staff was required for each of the two new Departments; a sub-chief for each, a secretary for each, and engineers, and so on, for each; and, therefore, the expense had been increased instead of being decreased. The work had been increasing steadily, year after year; the work of the Railway Department, especially, had increased; the works on the Pacific Railway had increased. As to the amount of money voted in 1878-79 and the amount required this year, namely: for 1878-79, a sum of \$53,833, and for this year a little less than \$70,000 or \$16,130 of a difference, he had this to say: In the Department of Public Works there was the Statutory increase of \$650; there was the allowance of \$600 for Private Secretary, not granted the previous year; there was an officer, Mr. Stekle, in the Engineering Branch, a very good officer, and one of the best mathematicians we have, formerly paid out of the different works that were under the control of the Department, and whose salary was

not therefore in the list of expenses for salaries last year. Mr. Perley, another good officer, was employed as an engineer in the Lower Provinces, but he has been brought here to be the Engineer of the Department. His salary was not included in the list last year, but was paid out of the works constructed in the Lower Provinces. Then there were the shorthand reporters, who were transferred from the Post Office Department, and another officer in the Architect's office, who received \$650 a year, who were not on the list of officers last year. These sums aggregate \$8,900. In the Department of Railways, Mr. Page's salary has been increased \$500, making it now \$4,500, I think. Mr. Cross, whose salary is \$1,850, has been transferred to the Department of Railways. Mr. Jones, who receives \$1,250, and Mr. Greenfield, who receives \$750, were paid out of the Intercolonial grant, and those salaries were, therefore, not included in the amount of \$53,000 for the previous year. While giving these explanations, I may say that Mr. Schreiber's salary was, up to last year, paid out of the Intercolonial Railway. When I came back from England I turned my attention to the outside staff of the Department. There was a large staff in the Lower Provinces and a small one in the Province of Quebec. These were excrescences on the Department. Under the different Administrations one clerk after another had been added until this service was swollen to large proportions. The expenditure in those establishments, in the Lower Provinces, amounted to \$10,635 per annum, and \$7,959 a year in the case of Ontario and Quebec. Those establishments have been abolished. I do not say that the whole of that expenditure will be saved, but we will certainly save from \$14,000 to \$15,000 a year out of that. During the next season we will require a few engineers and clerks to go round and examine certain harbours, but they will only be paid for the time they are employed.

MR. ANGLIN : This is rather an interesting statement. We are learning now something of the nature of the extraordinary economy effected in reconstructing the staff on the Intercolonial Railway. The gentlemen whose names have been given are employed in doing a portion of the work which was formerly done by

Mr. Brydges and the officers employed under him at Moncton and elsewhere on the Intercolonial. If we were to enquire carefully into the matter, very little saving has been effected by the Government. With regard to the Public Works staff in the Lower Provinces, I think that service was organised when the hon. gentleman himself was formerly Minister of Public Works. If the Government pursue the policy they followed the last year or two, with regard to the improvement of harbours and the creation of places of refuge in the Lower Provinces, there is very good reason for the reduction of the staff, for there will no longer be the amount of work to be done that there was formerly.

MR. LANGEVIN : Because three of those officers have been brought from the Intercolonial to the Department here, the hon. gentleman does not acknowledge the reductions made in the Railway Department. But the salaries of those officers cannot make much difference. There are 250 more miles of Railway in operation now than before, and that requires a larger staff. With regard to the Lower Province staff, I thought we would not be justified in keeping it partly employed when a large portion of the work could be done at head-quarters. The remainder of the work can be performed by special hands employed temporarily.

MR. ANGLIN : Having a large portion of the work done at Ottawa does not make it cost less. There is a strong feeling against the centralisation going on in such matters. If it would not cost more to have it done in St. John than in Ottawa, there is no reason for the change. With regard to the reduction of expenses on the Intercolonial, the hon. the Minister of Public Works has misunderstood me. The Report of the hon. the Minister of Railways shows that the saving on account of all those salaries of the officials is not \$250,000, but less than \$26,000. I have already remarked that, even if that saving had been effected, by the dismissal of some of the officers and the reduction of the salaries of others, after all it was not as great as appeared at first, because the amounts now paid by the Department of Railways ought to be added to the amounts paid the gentlemen employed here. A portion of their services is required for the work of the Pembina Branch Railway. A few nights

ago I proved the hon. the Minister of Railways was astray in his statements as to the saving from the workmen's wages.

Vote agreed to.

19 Departmental Contingencies . . . \$137,750

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked if the hon. the Finance Minister knew what the expenditure for the present year would be; was he going to ask for Supplementary Estimates?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said he thought the Supplementary Estimates would contain an item of only \$500 for the Audit Department and no other. He thought this total vote would cover all the contingent accounts for 1879-80.

Vote agreed to.

20 Stationery Office, for Stationery. . . 5,000
 21 To meet the possible amount required for new appointments, by an extension of the staff, or any other change. 5,000

XXVIII. COLLECTION OF REVENUES—
 CUSTOMS.

Salaries and Contingent Expenses of the several Ports.

	In Province of Ontario.	\$219,735
	" Quebec.	193,890
	" New Brunswick.	92,005
	" Nova Scotia.	107,405
	" Manitoba.	13,000
	" N.-W. Territories.	4,000
	" British Columbia.	23,600
	" P. E. Island.	22,930
186	Salaries and travelling expenses of Inspectors of Ports, and travelling expenses of other Officers on Inspection.	18,000
	Contingencies of Head Office, covering printing, stationery, advertising, telegraphing, etc., for the several Ports of Entry.	15,000
	To meet probable expenditure in connection with the Board of Experts and Outside Detective Service.	15,000

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked for an explanation of the increase of \$5,000 for the Detective Service.

MR. BOWELL said the services had cost more than was anticipated when the \$10,000 were taken. He found it necessary, from the constant reports of smuggling going on in different parts of the country and along the frontier, to appoint an additional officer to look after the Revenue, and prevent smuggling if possible. He (Mr. Bowell) was strongly of opinion that the tendency to smuggling was increased by the statements in the Opposition press, that it would be easy and profitable to smuggle, under the

MR. ANGLIN.

present Tariff, which made the duties higher. He was quite satisfied that the seizures and savings effected by the Detective Force, and the additional amounts received by the constant supervision of the different invoices presented, and the compelling of importers to pay the duties according to the law, upon the fair market value of the articles purchased in the different countries of production, would double the charge for their salaries.

MR. ANGLIN said the expenditure they could lay their fingers upon, but the saving seemed of a rather impalpable character.

MR. BOWELL said he did not know that he would be justified in laying the invoices of the different importers before the House, but he would show the member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin), in the Appraiser's Office, if he took the trouble to go there, invoices proving the truth of his statement—of course no improper use would be made of their examination. He could see the large profit accruing to the public from the present strict surveillance over this branch of the service. Where the invoices of goods have been under the market price of the country wherein produced, they have been raised in accordance with the strict provisions of the law. He (Mr. Bowell) knew this sort of administration was unpopular with importers, but the public interest had to be protected. The old law was, in some respects, more restrictive than the present. The value for duty is fixed at the time of the exportation of the goods at the then prevailing price.

MR. DESJARDINS: At the port of Montreal I observe that while the regular salaries for the year 1879-80 amounted to \$78,000, and the wages and extra services to \$17,000, this year the salaries are \$69,000, and the extra services 25,000. Is the advance in the amount for extra services caused by a reduction of the staff in regular service?

MR. BOWELL: The decrease in the port of Montreal arises from the fact that a number of officers died last year, and have not been replaced. Some of the older ones have been superannuated, and others who were doing outside service have been charged to the ports in which they are stationed. But in no case, has there been any officer put upon the Per-

manent List in the city of Montreal since I have had the honour of presiding over the Department. It was found necessary, in one of the Appraisers' Departments, to have an assistant, to which position Mr. Lamarche was appointed, and that is the only addition which has been made to the staff since I have been in office. About \$12,250 per year have been saved at that port by not filling vacancies that have occurred from various causes. Unfortunately, at that port, the Department has an elephant on its hands in the shape of a warehouse, and that has cost us this year, in local taxes, no less than \$3,320 over and above the contingencies necessary for that Department. However, there is an actual saving in salaries and in the entire management, of \$11,950 for the year.

MR. JONES: There seems to be complaint on the other side of the House whenever there appears to be an increase in the Estimates, and also complaint whenever there appears to be a decrease. I said the other night that, with regard to the Customs Department, there was a penny wise and pound foolish system carried out. I think it unwise to decrease the expenditure on Customs at a time when we have increased our Customs duties to so considerable an extent. Reports come to us that the regulations of the Department are being evaded, invoices are being entered at 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. under the actual selling price in the United States, and yet the Customs Department do not compel these parties to amend their entries. We have a law increasing our duties 25 or 30 per cent., and we have not got sufficient authority to carry out the law. If an invoice passes our Customs Appraisers, no matter how much he has undervalued his goods, I understand the law is such that the authorities cannot seize the goods. But in the United States, where they have much higher protective duties, if a man passes an entry undervaluing his goods, no matter how long afterwards the officers can go into his premises and seize both the goods and the books, and compel him to make restitution. But here in Canada if a man is detected in passing a false entry, an influential friend or a member of Parliament goes to the authorities and says: This is

a friend of mine, an honest fellow, I want his goods released, and the goods are released. Another man is found making an entry with an undervaluation and the goods are detained. He goes to the Administrator of the Department, and what is said? My friend, you have made a little mistake, no doubt, but just amend your entry and pay the duties and it will be all right. If the Department would take the matter in hand and make a few seizures they would not be troubled so much with smuggling. Appraisers should be appointed over certain districts, to see that goods are entered at their proper valuation.

MR. RYAN (Montreal Centre): Notwithstanding the reduction in the staff and in the salaries at the port of Montreal, I am not aware that the Service has suffered any detriment thereby. The business seems to be just as well performed by those who remain. But I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that the appraisers ought to be better paid. The salary of an appraiser ought to be at least \$2,000 a year so as to place him beyond temptation to wink at undervaluations of goods.

MR. BURPEE (St. John): Speaking of this Appraisers' Department at Ottawa, it may accomplish what the hon. Minister expects of it. But I am of opinion he would secure his object more effectually in stationing appraisers at some of the larger ports, where they will accomplish more than they can here at head-quarters. I quite understand the difficulty the hon. Minister is under in exacting the fair market value for goods where they are purchased. There will always be found importers who will try to evade the law if they can. On the other hand the great majority of merchants are honest in their entries. I believe there are just as many honest merchants in the country as there are honest manufacturers. Some of them have suffered great hardship in the interpretation of the law. My interpretation of the law is to make a fair valuation upon the market price in the country in which they are purchased. I submit that it was never contemplated by the law to charge duty on any increase which may take place on the goods imported between the time of shipment and

the time of arrival in Canada. It is a rule, however, if persevered in, that should work both ways. If the price falls on the shipment the duty should be levied on the reduced price. I desire to refer to the matter of the defalcation of the Toronto Custom House, which has been alluded to at a previous time on motions for papers, etc. The hon. the Minister of Customs then stated that that defalcation existed in 1875; it was so reported by Inspector Kavanagh that no action was taken. This, however, was not the fact. The reports of the Inspectors only showed that an irregularity existed. The returns brought down do not show any defalcation in 1875, nor is there such charge made by the Inspector either against the Collector or cashier. The Inspector reports an amount of \$841 in the cashier's hands in 1875, which he said he retained to pay refunds, etc., and sent in an account of the distribution of the same every three months. The Inspector says this is irregular, and should be accounted for every three months. He further says that he left instructions to have the deposits made every day, and the cashier's accounts balanced every month, and that Mr. Douglas was ordered to see these instructions carried out. In the Commissioner's investigation, November, 1879, Mr. Douglas declares that he does not remember any such orders from Mr. Kavanagh the Inspector, nor did he hear of anything irregular as to the keeping of the cashier's or Collector's accounts. The Commissioner's reports of November 14, 1879, November 25, and November 27, 1879, do not furnish any evidence that such was the case. The cashier acknowledged he was short, both to the Commissioner and Inspector Newburn, later on, but no time can be fixed when it was. He said to the Commissioner, as per his (the Commissioner's) report, that it was \$3,500, but to Mr. Newburn he said at one time \$2,000, and at another \$1,000. On these, however, the cashier and Collector gave contradictory statements, but nothing definite could be ascertained. They, however, both say that this was kept strictly secret from the Inspector and the Department. Inspector Newburn says that he visited Toronto port in 1879, and remained there a long time. During that time he had no hint or the slightest suspicion that

there was then, or had been any deficiency or irregularity in the accounts of either the Collector or cashier. The first intimation I had was in November, 1878, when for the first time the cashier's book was closed at 2:30, then at two o'clock, and so on, till at last it was closed at twelve o'clock in the day, whereas, the office closed at four o'clock. This closing the cash book so early in the day, gave an opportunity to use the funds after that hour for the day. Inspector Newburn also says in his Report that the great bulk of the defalcation took place between December, 1878, and April, 1879. He also says that Collector Smith told him, that he (the Collector) and McClose disagreed about November, 1878. The funds were then shut off from Mr. McClose, and then the larger borrowing began from Customs, etc. These reports show that the late Government was only cognisant of the existence of an irregularity on which I was not prepared to dismiss an officer, I should have to be satisfied that he had taken money before I would have removed him.

MR. BOWELL: I think the hon. gentleman has gone a little farther than he intended to go in his statement in regard to that defalcation. The remark I made was that, if the irregularities, not the defalcation, to which Mr. Kavanagh had called the attention of the Department in 1875, had been checked at that time, this defalcation would not have taken place. In relation to the practice of levying duty on goods which increased in value subsequently to the period of their entry, the hon. gentleman is mistaken. The rule is that if they have increased in value between the period of purchase and the time of exportation from Liverpool or other foreign market, the duty would be levied under the law on the increased value, but not as stated by the hon. member, upon the increase in value of articles after shipment; that was the old law, but to avoid any difficulty on that point, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance amended the Act by repealing that clause, and enacting one under which it would be impossible, unless the law were grossly violated, to charge increased duty on the value of goods after they had been exported. Undervaluations are constantly taking place; the value for duty is the fair mar-

ket value at the time of exportation. I do not accuse merchants of dishonesty, or that the undervaluations are made for the purpose of defrauding the Revenue. A merchant goes to the United States, and the seller there, in order to keep the Canadian market, sells at a less price than they do to their own dealers; and when the merchant in this country presents his invoice, the prices are less than the fair market price in the market in which they are purchased, or at the time they are exported to Canada. It is the appraiser's duty, under the circumstances, to see that these invoices are raised to the fair market value at which the exporters sell to their own dealers in their own country. That is the law.

MR. BURPEE: All goods do not come that way.

MR. BOWELL: I am speaking of these particular invoices. When a deputation of hardware merchants waited upon me I showed them the law. They certainly did not find fault, except that they thought it unfair that the value should be added to their invoices in this way, while in case of prices falling the difference could not be deducted.

MR. ANGLIN: Hear, hear.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) says "hear, hear;" it is quite evident he does not know the law. My hon. friend thinks it an unfair law that does not work both ways. But it is strange that for three years there should be left in the Act a clause making a special provision that under no circumstances shall an invoice be lessened in value for duty. Let my hon. friend refer to the 46th Section. That clause being on the Statute-book how can the hon. the Minister of Customs or the appraisers, even if satisfied that the price of goods have gone down, deduct anything from the invoice on that account. If the law is wrong then it should have been repealed; but having been passed by the late Minister of Customs he could see no wrong in it until he became an Opposist.

MR. BURPEE: I can explain that.

MR. BOWELL: There is no Collector of Customs with whom I have had correspondence whose attention has been called to this that has not placed the same construction on it. It is our duty

to see the law, as it stands, carried out. As to increasing salaries, I agree with the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Ryan) that there are officers whose salaries ought to be increased, considering the duties they have to perform, and I have provided for an increase of some of them. There is one who acts as Clerk and Secretary to the Collector, and does an amount of correspondence most marvellous, and I intend to increase his salary, as well as those of some of the Assistant Appraisers.

MR. BURPEE: I agree that it would be impossible to take off the difference from an invoice in case of the goods going down in price, but I connected that with the remark about raising the value above the invoice when the goods go up. The amount of value when exported is the value to be entered in the Customs house, and if the goods go up in value between the time of shipment and their arrival in this country, the invoice should not be increased.

MR. BOWELL: It has never been done; if it has the Department does not know about it, though such was the law as passed by the hon. member himself when Minister of Customs.

MR. BURPEE: The clause which refers to importation of goods is the thirty-second section of the Customs Act. This clause refers to the entering of goods. What determines the value is the market value.

MR. BOWELL: But the 133rd clause fixes the date when the market value should be considered to rule.

In reply to Mr. GILLMOR,

MR. BOWELL said that West Isles was formerly a port of entry: the amount of duties collected, and the duties to be performed fell off, hence the port was made an outport of St. Andrews, and the salary of the Collector at West Isles reduced, so that though the pay roll at St. Andrew's was increased by \$300, the actual saving to the Revenue was \$400, by abolishing the port of West Isles.

MR. BROOKS: I notice in looking over the details at the port of Sherbrooke a \$1,400 increase. I would like an explanation of this, as to whether any new officers have been appointed or any increases made in the salaries of officers.

MR. BOWELL: Neither the one nor the other. To relieve Montreal of a cer-

tain officer, Mr. Barry was sent to Richmond by my hon. friend opposite, as a general detective. The fact of his being there, induced the Government to erect Richmond into an outport of Sherbrooke, Barry receiving his former salary; but being made an outport of Sherbrooke, it gave it the appearance of increasing the expenses of that port, when, in fact, it was only a transfer from Montreal, where he had been for thirty or forty years, and being a very active officer, was sent to Richmond, where he has been made a sub-Collector.

MR. BROOKS: Then Sherbrooke has suffered for the benefit of Montreal. It seems an anomaly that the salary of such an officer should be equal to the salary of both Collector and Assistant at Sherbrooke. Sherbrooke is the fourth port in the Province of Quebec, and the expenses are less in proportion to receipts than in any other port in that Province except two others, being only 8 per cent. of the receipts. I have no fault to find with this officer at Richmond, or with his appointment, or with the making of that place into an outport of Sherbrooke; but he receives within \$100 as much as the Collector and Assistant at Sherbrooke, both of whom are efficient men and able officers. They have given satisfaction to the public there and to the Department, and I would urge upon the hon. Minister that, when it can be found possible to do it, there should be a gradual increase in their salaries.

MR. SPROULE was glad the hon. the Minister of Customs saw the necessity of guarding against goods entering below value. It was a custom very prevalent for United States travellers coming through the country to offer goods to merchants and arrange to send two invoices. He had heard these offers made very often, and he thought that with the view of providing against this practice, it would be desirable to have more appraisers; it would be to the interest of the country. It was not so much to the advantage of the importer as to the seller on the other side to carry on this practice, when they could accomplish it by making out two invoices, and sending one by mail and the other lower one along with the goods. By a little species of book-keeping it could be made impossible to find it out. More

attention and more appraisers would protect the interests of the country.

MR. BROOKS: I notice, Mr. Chairman, by the schedule in the Estimates that the expenses of the port of Sherbrooke have been increased by the sum of \$1,400. I would like to know from the hon. the Minister of Customs for what purpose this sum is required, whether additional officers have been appointed at that port, or whether the salaries of the officers at that port have been increased.

MR. BOWELL: Neither the one nor the other. As I stated before, this increase is caused by the establishment of an outport at Richmond, and the payment of the salary of Mr. Barry, who had been sent there by the late Government from Montreal, and whose salary was fixed at the sum of \$1,400.

MR. ANGLIN said this story of cheating the Revenue was a very old one; and there was no proof whatever that, to-day, with the existence of this Board of experts and all the additional cost, a more effectual check is placed on frauds of this kind than before. Under former Administrations all possible care was taken at the various ports of entry to prevent these frauds; under the Administration of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) care was taken to ascertain the market value of articles for which fraudulent entries might be made, and parties making them were compelled to rectify them. We had this Board established at very considerable expense, and even amongst very honest and honourable merchants the decisions of that Board had caused very serious discontent. No one could fairly object to the hon. Minister indulging in a joke. He rarely does so, and although this was second-hand, he should be permitted to indulge in it without objection. But the whole country must feel that when the duties were increased, the work of the smuggler and the illicit distiller was promoted.

MR. BOWELL: How is illicit distillation increased?

MR. ANGLIN: By the higher rate of duties on liquors. A larger force is now required to check such operations than was required some years ago. The hon. gentleman seems to think that smuggling has either been put an end to or virtually checked by means of the larger detective force, but the

MR. BOWELL.

general impression is that there is a large amount of smuggling going on all along the frontier. With regard to the port of Montreal, there has, for years, been a great deal of talk about the expenditure there. The late Minister of Customs made some changes in the regulations of the port for which he was violently attacked, because they seemed to increase the expense of collecting the revenues of that port. I do not see there has been any improvement under the present régime. But, taking everything into consideration, distribute the expenditure how you may, the expenditure for this year is larger than that for last year, even excluding the superannuation allowances.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. gentleman has used one expression which I do not want to go to the country without contradiction. He stated that the decisions arrived at by the appraisers were "arbitrary."

MR. ANGLIN: I said they were so regarded by importers.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. gentleman repeated the statement, and put it in such language as to leave the impression that the appraisers acted arbitrarily, and without sufficient data. I can tell him that no matter what the impression is in the country, such is not the fact. Importers have not been interfered with at all, except upon the best possible evidence that goods were marked at less than the price for which they were bought, or at prices under the fair market value in the country in which they were bought. If the hon. member desires to assist in the proper administration of the Customs law, I think he should rather justify the conduct of the appraisers in the conscientious performance of their duties in endeavouring to establish uniformity in prices for duty in different sections of the country. The hon. gentleman says that if this matter were properly investigated it would be found that the appropriation was as large as the previous year. If, however, the hon. gentleman would look into the matter he would see that the Estimate was not as large as the previous year. The difficulty I had to encounter was that our ports were overstocked with officers. There were more men than were necessary, and I have invariably, when a vacancy

occurred, promoted the next man to the position, if qualified, giving him a little increase of salary, thereby saving the balance.

MR. ANGLIN: The hon. gentleman has misinterpreted what I said. What I did say was that complaints were made by importers of the decisions of the appraisers. In regard to the port of Montreal I did not deny that there was a reduction in the amount of the salaries. On the contrary, I said there was a large reduction and I stated the manner in which the hon. member accounted for the reduction. What I said was, that taking the figures as they stand, the amount to be expended in that port next year is quite as large as the amount asked for last year—a few dollars larger, I think. The Estimates for the port of St. John show an increase of \$600, while it is notorious that of all ports in the Dominion the falling off in revenue for that port was the greatest. Therefore, there could have been no reason for an increase of wages.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) asked what provision had been made for the prevention of smuggling, and the collection of duties in the North-West.

MR. BOWELL: There has been no change made in regard to the collection of Customs in the North-West.

MR. SMITH: At what points on the boundary line does the collection of duties take place?

MR. BOWELL: Wherever the North-West Police are stationed there the duties are collected, and if it be necessary for the officers to go to a frontier port on Customs business, they go there and attend to it.

MR. SMITH: Then the duties will continue to be collected by the officers of the North-West Mounted Police?

MR. BOWELL: Yes.

MR. SMITH: I understood the system was to be changed, and the duties collected under the auspices of the Minister of Customs.

Vote agreed to.

XXIX. COLLECTION OF REVENUES—EXCISE.

Salaries of Officers and Inspectors of Excise.....	\$180,000
To provide for improvement of classification subject to results of Excise Examination.....	6,000

187	Travelling Expenses, Rent, Fuel, Stationery, etc.....	40,000
	To pay Collectors of Customs allowance on duties collected by them.....	2,000
	Preventive Service	6,500
	To repay—Wilson, an Officer of Excise, for certain disbursements and expenses incurred in protecting the Revenue, and in defending certain suits in law brought against him in consequence thereof.....	750

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Here again is a tolerably ample justification of the votes taken by the late Government. We find the present Minister wants \$13,510 more than in 1880. In the case of Customs, I could understand more money might be wanted, and my impression is that it will be; and I was not disposed to find fault with the demand of a few thousands more. But I hardly think the same rule applies in the case of Inland Revenue. The increase here is considerably larger than in the Customs; it amounts to 16 on 17 per cent. on the previous expenditure. The present hon. Minister used to find fault with us for the small amount we expended. In 1877, the total expenditure under this head was only \$211,000; in 1878, \$215,000, and in 1879, \$211,000. As between \$211,000 and \$235,000, now asked, there is a difference of nearly \$24,000, making a very large expenditure. I cannot see what ground there is for adding nearly 12 per cent. to the total expenditure in this item.

MR. BABY: The addition is only \$12,000.

SIR RICHARD J. CARWRIGHT: I speak of the actual expenditure in the last Public Accounts before us. Has the hon. gentleman found that there is such an increase of illicit distillation that this expenditure is required, or are there any other causes? The revenue has not increased to any appreciable extent.

MR. BABY: The number of distilleries and malt-houses has increased considerably, although it gives no revenue; and there is increase in every branch of the Service. There are ten distilleries under surveillance.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: There used to be quite that number.

MR. BABY: For some years previous to a recent period the number was diminished considerably.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

In 1878, there were only four distilleries.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: There were more in 1876, and the expenditure then was not any greater.

MR. BABY: In every branch the business has increased, Excise officers being required now where they were not before, to protect the Revenue.

Vote agreed to.

XXX. COLLECTION OF REVENUES—CULLING TIMBER.

188	{ Quebec Office.....	\$62,100
	{ Montreal Office.....	4,600
	{ Sorel Office.....	200

XXXI. COLLECTION OF REVENUES—WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AND GAS.

189	Salaries of Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors of Weights and Measures.....	\$40,800
-----	--	----------

MR. CASEY: I would like to call the attention of the Government to the petition I presented to the House yesterday, signed by the late Deputy Inspectors of Weights and Measures, asking for compensation in lieu of their superannuation moneys. I would like to know what is proposed to be done in the matter.

MR. BABY: Provision will be made in the Supplementary Estimates for those Deputy Inspectors who have faithfully performed their duties.

Vote agreed to.

190	Salaries of Inspectors of Gas	\$ 8,000
191	Rent Fuel, travelling expenses Postage, Stationery, etc.....	23,500

XXXII. COLLECTION OF REVENUES—INSPECTION OF STAPLES.

192	For the purchase and distribution of standards of flour, etc., and other expenditure under the Act.....	\$3,000
-----	---	---------

XXXIII. COLLECTION OF REVENUES—ADULTERATION OF FOOD.

193	To meet expenses under the Act.....	\$10,000
-----	-------------------------------------	----------

XXXIV. COLLECTION OF REVENUES—MINOR REVENUES.

194	{ Department of Inland Revenue..	\$8,000
	{ do the Interior.....	2,000

XXXVII. COLLECTION OF REVENUES—POST OFFICE.

205	{ For Ontario.....	\$842,000
	{ Quebec.....	486,500
	{ New Brunswick.....	168,500
	{ Nova Scotia.....	196,000
	{ Prince Edward Island.....	49,000
	{ British Columbia.....	64,000
	{ North-West Territory.....	22,000
	{ Manitoba.....	24,000

XXXVIII. DOMINION LANDS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

206 Amount required for Surveys...\$300,000

XXXIX. DOMINION LANDS.

207	Outside Service, Land Agencies in Manitoba and North-West Territories, and Timber Agencies, nine offices in all; their salaries, contingent expenses and inspection.....	\$32,009
	Extra Clerks at Head office, Ottawa, maps and other printing and advertising expenses and other similar charges.....	14,600
208	Outside Service, British Columbia, Staff, contingent expenses inspection, etc.....	10,645

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: This is very much objected to in the present shape as chargeable to capital. The amount is very large, but independently of that, the charge to capital appears to be objectionable. We have charged in former years very large sums steadily to Dominion lands. The practice of charging anything to capital is to be guarded against.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In the first place, this \$300,000 is for surveying some 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 acres of land, which it is proposed to survey this year. The influx of immigration is so large that in the township surveys and block surveys, the system about to be adopted is to have competition between the surveyors as to the charge. We cannot exactly say what the lowest tenders may be, but it will be under four cents an acre. As to the charge to capital, it is simply owing to this that we hope to realise capital out of the land and this charge is to be taken out of capital.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not fair having regard to other years.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It only requires an explanation. It is satisfactory to know that up to yesterday at Emerson, 7,000 emigrants came in, 3,500 of whom went into Winnipeg. There is a great claim for land both by settlers and purchasers.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I do not want to press discussion. The sums recived heretofore for Dominion lands have been credited as an ordinary income. This is manifestly correct, and I do not think it is right to have this survey charged to Capital. It should be

charged to Income and any proceeds also should be charged to Income; therefore, in the Public Accounts for the future, if this is persisted in, you must charge the other side.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Certainly, a special land account can be kept for this for which credit will be given for all moneys received and in which all charges for surveys, etc., will be charged.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT Without pledging myself as to taking a vote I may say that that will to a considerable extent obviate the objection which lies to charging to Capital. Some distinct assurance had better be given on that head.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: By the terms of the Resolutions of last Session, there would have been a general arrangement made between Her Majesty and Canada. There would have been Commissioners to hold these lands in trust. As there are no Commissioners, the Government must act as Commissioners, and keep the accounts which the Commissioners, if appointed under the Resolutions, would have kept.

MR. BUNSTER: I would like to know about having the twenty-mile belt of Vancouver Island surveyed. By an Order in Council there is a reservation made.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is all over.

MR. BUNSTER: It is not all over; it is in Vancouver Island. The hon. the First Minister has staked his reputation on it. He has a large interest in it. It is my duty, and it is his duty, to see it surveyed and thrown open for settlement. There have been many going away through the delay. I want to know whether he intends to have it open for settlers.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There was an Act passed setting aside certain lands on the Island, and Mr. Kertch, acting on behalf of the Canadian Government, is pressing on the British Columbian Government the necessity of immediately setting out the railway lands under the agreement of Union. Negotiations are going on to have them at once set out.

MR. MACKENZIE: That Act was passed, as to the land on the Island, as a condition of building the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway. That enterprise

fell through, therefore the Government have nothing to do with it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The land is reserved by an Act of Parliament, and can only be restored by a repeal of that Act. There is an Act of the British Columbia Legislature actually reserving those lands for the purposes of the Pacific Railway.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not for the Pacific Railway; for the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I may be wrong.

MR. BUNSTER: According to the Carnarvon Terms, \$2,000,000 a year were to be expended on Vancouver Island.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, no.

MR. BUNSTER: The hon. gentleman, who was a party to the transaction, says "No, no." If it were not too late in the Session, I would convince him by means of documentary proof, that he is wrong. The hon. the First Minister made a request to British Columbia to reserve twenty miles of land on Vancouver Island, and that land was reserved, much to the detriment of intending settlers. It is my bounden duty to call attention to the injustice done to the Province. The hon. member for Lambton, in all earnestness, landed 500 tons of rails on the Island, with the intention of building the Railway, in accordance with the Terms, but they were carted away again. We do not mean to let go of the Award for one moment, and we expect that the hon. the First Minister will do justice to himself and the country, and carry out the Carnarvon Terms.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We must try and get the best land we can out of British Columbia.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): Is it the intention to survey the land round Edmonton, St. Albert, and other stations on the North Saskatchewan?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is a party surveying Edmonton at present, and another is about to be sent out to make further exploratory surveys.

In reply to **MR. BUNSTER**,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said: I cannot give any other answer to my hon. friend, in regard to our position with respect to British Columbia, until we receive an answer from the Government of the Province.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. BUNSTER: That answer is important to our people, and they will see that Mr. Walkem does his duty. If he does not, we will soon turn him out.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): Have any timber licenses been given out in the North-West this year, or if not, is it the intention to give out any.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes, we hope to be able to give out timber licenses. There are several applications from people of enterprise and capital, who desire to build grist and saw mills. Licenses will only be given to persons who show that they have means to put up mills and utilise them at once.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Licenses have been granted under the terms of the Dominion License Act. They are for twenty-one years. The holders pay a good rent and royalty. The original licenses were granted to Mr. Macaulay and others before 1873. Some were granted in our time. Last year they were put up to public competition, and some twenty berths were sold and \$24,000 received on account. That system will be adopted as a general rule.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Unless you adopt one definite system for all concerned there is very great danger of jobbery, particularly in a country where the privilege is of much more value than in any other part of this Dominion.

MR. BUNSTER: What is intended to be done with the timber licenses of British Columbia?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Until we have the negotiations concluded with British Columbia, it would be impossible to offer any policy on the subject. I will give my hon. friend (Mr. Bunster) the earliest information when the negotiations are terminated. Since the present Government was formed all the twenty-one years licenses for timber have been given to public competition. We only give our permit or annual licenses from year to year.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): Is it the intention of the Government to give any licenses for coal mining in the unsurveyed Territories?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Respecting the coal district of Souris, under the Dominion Act, certain provisions were made to encourage exploration, and people had

een exploring and marking off limits for themselves. The Government have stopped anything of this kind, especially at Souris, where a coal-field is believed to exist, close to the boundary. There is to be a thorough, exhaustive examination of that coal-field, and till its extent and value are ascertained it will not be put into the market. It would be bad policy to allow it to go into the hands of people who might raise the price; so that whole district is withdrawn from settlement, until the geological and mineralogical survey is completed.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): I hope something will be done in the upper part of the Saskatchewan, where there are valuable coal-fields.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hope so.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I should be glad of the Government's decision as to whether they will reserve a certain royalty on the coal-fields or not. We have made no attempt to increase our Revenue from the great mines and coal fields. Those coal-fields are exceptional deposits. The question is worth considering. I would be glad to hear the hon. the First Minister's views on the subject.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We have a Bill before the other House to give more power to the Government in regard to this matter.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: A very considerable revenue might be obtained in this way.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think so.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Ten minutes before
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 29th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor-General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

"MR. SPEAKER:

"His Excellency the Governor-General desires the immediate presence of this House in the Senate Chamber."

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate.

In the Senate Chamber.

HIS EXCELLENCY the GOVERNOR-GENERAL was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to further amend an Act respecting the security to be given by Officers of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Commercial Travellers' Association.

An Act to amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies to construct works to facilitate the transmission of timber down rivers and streams.

An Act to incorporate The Mail Printing Company.

An Act respecting the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.

An Act to authorise the establishment of Superannuation, Provident and Insurance Funds by the Great Western Railway Company.

An Act to give certain powers to La Compagnie Française du Telegraphe de Paris à New York.

An Act to incorporate the Baptist Union of Canada.

An Act to provide for the Salaries of two additional Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

An Act to amend and reenact, as amended, the Act incorporating The Dominion Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of Canada.

An Act to amend the Act intitled: An Act to incorporate the Anchor Marine Insurance Company.

An Act to amend the Act thirty-sixth Victoria, Chapter one hundred and eight, intitled "An Act to grant additional powers to the Quebec and Gulf Ports Steamship Company."

An Act respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.

An Act further to amend the Act therein cited incorporating the Canada Guarantee Company.

An Act to incorporate the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the President, Directors and Company of the Bank of New Brunswick.

An Act to empower the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to relinquish their Charter, and to provide for the winding-up of their affairs.

An Act to incorporate the St. Clair and Lake Erie Navigation Company.

An Act to confirm the purchase by the Dominion of a portion of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the agreement made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company with respect thereto.

An Act for the final settlement of claims to

lands in Manitoba by occupancy, under the Act thirty-third Victoria, chapter three.

An Act to amend an Act respecting the Port Whitby Harbour Company.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company.

An Act to authorise and provide for the winding up of the Stadacona Bank.

An Act further to continue in force, for a limited time, "The better prevention of Crime Act, 1878."

An Act respecting Dorchester Penitentiary. An Act further to amend the Acts therein mentioned respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.

And the House being returned,

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 118) Respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.—(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

Bill (No. 119) Respecting the administration of criminal justice in the territory in dispute between the Governments of the Province of Ontario and of the Dominion of Canada.—(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

Bill (No. 120) To amend the Law of Evidence in criminal cases, and to authorise the taking of depositions, and to make same evidence in certain cases.—(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

BILLS WITHDRAWN.

Resolved, That, as, at this late period of the Session, it is impossible to obtain a quorum of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, the following Bills be withdrawn, and the fees paid thereon be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation.—(*Mr. Langevin.*)

The following Bills were accordingly withdrawn :—

Bill (No. 72) To extend the corporate character and powers of the Direct United States Cable Company to the Dominion of Canada.

Bill (No. 76) To remove doubts as to the true construction of Section 12 of the Northern Railway Company Act, 1877.

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Canadian Telegraph Company.

DUTIES OF CUSTOMS AND EXCISE BILL.

[BILL 102.]

(*Sir Samuel L. Tilley.*)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. BÉCHARD: Allow me to call the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to one Customs duty which works injuriously to some people. I refer to the duty imposed on imported apples. There are some people situated on the

Richelieu River, engaged in dealing in apples. They were in the habit of going to the States of Vermont and New York, where they could buy apples at cheaper prices, and they brought them by the Richelieu River to the Province of Quebec where they sold them. That trade was very profitable to some people in the Province. The duty of 40 cents per barrel has entirely annihilated their trade. They could get their apples for 15c. per bushel last fall, but the duty amounting to 16c. per bushel makes the cost of those apples 31c. a bushel, which is more than they could sell them at. They could not sell at more than 25c. or 30c. a bushel. I thought, therefore, that I would submit this matter to the hon. the Finance Minister. If the hon. gentleman cannot see his way to remove the duty altogether, perhaps he might be able to make it an *ad valorem* duty instead of a specific one, as it is, for surely common apples should not pay the same duty as apples of the finest kinds.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I am afraid I shall not be able to meet the wishes of my hon. friend. I think, as a rule, that, with anything like a favourable season, we have an abundant supply of apples, and at pretty low prices. I recollect being in the County of Kent, some years since, and observing that there was there, and on the whole of the Peninsula, an abundance of apples of every kind and description; some of the best were sold at \$1.20 a barrel delivered at Prescott Junction. With the increase of fruit trees transplanted since that time, I think we must produce apples sufficient for our own use. I am afraid I cannot comply with the request of my hon. friend.

MR. BÉCHARD: It is true that apples, like everything else, were cheap in Canada last fall; but I wanted to point out to the hon. Minister one branch of trade which had been entirely destroyed by his Tariff.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I can quite understand that just in that locality it may have had that effect.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Bill reported.

Motion made and question proposed :

MR. BÉCHARD.

That the said Bill be now read the third time.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) : Before the Bill is read a third time, I would like to call attention to a discrimination, or rather a want of discrimination, injuriously affecting an important branch of Canadian industry, in relation to the duty on imported cement. Have we native production suitable for building purposes? There is a very large industry engaged in the manufacture of artificial stone. The ingredients used are common stone and Portland cement. Portland stone is imported from England, and those engaged in the manufacture of this artificial material are placed at a disadvantage in having a part of their raw material heavily taxed. The tax is the same on both Portland cement and hydraulic cement; they are both placed on the same footing. Hydraulic cement is produced in this country; and as the object of the Tariff is, or should be, to give the Canadian manufacturers their raw material as cheaply as possible, I can see an incongruity between taxing both these articles alike. I now, therefore, draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance to it, in order that he may avail himself of an opportunity which he now has of relieving an important industry of a heavy duty, and of thus supplying us with a material so much needed.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : I very much fear that, if Parliament were to take the duty off this cement, it would not compete with the stone of a superior character to be found so abundantly in different parts of the Dominion. Supposing it were admitted free, cement is a very expensive article. I do not think there would be a cubic yard in a barrel; and it appears to me it would be cheaper to use stone, even if it had to be brought a considerable distance. The suggestion of my hon. friend would of course involve the removal of the duty for all purposes. My attention has not been called to the matter before, and I very much regret that we cannot open up the question at the present stage. I will take a note of it and take the matter into consideration, though I confess it does not present itself favourably to my mind at the present moment.

MR. BLAKE : My hon. friend asked for bread, and the hon. the Finance Min-

ister gives him a stone. I will give the hon. gentleman an answer, in regard to his suggestion, about cheap stone; it is that the artificial stone is being largely manufactured at certain points.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross) was asking for bread, I am afraid it is bread that he cannot live very long on. In view of the evidence taken last Session, in regard to the quality of stone in certain localities, it strikes me that it would be exceedingly difficult to compete with the stone to be found in certain parts of Ontario.

MR. ROSS : We have no stone in Western Ontario, such as serves the same purpose as the artificial stone—in fact, we have none in any part of the Dominion. The artificial stone made in my town and other parts of the Province serves almost the same purpose as the beautiful Ohio stone, which was used for dressing in the Parliament Buildings. It is extensively used for lintels and ornamental purposes of all kinds. I hope that between now and next year the Government will give this matter a little attention.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY : I have taken a note of the matter.

MR. MILLS : In the section of the country in which I reside—in fact, on the Western Peninsula, we have no free-stone at all. We were largely supplied with free-stone from Cleveland, Ohio, but the hon. gentleman's Tariff has excluded the free-stone of that neighbourhood, and this artificial stone is taking its place. It is used largely for ornamental purposes in buildings of a superior character, but the hon. Minister's regulations practically prohibit its use in the erection of buildings of a public and private character. It is very desirable that either the duty should be taken off free-stone, or the duty reduced on Portland cement, or both.

MR. ANGLIN : I have no doubt the hon. Minister will be surprised to learn that even in the city of St. John, where we have large quarries of free-stone within a few miles, a large quantity of this artificial stone has been used since the fire. All the window frames and ornamental work of the new Methodist Church, on Queen square, are built of artificial stone made in the city. One advantage in using this stone is that it can be pressed

to the necessary shape in the process of manufacture, thus saving the expense of cutting which adds much to the cost of free-stone.

MR. CURRIER: Cement is manufactured in various parts of this country, and my hon. friend from Middlesex can buy just as good cement, manufactured in Hull, as the Portland cement. Enough can be manufactured there to supply the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. It is cheaper than the Portland cement, and will compare favourably with that article for every purpose.

Bill read the third time and passed, on a division.

PICTOU HARBOUR ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 106.]

(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, and reported.

Motion made and question proposed:

That the said Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)

MR. BLAKE: It does not appear that this Bill is based on a proper principle. The hon. mover says it may be quite right, that, in all cases, the Harbour Commissioners should have the appointment of the harbour master. But I think that where a harbour master has been appointed, it would be proper to leave him undisturbed, and not legislate him out of office simply with a view to his temporary appointment by the Commissioners. I presume the harbour masters now hold office during the pleasure of the Government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No doubt.

MR. BLAKE: I should not object to a provision that, for the future, the Commissioners should be the persons under whom the harbour masters should hold office; but that change should be effected by legislation. I think that on general principles no officer should be legislated out of existence in this way. You should give the Commissioners, for the time to come, the same power of dismissal as the Government has.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I think the hon. member for West Durham misunderstands the Bill which, as I understand it, does not legislate the harbour

master out of existence, but leaves to the Harbour Commissioners the right to deal with him as they think proper—to dismiss him if they see fit.

MR. BLAKE: What is the proviso for?

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): Though I doubt if the proviso gives the power the hon. gentleman supposes, I have no objection, if it is desired, to strike it out. I agree with him that it is undesirable to legislate such an officer out of existence. The object of the Bill is to put the harbour master under the control of the Commissioners—there is no other purpose.

MR. BLAKE: Then strike out the proviso.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I have no objection.

MR. ANGLIN: Is Pictou the only harbour where the Commissioners have not the right to appoint the harbour master? Is this an exceptional measure?

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I think the same jurisdiction was given to the Commissioners in other parts. I am not certain whether the power is general or not.

MR. BLAKE: I presume the Bill is intended to bring Pictou within the general rule. There can be no exceptional reason why its Commissioners should have the appointment of the harbour masters and the Commissioners of other ports not have a similar power.

Bill again considered in Committee of the Whole, amended, and reported.

MR. BLAKE: I hope the Government will consider the suggestion of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) and deal with all harbours on the same general principle. No special circumstances for an exceptional policy in this case have been assigned. Therefore, on motives of general policy, I think it is not proper to apply an exceptional Bill.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): The Harbour Commissioners do not appoint the master at any of the harbours. During the Recess, a general Bill on the subject will be considered by the Government, with a view to having all the harbour masters appointed in this way.

Bill read the third time and passed.

MR. ANGLIN.

REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS BILL.—

[BILL 107.]

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. BLAKE: Some of the provisions of this Bill appear, at first blush, rather beyond our jurisdiction. They appear to create, in reference to a civil wrong, a liability on the part of individuals for expenses incurred in removing obstructions, or recovering damages therefor from a private owner. It seems to be rather doubtful whether we have power to give the Crown the right to remove such obstructions, and levy in a civil action against a person for the cost and expense of such removal.

MR. LANE: I would like a clause added giving to municipalities the power of removing all obstructions from rivers. We have had a great deal of difficulty in our part of the country from those obstructions, and during last year the citizens of the town I live in were put to the expense of getting a decree from the Court of Chancery to remove an old hulk from the harbour, which cost us a considerable sum. I propose the addition of the following clause:—

“And be it further enacted, that any municipality in or through which any navigable river runs or harbour is situated, or is in whole or partly situated, shall have the right to notify in writing the owner or owners of the vessel or obstruction or such wreck as referred to, or part thereof, lying or being in the said harbour or river, situate within the limits of the said municipality, within to remove the same from such river or harbour. Or, in case the said notice is not complied with within days, the said municipality shall have the right to remove the same and charge the expense of such removal to such owner or owners, which expense may be charged to such owner or owners and collected in any Court of competent jurisdiction.”

I do not think there can be any objection to this clause. The law, as it stands, is not well defined and should be made clear. Such a law as I propose would be beneficial. We have a number of hulks in our harbours and rivers that should be removed in the interest of navigation and trade.

MR. MILLS: I think that very serious wrong may be done under this Bill.

Take the case of a collision, where the party not at fault has his vessel sunk. He would be liable to still further damage for the cost of the removal of his vessel from the harbour or water-way. Apart from the question of jurisdiction, that is a serious defect. Unless you take proper steps to protect innocent parties against wrong in that way, the Bill should not pass.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): I believe the parties interested in the collision should remove the wreck. Have the people of the country any right to do so? Somebody must pay for the work, and why not the private parties interested in the vessels or obstructions? There is much reason why the Bill should pass. Our law ordering the owners of wrecks to remove them is evaded. Some years ago a vessel, laden with lumber, was wrecked at Prince Edward Island, and run on the flats where every vessel, approaching at night, incurred the risk of a collision. Though applications were made, time after time, to have this vessel removed, and tenders were received for the work, it remained unmoved up to last year; the cost of removing her being \$900. With a law like this proposed, the navigation could have been cleared long before. In this case the parties responsible for the wreck left the country, entailing upon it the loss of \$900. There are many demands upon the authorities at present for the removal of such obstructions. If the Government is compelled to remove them it should be compensated, and the expense not thrown on the public. In some cases, where the channels are narrow, they are entirely blocked up with wrecks.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Bill is intended to cure a serious evil. The hon. member for West Durham has raised the point of jurisdiction, which is worthy of all consideration. But I think that, under our powers in connection with the subject of navigation, we can pass the present Bill. The evil dealt with is of very considerable importance, and I hope the House will allow the second reading.

MR. BLAKE: The cases which the hon. the Minister of Marine has mentioned, no doubt ought to be provided for, where a party is wilfully negligent, runs his vessel on the flats or sinks her in a harbour, and does not remove her, running the risk of obstructing the channel.

He is guilty of a wrongful act, and provision ought to be made for making him pay the damages, or cost of removal, as well as a proper penalty for his offence. But there are cases in which this might prove a very harsh measure, including that suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Are you going to charge the owner of a vessel which has been sunk by the fault of another, and who has thus suffered heavy loss, with the cost of removing the wreck in addition? Ought you not rather make amenable the persons whose wrongful act occasioned the obstruction?

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): The difficulty in carrying out the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham would be, that you would be throwing the onus on the Government of establishing which of the two crews or ships was at fault, a point that should be more properly determined in a Court. It does not appear to me to be a great hardship to hold the party whose vessel obstructs the navigation responsible for its removal, as he can establish that as an additional item of damages against the party blameable for the collision or loss, when proving his other claim. When dealing with the public interest, the Government can hardly look at the immediate loss of a private party.

MR. FLYNN: I remember a case of a vessel of twenty or thirty tons burthen being run into, in a harbour in Nova Scotia, by a steamer, and sunk. They could not have taken up that craft. In cases of that kind the Bill would inflict great hardship.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): There would have been no great hardship in the case mentioned. If the fault lay with the schooner, she should have abided by the consequences. The parties in the wrong could be taxed and compelled to pay damages.

MR. KILLAM: Some of the provisions of this Bill appear unfair and likely to inflict serious injustice upon private parties who might not be able to pay the cost of removing wrecks. This Bill has been introduced at so late a period of the Session that I presume the Government do not intend to press it. We should have an opportunity of consulting

our vessel-owning friends before being asked to pass a Bill of this kind.

Bill read the second time.

PROMISSORY NOTES DUTIES ACT EXTENSION BILL.—[BILL 108.]

(*Mr. Baby.*)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading *read.*

MR. BLAKE: The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue promised at this stage to bring down a statement of the amount of the duties collected.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo): I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what provision he intends extending to British Columbia, to enable persons in the interior to get conveniently the necessary stamps. A resolution has been passed by the Chamber of Commerce, Victoria, setting forth the inconvenience that would accrue to persons in the mining districts if with the Bill passed, if facilities were not extended to them of obtaining those stamps. I am perfectly in accord with the statement of that body, as I know that, in the isolated mining districts, especially during the winter, it would be almost impossible to obtain stamps every time they were required. The Memorial says:

“The imposition of such duties in our widely scattered mining camps, where the greater part of the business is done on a credit basis, will entail on the traders and miners a very heavy burden, without any corresponding advantage to the Revenue. For instance: At Cassiar, where from November to May no communication takes place with the other parts of the Province, the proper observance of such an Act will be almost impossible, and the non-observance may result in serious loss. At Kootenay, where there is only mail communication five times a year, and at Omineca, where there is none at all, it will be a matter of impossibility to comply with the requirements of the Act.”

I merely wished to enquire of whom the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue intends we should apply for these stamps. If we cannot get them, we should not be subject to the penalties the law imposes upon those who fail to obtain them.

MR. BABY: The Department will give the same facilities in British Columbia as exist in the other Provinces. Any responsible party will be furnished, on application, with a license to sell bill stamps. If the hon. gentleman wishes to recommend any respectable man for a license to sell bill stamps, the Department will grant him one. With respect to the

question put by the hon. member, if he will refer to page 210 of the Report of the Department, he will find that in Prince Edward Island, in 1878, the revenue derived from bill stamps amounted to \$295, and in 1879, to \$1,045. No revenue whatever has been collected from British Columbia up to this year. During the present year it appears from the books of the Department that \$3 have been collected in that Province up to date.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 105) For the relief of Permanent Building Societies and Loan Companies, and to restrict their modes of lending.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 84) To amend the General Inspection Act, 1874, and the Act amending it.—(Mr. Baby.)

Bill (No. 109) To authorise the raising of a further sum, to enable the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to complete their Tidal Dock.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

Bill (No. 110) To enable the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to pay a life annuity to the widow of the late Hon. John Young.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 117) To repeal the Act 42 Vic., cap. 5, for granting an annual subsidy towards certain telegraphic communication.—(Mr. Langevin.)

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 96) To repeal the Act extending the Dominion Lands Act to British Columbia, and to make other provision with respect to certain public lands in that Province.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 57) To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the North-West Territories.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

CANADIAN RESIDENT AGENT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM BILL.—[BILL 88.]

(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It has been found, in the opinion of the Government, necessary to have an agent residing in the vicinity of Her Majesty's

Government. With the growth of Canada, its increasing power and population, and its increasing interests as they are developed, it is found that the correspondence across the seas which the Government have to conduct, is altogether unsatisfactory, and that it will be well to have a Minister residing there. We have now a financial agent in England with subordinates throughout the United Kingdom, but it is proposed that this Commissioner be charged specially with this service. Without saying anything either in disparagement or praise of the present agent, or of the past agents who were charged with the matter of emigration from the United Kingdom to this country, I may say it has been found that an agent living in London, without a commission, has not been able to claim anything like public attention to that important subject. It can be well understood that the statements of a mere agent, with a limited and local jurisdiction, to a certain extent not known or recognised as holding an office for the purpose of expediting and assisting in giving information to intending emigrants—it is found that he is placed at a disadvantage when he is confronted by the active, ceaseless and energetic exertions of the various agents of the railway companies in the United States, whose prosperity and future depend altogether in the seduction of the emigrants from Europe—and especially from the United Kingdom—to the United States and diverting them from Canada. It is believed that by having an officer holding a quasi diplomatic position, in fact holding a diplomatic position so far as is consistent with our position of a dependency of the Empire, his statements, and actions, and prestige will be generally accepted by the public, and will greatly assist in giving a direction to emigration from the United Kingdom, and from Europe generally, especially from Germany. At present, the local emigration agent living in London can have no influence whatever. He is not accredited in any way to Her Majesty's Government, and can have no influence on the continent in the way of giving assurances or holding out hopes to the emigrants from the north of Europe. That is a matter of primary importance, especially just now when, happily, there is a growing tendency in Germany to

an emigration towards British North America. It is believed that an officer of high rank and position, to whom reference can be made, and to whom the Colonial Secretary can send any communications from continental powers on this subject, will be of the greatest importance to Canada, and will assist us in the attraction of emigration. That is only one small branch of the duties that it is proposed to impose upon this representative agent. Besides looking after the whole question of emigration, we thought it desirable to have a representative agent on the spot to attend to the commercial interests of the Dominion. It is known that within two years, most of the commercial treaties which previously governed the commerce of the continent, have been abrogated, and that all the European nations are at this moment taking counsel together for the purpose of renewing old treaties, and amending them, or at all events establishing the commerce of the world, so far as Europe is concerned, on a new basis. Therefore the Dominion, like the other Colonies of the Empire, have been, to a great degree, unrepresented; and it is of great importance, at the present juncture, to have in Europe a resident agent, or Minister, who will be on the spot for the purpose of being consulted upon any negotiations that are going on between Her Majesty's Government and the various European powers in commercial matters. Her Majesty's Government have, as will be seen by the papers laid before the House, assented to the proposition of Canada. They are willing to receive and to give proper position and prominence to such an officer. They will give him such a diplomatic position as is consistent, of course, with the subordinate position of Canada as a dependency of the Empire. Although it is not well to mix up personal questions with the general principles of the Bill, it is known that Sir Alexander T. Galt has been selected to fill the office. His success as the agent of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the Fishery question has given him a prestige which will, I think, inure very much to the future advantage of the Dominion. He has been employed under the wing of Her Majesty's Government, with the assent of that Government, in attempting to inter-

est France, for instance, in special commerce with Canada; he has been also employed by the Government in attempting to interest Spain in the trade between Canada and Cuba, Porto Rico and the Spanish possessions generally in America, and with Spain herself. I may say that when Sir A. T. Galt, in the first place, went to Spain, at the instance of the present Government, his instructions were to attempt to open up trade with Cuba and Porto Rico. But at the suggestion of the Spanish Government itself, the sphere of his instructions were enlarged, so that the whole question of trade with Spain herself, as well as her Colonies, was opened up. In Spain, as well as in other older countries, matters move slowly; but the manner in which we have been treated, and the way in which the suggestion made for the enlargement of trade, especially between Cuba and Porto Rico and Canada, have been received, give us great hope that there will be in the early future a largely increased trade with Cuba and Porto Rico. In France we were just on the verge of success, in respect to the reduction of duty on Canadian shipping built in Canada and sold in France. It is known that the shipping built in England can be sold in France on paying a duty of two francs per ton, while the shipping built in Canada must pay a duty of forty francs a ton. The obvious injustice, if it be an injustice, the obvious disadvantage to Canada in such a discrimination against her ships, was pressed upon the French Government, and it was almost agreed—I may say it was agreed—that Canadian ships might be introduced to France at a duty of two francs per ton, when Austria gave notice to all the nations with which she had commercial relations that its treaties were at an end. That of course at once put an end to the negotiations. However, both England and France, it is believed, are about to enter into new negotiations for extended commercial relations. In such a case it is obviously of great importance that Canada should have an officer, such as this Bill provides for, who should be always on the spot, ready to take advantage of every matter without any communication with Canada. The office will include diplomatic and emigration duties. It is proposed that the Canadian Agent shall have charge

generally of our financial operations, under the instruction of the hon. the Minister of Finance in Canada. On that point the hon. the Minister of Finance will speak with authority, and I have no doubt he will receive the support of the late hon. Minister of Finance in the statements on the desirability of diminishing the cost of our loans, the payment of our obligations at maturity, interest or principal. I believe the credit of Canada is sufficiently well assured to obviate the necessity of paying heavy commissions for the purpose of putting her loans on the market and meeting her obligations under the auspices of bankers or capitalists. Then I have stated that the papers show that Her Majesty's Government has agreed to accept a High Commissioner at our hands. I am sure that this is a very important step towards asserting the importance of the Dominion of Canada as a portion of Her Majesty's Empire. Although it is not quite germane to the Bill, I shall speak about the salary which we will ask the House to provide in the Resolution on the paper. We will ask that the High Commissioner shall receive a salary of \$10,000 per annum; that is the salary which is given to our Lieutenant-Governors of first rank, and we hold that the Minister in England should not receive a less sum. The general belief, with those who have spoken to me on the subject, is, that the sum is inadequate for him to keep up the position in England. However, we modestly commence with that sum, and perhaps our successors may find it expedient to increase the amount. I would say, Sir, that I believe, in all sincerity, that it is not only a very important step, but that it is a very wise step that Canada should, at once, as a Dominion, as an auxiliary kingdom, if I may use the expression, should have a resident Minister in England representing our wishes, to receive instructions from us, and keep at once a position among the *Corps Diplomatique* which has not latterly been accorded to any portion of Her Majesty's Empire. It is a wise step. I think it will fructify for good. I believe, as a matter of economy, that we shall save a large sum of money. It is well that every subject which it is desirable to present to Her Majesty's Government, should be pressed upon that Government by a man

of ability, position and prestige. Of course he is merely an agent of the Government of Canada, and everything done by him must be as the agent of Canada, subordinate in every possible way to the instructions of the Governor-General with the advice of his Council.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Will the hon. the Minister of Finance explain the nature of the financial duties proposed to be conferred upon this gentleman?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The remarks I have to make will be exclusively with reference to the financial portion of the arrangement. My hon. predecessor will, perhaps, recollect that when I retired from office in 1873, and he assumed the duties, he was good enough to ask me whether I had any suggestion to offer relative to matters connected with the Department. I then said that there was one subject to which I attached no very slight importance, and that was an arrangement relative to the negotiations of our loans and the payment of the interest upon our debt in England; that it appeared to me that the sum that we were paying for that service at that time—under the arrangement that had been made by the old Government of Canada previously to the Union, and by the representatives of the different Provinces now constituting the Union—were excessive, and that some arrangement might be made, by the appointment of an agent or some other person in London by which the expenditure might be largely reduced. When negotiating the loan of 1873, an arrangement was made by which it was floated at one-half of one per cent., instead of one per cent. as had been previously paid. When my predecessor floated his subsequent loans he made an arrangement by which all guaranteed loans should be floated without any charge, and unguaranteed loans at one per cent. I think he made an arrangement for the reduction of the percentage on the interest paid from one to half of one per cent. That arrangement has stood to the present time. Subsequent loans, negotiated by my predecessor, and loans negotiated by myself, were under the same terms. But even under that improved arrangement, the amount that has been paid since 1873, by the Dominion of Canada, for the negotiation

of loans and for the payment of interest, has been a very large sum indeed. I have in my hand the sums paid in commissions to agents during the last year, simply for the payment of coupons as they fall due, and it amounted to \$45,298.53. In addition to that there was something like \$5,000 paid for debentures that were purchased in connection with the Sinking Fund. This does not include the commission paid to agents for negotiating loans. Under the arrangement by which these loans were negotiated, one per cent. is paid, together with any cost incurred for brokerage in addition to that. During the next year, from July, 1880, to July, 1881, it is not expected we will avoid going into the English market for a loan with the estimated expenditure upon our Railway the following year of \$10,000,000, and subsequent years of \$5,000,000 a year. It is very likely that the Dominion Government will find itself under the necessity of going into that market somewhat under, perhaps, the \$10,000,000 or \$5,000,000. If we were to transfer the payment of interest on coupons on the existing debt as it stands at the present moment, the commission saved would amount to \$45,298, not taking into consideration the question of the Sinking Fund and the loans that are to be negotiated in the future. It must not be supposed that these loans can be negotiated without paying some commission, though we may have a resident agent there, but it is very probable that we can save one half of one per cent. at least. It will be quite competent for our representative there to enter into arrangements for the negotiation of our loan, either through our old agent or through the Bank of England, or any other parties he may think proper to arrange with. I can only say, for myself, that I would feel very anxious indeed that the services of our old agents should be secured by our representative for the negotiation of these loans. I have received very great assistance from them, especially when floating the last loan. They were the agents of Canada for many years before the Union. Messrs. Baring Bros., were also the agents of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick before the Union, and the natural feeling will be, if they will undertake any duty of that kind on as favourable terms as any other party similarly situated, that it

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

would be highly desirable that they should have it. In the negotiation of the loan of \$10,000,000 our representative there will, I trust, be able to save something like \$50,000. I am satisfied that, by the appointment of this official, as now proposed, that the sum that will be expended in the maintenance of that official, and the assistance it may be necessary to give him in order to perform the work, will be a small expenditure compared with the large saving that may result from it in a financial point of view, apart from the commercial, political and other considerations, to which the hon. leader of the Government has referred. I think my hon. predecessor—who has, I know, given the matter some consideration, because I have seen communications from him on the subject—will agree with us, that the time has probably now arrived when the step may be taken for the purpose of reducing the expenditure in connection with the transaction of our business there. I give these figures to the House for the purpose of showing that by transferring the payment of interest on coupons alone the saving would have amounted last year to a very large sum. Then there is another point of some importance. I think it is in 1885, that there will be \$35,000,000 of 5 per cent. debentures, that may be redeemed by the Government at that time.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: That is optional.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: But I take it for granted that if the 4 per cent. securities of the Dominion of Canada sell as readily as at present, that whoever may be in power at the time will take steps gradually, or at one time, to put that portion of our debt on a more advantageous basis than at present. I think a very considerable sum of money can be saved, when that time comes, by substituting 4 per cent. securities for 5 per cents. I think it will be seen that by the appointment of this official, a very great saving can be effected in a financial point of view alone. I think the House must consider that this is a move in the right direction.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Can the hon. gentleman give any idea of what the cost will be of the clerical assistance Sir Alexander Galt will require to transact the business he has alluded to.

He knows as well as I do that the cost of maintaining an office in any of the streets in London, frequented by these great commercial houses, is very considerable, and I should like to know, roughly, what he supposes the cost might be.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That is a rather difficult thing to state now. Our object is to connect this Department with the Department of Emigration. Our High Commissioner is to have control of the Emigration Branch of the Service as well. As the hon. gentleman is aware that the interest on our securities falls due in January, May, July and November, principally, it is intended to make available for that service as well the employés in the Emigration Department. Therefore, it is that the additional number of persons that will be required for the purpose of paying interest on the coupons will not be very great. Probably it may be necessary to have one thoroughly efficient accountant, a person thoroughly up in his work, to take charge of that particular branch. With the employés in connection with the Emigration Department, and with, perhaps, one or two added with small salaries, the work can be performed. An efficient accountant, thoroughly acquainted with the business, connected with the coupons, and, perhaps, one or two persons to assist, will be able to take charge of that work. It may be that the office will be changed to Parliament street. It is proposed to have our representative's department and emigration offices in one building, in order to save expense. In addition to the proposed salary, to which my hon. friend has referred, there will be certain contingent expenses, and the Supplementary Estimates will show the amount considered necessary.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I have no doubt that attention was early called to the large sums paid for commissions and brokerage, in having two firms instead of one to transact our business. I am quite aware, of course, that that only strengthens the necessity for taking it into our own hands, and no doubt the present time is a good time to do all. We have succeeded in paying off a heavy indebtedness, and I think it very likely our new Commissioner will be able to extend our loans on very fair terms in times of serious commercial stringency. The connection

with the two great houses who have done our business might be of great value again, and that was my reason during my term of office for deferring bringing this arrangement to a point until the matured indebtedness of Canada was disposed of.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I quite understand.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: That being done I am bound to say that, so far as the financial aspect of the arrangement is concerned, I see no ground for opposing it. I presume, however, that it will be found necessary to alter the present location of the offices or else to enlarge the building, and I would like to have known if a decision had been arrived at. The cost of lodgings and buildings in that city is very considerable.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is believed that our offices are misplaced. However, they are new offices and can be disposed of without any loss. Every endeavour will be made to get near Parliament street, where all the other agencies are—more in the vicinity of other public offices. The hon. gentleman must know that, altogether, we have to be governed by the experience of other Colonies whose offices are all grouped together in a very narrow space. Sir Alexander Galt is charged to obtain offices as suitable and inexpensive as possible, but such as would be worthy of Canada.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: The hon. gentleman proposes to go out very far from where Mr. Jenkins was established at first, and then he was shifted, or, rather, after his resignation, the offices were shifted to Queen Victoria street, but I presume the intention of the hon. Minister is to have them somewhere near Downing street. The hon. gentleman, I think, or the hon. the First Minister, said something about making arrangements with the Bank of England. I can see very great advantages in that if it can be done. That will give a sort of introduction to our securities, and I think it would be worth while taking a good deal of trouble to make an arrangement with that bank. Every reasonable consideration should be shown to the two great houses we have been dealing with, and whose existence, as I have said, may be of use to us again. They have a

large and numerous *clientelle* who are in the habit of investing in Canadian securities. There are a certain class who deal in securities of the Colonies, and I think that by keeping in with these firms they will secure a good class of investors. I think the pains taken during the last four or five years have had the result of bringing to us a larger number of investors than we formerly possessed.

MR. ANGLIN: The combination of duties which are to be discharged by the High Commissioner is remarkable, and there are some objections to the proposal, as a whole, which ought to be considered. It may be that the time has come when we can, with advantage, establish a financial agency of the sort described. Perhaps we may be able to save a large amount annually by that means. I think it must be obvious that if the duties of such an agency are to be discharged, properly and satisfactorily, the establishment must be organised upon such a basis as to ensure the satisfactory working of it, altogether independent of the supervision of the High Commissioner, and therefore, in considering the propriety of his appointment, we ought to put out of view altogether the advantages likely to be gained by any change in the mode of managing our Public Debt and paying the interest on it. We must have some gentleman at the head of that agency thoroughly qualified to discharge the duties of the position, to superintend and conduct the whole business, just as if we had no High Commissioner resident in London. That High Commissioner will not be in London always. He may be one month in Paris, and another in Madrid. Some one qualified to do the work, and responsible, must be there independent of any control on the part of the High Commissioner—some one of ability known to be possessed of all the necessary qualifications. We may establish such an agency, and it may prove efficient, although we sent no High Commissioner to London; and it is scarcely proper, therefore, in fixing an opinion as to the opportunities of a High Commissioner to take into consideration any saving that may be effected by such an arrangement as that. What the High Commissioner can do to promote immigration, the hon. the First Minister has scarcely explained. He may, we are

told, hold communication direct with the Colonial Office. He may receive communications sent to Her Majesty's Government by foreign countries. He may be guided, and he may guide others in accordance with such communications, but all this is exceedingly vague and it would seem not to afford a sufficient reason for the creation of this office. We have already a very efficient immigration staff in London. I admit I have never been able to learn the precise value of the duties performed or performable by these officers in London. It may be that by their services emigration to this country is materially promoted, but I have not seen any evidence to satisfy me that it is. The officials who reside in the out districts, if they are active and energetic in encouraging emigration, perhaps do render valuable services. They, I suppose, make their reports to the Central Office, and in that way the Central Office may be necessary or useful. How far the utility of the Department can be increased by the appointment of a High Commissioner is more than the right hon. gentleman has explained. Mr. Speaker, this appointment is, as it appears to me, of very much more importance and significance than has generally been supposed. It seems a very extraordinary departure from any direction we have previously taken, and it places Canada on an entirely different footing towards the Mother Country from that we occupied before. It seems to be made with a view to the creation of relations between Canada and the Empire of an entirely new character. In a Memorandum submitted to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach by Sir John A. Macdonald and two of his colleagues, some extraordinary statements were made respecting the future relations of Canada and the Empire. These are of a very extraordinary and startling character. Well, we are in a position more than other Colonies, if we choose to do so, to promote concord or discord between the Empire and the United States. We are more in a position than those more remote from that country to promote good feeling or to create difficulties between the United States and the Mother Country; and should quarrels arise, we would have to bear the brunt of the battle, the burden and the trouble of any struggle that may occur between them. The whole question

is certainly of very grave importance. In taking this new departure, we are treading on rather delicate ground. In some sense the statement made is correct and unobjectionable, but it may be looked at in another light, namely, the assumption by us of duties and responsibilities which we ought not to undertake lightly. We pledge ourselves to do all in our power to develop the resources of that country, to provide for its good government and the safety and well-being of all who go to dwell there. We do that primarily with a view to the interests of Canada, in order that we may build up a country which will hereafter be a source of wealth and prosperity, not only to the people who live there, but also to the people of the older Provinces, who are called upon to make such heavy sacrifices for its development. In a speech delivered at Montreal, not long ago, by Sir Alexander T. Galt, who, no doubt, received his appointment in advance of the passage of this Bill, took a very different ground from that taken by the hon. the First Minister on this question. He spoke of the utter impossibility of our discharging all the Imperial duties in that vast territory, and declared distinctly that the people of Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick have no more interest in that far country than the farmers of Lancashire or the peasants of Tipperary; and he argued that it was incumbent on the British Government to take a great share of the trouble and expense of opening up that country and so extending the boundaries of the Empire. I think we might all concur in that view. It may be said that this sentiment is not incompatible with what has been said in this Memorandum, but I think it will be found that the views of the High Commissioner on this point are scarcely reconcilable with the views expressed in the Memorandum, and he goes to London to present, and, as far as he can, enforce views that are not the views of those who commissioned him. In the next paragraph there is a declaration which seems to have been framed with a view to bringing about some arrangement between the Imperial Government and this Government, with regard to the development of the North-West. If any conclusion of that kind can be arrived at, I think we will all be dis-

posed to join in sincere thanks to the hon. gentleman for having done much to relieve Canada from a burden under which the people are unquestionably tottering. We are told that it is necessary to have constant personal communication between the Governments of Canada and Great Britain, with regard to every important subject that may arise. It is remarkable that our Government should come to this conclusion just at the time when the United States are beginning to think that it is unnecessary to appoint Ambassadors or Ministers to foreign countries, and that it is better to depend upon special missions to do anything which may be necessary to maintain friendly relations with other countries or bring about better or more satisfactory commercial relations. My own impression is that Canada, having from time to time, for many years past, obtained such alterations in her relations with the British Empire as give to her Local Government and Parliament more unrestricted liberty to deal with all local matters should not seek, in any way, to render the connection in matters of Government more intimate than it now is. The policy of Great Britain of late has been entirely in that direction, and that policy has converted a number of discontented Colonies into a number of friendly States, devotedly attached to the Mother Country. The more unrestricted and unrestrained is the freedom of action Great Britain is willing to permit us to possess, and we are determined to exercise, the better will we get along. We complained, a short time ago, of having a particular question affecting the Government of this country sent to England for settlement. We know the views that were entertained on that question. Many hon. gentlemen opposite spoke in terms of the warmest indignation of the conduct of the highest official in Canada, because, as they believed, he had referred a matter of a purely domestic kind to England. But now we are about to appoint a High Commissioner, to reside in London, to be in constant communication with the Colonial Office, to be constantly engaged in making terms and arrangements with that office, which may, to a great extent, afterwards bind us, no matter how we may dislike them. We cannot have so many matters to discuss with the British

Government as to need such an official. We had a great deal more need of a High Commissioner twenty years ago than we have at present. Year after year we have received copies of the papers that have passed between the Imperial authorities and our Government in relation to Colonial affairs, and we know that the business is by no means so large now as it once was. A few important questions have arisen from time to time, and I am satisfied that it was very much better that a member of the Government—who had been living in Canada, breathing this Canadian atmosphere, hearing those important questions discussed, understanding what public opinion in Canada is in relation thereto—that a Minister so circumstanced went to the Old Country to deal with those subjects than it would have been to leave them in the hands of a gentleman, no matter how able he may be, who left the country some four or five years before, and had to depend upon despatches or newspaper articles for his knowledge of our public opinion, and of the precise state of our public affairs. There is no doubt of the financial skill and ability of Sir Alexander T. Galt. Probably no man is more competent to put a loan on the British market than he. But he may not always be willing to act in cases of difficulty and doubt, without having the advice and assistance of a Minister to enable him to form his opinion as to what is best to be done. I do not see any necessity for the appointment of a High Commissioner, because we desire to take part in the making of Treaties. Treaties are not made between European Powers every day—not even once a year. When they are about to expire, it becomes a matter of notoriety, and we would be invited to send some person to assist the British plenipotentiary in endeavouring that the new Treaties should be so framed as to protect the interests of Canada. That was done in regard to the United States when the Treaty of Washington was negotiated, and it may as well be done elsewhere. We all know that certain Treaties are to be renewed, and at such time it may be very well that some person should be sent home who is fully cognisant of the opinions and views of the Government to assist in obtaining, if pos-

sible, more favourable terms for Canada but the appointment of a High Commissioner for such a special purpose as that is something entirely different from the appointment of a permanent Commissioner to reside in London, and to be employed abroad for the purpose of negotiating Treaties for Canada. There is another reason why I consider this appointment is attended with serious difficulties. Occasionally, a Colonial Secretary entertains extraordinary views as to the duty of Canada towards the Empire. At various times efforts have been made to impose extraordinary obligations upon Canada's military; and, I confess, I regard with some apprehension the fact that a gentleman is to be placed in London as a representative of this country, who will be constantly under the influence of the Colonial Office. I am afraid that acting there, no doubt in the best possible faith and entirely within his instructions, he may commit us to something which we may afterwards find onerous. Amongst the matters which we are told will engage the Commissioner's attention is the Pacific Railway. During last season, when some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side were in England, I observed in the Reports of speeches made at the places where they appeared, observations which indicated that somebody had proposed, and somebody had almost agreed in, some new system of defence, some military reorganisation of some kind or other, which, to be of any value, must necessarily impose serious additional obligations on this people. It may be that nothing more was asked or assented to than what Canada ought to do; but I think negotiations on a subject of that kind would be very much more wisely conducted between the Government of Canada and the authorities in Downing street, than through any gentleman of the temperament of Sir Alexander T. Galt. He is a man of high and exalted abilities, in some respects brilliant, but he is easily swayed by some passing, temporary influence; and he may, in his eagerness to bring about a thorough understanding between the Governments, or for some special object of his own, commit us to something we might not like to carry out. Instead of having this permanent High Commissioner, I think it would be better

proceeding as in the past, to send one or more members of the Government to England when any serious question arose between the Governments of Canada and Great Britain. For those reasons I must express my grave doubts as to the propriety of the appointment of this High Commissioner. The suggestion did not come from the Imperial Government; the application was made, in the first instance, by Ministers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach only intimating that the gentleman to be appointed should not hold, or imagine he held, any position other than befitting a mere colonist. He was quite willing that a Canadian Commissioner should be appointed, that, perhaps, the clerks of the Colonial Office should be spared the trouble of writing so many letters or despatches. The proposal was based on the considerations expressed in this Memorandum; and we are now asked to commit ourselves to what I believe to be a new departure of a most serious character, which may seriously alter our relations towards the Empire, and from which I do not think we can derive any considerable profit.

MR. MACKENZIE: I regret that the hon. the First Minister did not introduce this Bill at the very beginning of the Session, and that the departure of the Commissioner should not have been delayed till Parliament had time to express an opinion upon it. It is the merest farce for a Government, with a powerful majority at its back, to go through the appearance of consulting Parliament after they have accomplished their designs on the subject. I would be able to express myself with much more freedom concerning the mission of Sir Alexander Galt, and his capacity to undertake it, if he were not now discharging the duties of the office, at least he has informed the public in a very formal manner, at the public entertainment given him in Montreal, that he was leaving upon that mission, speaking, also, of his instructions respecting the discharge of his duties. I have looked at the correspondence published, and find it exceedingly difficult to comprehend what are to be his precise duties. Ministers, in their Memorandum and Order in Council, devote much space to proving the necessity for the presence in London of what they call a Diplomatic Agent, and endeavour to obtain an acknowledgment

from the Imperial Government of the necessity of a diplomatic appointment, and the investiture of Sir Alexander Galt with some diplomatic character in England. We are even told in the Order in Council that the Ministry hope that he will obtain social precedence at entertainments in England, next after the diplomatic representatives of foreign states. It is a small thing to deal with no doubt in a formal state document.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is nothing said about entertainments.

MR. MACKENZIE: It does not, certainly, say that, but it can mean nothing else.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes, it can mean a great deal more.

MR. MACKENZIE: I will read an extract from the Order in Council:

"In making their suggestion on this point, the Committee have had in mind the position assigned to the delegates from Canada in 1865 and 1866, which was that of belonging to the Diplomatic Corps, taking precedence after the foreign ministers. They leave the subject in the hands of Her Majesty's Government resting on the assurances conveyed in the despatch under consideration that Her Majesty's Government will accord to their representative a status in every way worthy of his important functions."

Well, if I recollect right, the Ministers sent to England in 1865 and 1866 had no diplomatic mission. They went on a specific kind of business, but were well received and handsomely entertained by the chief authorities of the Mother Country, including Her Majesty and her Ministers, and they obtained proper social precedence; and now this Government asks that the same thing be accorded to this plenipotentiary. The first instructions that should be given Sir Alexander Galt might require some prudence in the use of language, which might be construed in a different sense from that which is suitable to a representative. In the famous speech he made for the hon. the Finance Minister at Belfast, he showed his opinion to be that Great Britain should impose a tax on the breadstuffs coming from all countries but the Dominion, for the benefit of our farmers, promising, in return, that we would do a good turn to the people of the Mother Country by admitting their goods at a lower duty. The hon. gentleman at Montreal, with reference to this matter,

used very extraordinary language. Speaking of opinions in England with respect to matters of trade, he said :

“ That I am not altogether wrong in the appreciation that I had of the effect of that policy, may I think be judged by those who will be kind enough to recollect the expressions and statements of the press in England fifteen years after Free-trade was adopted, and when Great Britain was in the full hey-day of prosperity, from what was supposed to be the inevitable result of that policy. At that time we know perfectly well that it was popular to speak in England of letting the Colonies go adrift ; we know perfectly well that at the time the Confederation Act was passed, very many in England considered that it was a good policy, because it would enable us to leave earlier the Mother Country. Now, that opinion changed, and no such opinion is held by either Tory or Liberal in England. It is a most significant change. One might have supposed that, after five or six years of very hard times, indeed, there would have been a greater disposition to throw off burdens to lighten the load, than there was before this Act. But if there be one thing more than another which has raised Lord Beaconsfield's Government in the minds of the independent people of England, it is that he has asserted that the Empire is not to be allowed to diminish, but that it is to be maintained in its integrity. Now, gentlemen, how is it that such a change has come over public opinion in England, for I do not think that any one can deny the change? I affirm it is because the Free-trade policy of England has, *quoad* foreign countries, proved a failure, and that the people of England are now awakening to the fact that they have within their own dominions a market larger than that which the foreign countries can ever give them ; that it only requires a wise policy on their part, and combined action on ours, to make the Empire independent of foreign countries for everything it requires ; and that in order to foster a trade which has proved during these past years to be an improving one, while others have been falling off, they should adopt such a policy as will bind the resources of the Empire more closely together.”

Whatever that may mean. How the resources of the country are to be “bound together” is something I cannot understand. I could understand their being developed together, but what the binding tie is to be is not explained. Mr. Galt however, proceeds as follows :—

“ The great admitted difficulty which has always met us when we have spoken in England on the subject, and many of us have spoken on it, has been :—You will never get the people of England to submit to a tax upon food. That was true until it was shown that the North-West Territory of this continent was the great food-producing district of the world. It is only for us to open it up, and we shall have solved the only question which made England seriously

dependent upon foreigners. We shall have done more by the development of that country in protecting her from the pressure of foreign nations, than could be done in any possible way.”

So Sir Alexander Galt has gone to England to express the opinion of Canada that she ought to impose a tax upon food coming from every place but our North-West Territories. He eulogises the Beaconsfield Government, and shows what has been accomplished under it. But when he would land in Liverpool the first thing he would see would be that Lord Beaconsfield's Government was in a minority of 150 votes in the new House of Commons, and of what use the eulogy of the politically defunct statesman could be to us, of what use to us is an Ambassador to England, is more than anyone can imagine. Could anybody imagine a more indiscreet thing than an Ambassador to England entering upon a laboured argument to show its Free-trade policy is wrong, and that it becomes her, at his instance, to charge duties upon food coming from other lands than Manitoba and the North-West? I cannot conceive of anything more foolish, and can only express the hopeless hope that he may be more discreet in England than he was in leaving Canada. We find in this remarkable speech also matters that have not been communicated to the Canadian people or Parliament. It was made when Parliament was sitting, as we are told in this Memorandum, in the first instance, signed by Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Samuel L. Tilley, that there are at present the following important subjects under consideration. The Pacific Railway was under consideration. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach stated lately that there was no correspondence on the subject. “ Important collateral subjects” are mentioned. What are they? Then come the efforts to secure commercial Treaties or relations with France and Spain. If the hon. gentlemen opposite take my advice they will never mention those efforts. A more reckless, sinful waste of \$11,000 was never perpetrated than on this holiday mission to Spain and France. It shows that two or three Canadian gentlemen were able, within two or three months, to spend all that money in travelling and holding

needless, senseless interviews with officials and other people in those countries. Not one particle of good was accomplished by the mission. British statesmen will only laugh at this miserable attempt to create a diplomatic corps, of which Sir Alexander Galt is to be the first and shining ornament and apostle. He tells us the question of the military defence of Canada is at present under consideration. Is it? The House has never been informed on the subject. What about this military defence? We find the resident Ambassador, as he is called, using the following language:—

“Therefore, the Imperial Government have, like ourselves, a direct interest in the proper organisation of our militia. They show that interest by furnishing us with skilled officers. It is our business to show that we on our part are furnishing the necessary organisation, and that we keep up the requisite staff. We are trying to do so, and the cooperation between the Imperial and Canadian Governments is going on in the most satisfactory manner. We saw evidence of this the other day when our military school at Kingston was recognised to the extent that certain commissions are henceforward to be given in the British Army to the cadets in that school. I hope the day is not remote when the course that has been taken with regard to the organisation of land forces in this country, may also be extended to our very large body of the most skilled seamen in the world; we have no organisation for them, and I think it is quite proper that we should look forward to the establishment of training ships for the organisation of a Naval Reserve, the result of which would be to permit our sea captains to have the honour of being registered as officers of the naval reserve.”

If there is a proposition to have a Naval Reserve in Canada; if the military defence of the country is to be attended to immediately; if Sir Alexander Galt, as the resident Minister, is instructed to negotiate with the Imperial Government on this subject, is it right that this Parliament should be asked to prorogue without a word of information on this subject? Is it right that this Bill, which might have been introduced on the first day of the Session, should have been postponed till the very last. That it is important to get a full expression of opinion, no one will deny. When it is too late to secure the subject its proper weight in Parliament, it is brought forward. We complain because the Minister has departed already with his instructions, and he took care before he

went to England to make an indiscreet speech at this Montreal banquet, in the presence of two Ministers, and to state his own views, as if those were the views which he was instructed to place before the Ministers and people of England. Now, while I am quite ready to discuss with hon. gentlemen, in the most enlarged sense, any of the duties and responsibilities which ought to be cast upon us as a British Colony; while I am prepared to accord them as the responsible Ministers every support which a loyal citizen can give a Government, I must protest against being identified as a Canadian citizen with the policy shadowed forth in these despatches and this object, to which I believe the people of this country will not at present commit themselves. I do not believe in a standing army, or in what Sir Alexander Galt is pleased to say here respecting our neighbours—that they are a hostile, or certainly, if they are not a hostile, at least an unfriendly people. If they were either hostile or unfriendly, it would be a very easy matter, indeed, for them to show it. I am not aware that they have done so, or that they have shown any disposition to manifest a hostile or unfriendly spirit, and it is clearly our duty, while maintaining a dignified position, to cultivate friendly relations with that people, and not to send an Ambassador abroad to Great Britain, whose last act on leaving Canada was to administer a feeble kick to them, and characterise them in terms we have no right to use to any friendly people. This seems the very height of diplomatic folly, if such a phrase can be used. The hon. gentleman says also:

“Referring to the diplomatic duties, if I may venture to use the term, in connection with the duties that are about to be imposed upon me, a new departure would appear to be absolutely necessary in consequence of the growing importance of this country. We have now relations of a diplomatic character, both with the Home Government and with foreign Governments. They arise from the large powers that were conferred upon the Parliament of Canada by the Confederation Act. By that Act the Imperial Parliament surrendered to us the complete control of our Customs, Excise, and every mode and description of taxation. By that Act Great Britain voluntarily deprived herself of the power of negotiating for this country with foreign countries. She deprived herself of the right to say to Canada: ‘You shall or you shall not impose any particular class of duties.’ I think, therefore, I am justified in saying that the passage of that

Act has placed us *quoad* commercial questions, although British subjects, in the same position."

And on the same subject, the Order-in-Council of December 22nd, says :

"In considering many questions of the highest importance, such as the commercial and fiscal policy of the Dominion as affecting the United Kingdom, the promotion of Imperial interests in the administration and settlement of the interior of the continent, and on many other subjects, indeed on all matters of internal concern, the Imperial Government and Parliament have so far transferred to Canada an independent control that their discussion and settlement have become subjects for mutual assent and concert, and thereby have, it is thought, assumed a quasi-diplomatic character as between Her Majesty's Government representing the United Kingdom *per se* and the Dominion, without in any manner derogating from their general authority as rulers of the entire Empire."

What on earth does all this mean ; this general deliverance of the hon. gentlemen opposite seem to me to indicate that when this despatch was written, it was extremely difficult for them to anticipate what could be or should be said to give something like a character to the dogmas and policy they were about to propound. I can quite understand the policy of the Finance Minister in having a gentleman in London to attend to certain financial operations, that the late Government attended to by means of an agent in the person of Sir John Rose. I am not aware that there was any lack of proper caution or ability on the part of Sir John Rose in the discharge of the duties entrusted to him. It was not necessary to appoint a resident Minister to attend to these matters. It will be observed by those who have read the Order in Council, the wording of which is very peculiar, that while they demand for this new Minister the status of a diplomatic nation, coming next after the representatives of the great and small countries of the world, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach dismissed the whole thing in a most summary manner. He says :

"Her Majesty's Government are very sensible of the advantage which might result from the appointment by the Dominion Government of a gentleman who, residing in this country, would be fully empowered to explain their views on the various important questions connected with Canada, which, from time to time, demand consideration, and which might often be more satisfactorily, as well as more expeditiously, dealt with if such means of oral

communication were provided. Looking, however, to the position of Canada as an integral portion of the Empire, the relations of such a person with Her Majesty's Government would not be correctly defined as being of a diplomatic character, and while Her Majesty's Government would readily accord to him a status in every way worthy of his important functions, his position would necessarily be more analogous to that of an officer in the home service than to that of a Minister at a foreign Court.

"He would, therefore, primarily communicate with this Department on the various subjects which might be entrusted to him, and while Her Majesty's Government would readily avail themselves of any information he might afford, and give the fullest consideration to any representations he might make on behalf of the Canadian Government, it would, of course, rest with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to determine in each case in what precise capacity his services might best be rendered."

That means that the foreign Minister is to deal with this resident Canadian Minister of ours in any way he pleases. He may invite him to attend with his secretary and sit in the lobby while he is attending to matters with representatives of some foreign Government, or that he may send for him, get his opinion, and then dismiss him and tell him he will send for him when he wants him again. The attempt to obtain this desired official status is so deplorably ill-managed, and the snubbing by the Colonial Secretary so marked, that I am only surprised, after this first despatch, that the hon. gentlemen opposite were in such a hurry to commission their Minister without the slightest knowledge of what the policy of the Imperial Government was as to the manner or terms of his recognition, or as to the duties he was to discharge by them for us. I look upon the whole thing as a huge blunder, an attempt to give Sir Alexander Galt diplomatic status powers, and exalt a colony by its humiliation. I will not refer to the policy of the right hon. gentleman opposite some years ago, when he voted down, with a great deal of indignation, a proposition supported by Sir Alexander Galt that the House required a voice in any negotiations with foreign countries concerning Canadian commerce, and that the views of the Canadian Government should be asserted and respect paid to them. We were then told in the hon. gentleman's most vigorous style, that this was nothing else but an attempt at independence, and that anything of that kind was practically a revolt against the

authority of the Old Country, which always acted in our interest; that it was the proper party to carry on negotiations. I sympathise with the views of the hon. gentleman, now that we ought to have something to say with regard to negotiations respecting our own affairs, and the late Administration took the best possible means of carrying that view into effect, when we refused to receive the English Commissioner who was proposed by the Colonial Secretary to settle our Fishery affairs. We declined to receive anyone but a man who should be chosen by the Canadian Government. We declined pæremptorily to have anything to do with it if Canada did not appoint her own representatives. Anything that Ministers might propose, to secure recognition of Canadian interests in commercial matters in a proper way, I would be prepared to support. This wretched, miserable attempt to make and send a Canadian Ambassador and establish him in London, when the Colonial Secretary plainly tells us that if there is a back room or office not occupied when he calls, he may sit in it until the Colonial or Foreign Secretary's business is finished with whoever may happen to be in attendance upon him, when he will give our representative an audience, amounts to saying that it would always simply rest with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to determine in what precise capacity his services could best be rendered. So his capacity as Canadian Ambassador is not to be recognised at all. He may be somewhat superior, perhaps, to the clerk of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, or the secretary or whoever there is attending upon him, but that is all the recognition he will receive. I have only to say further that, I hope this wonderful Minister's speech has not gone to England, and has not been read by the British Ministers, and I hope Sir Alexander Galt will be able to condone with Lord Beaconsfield, after the flattery he administered to him in that speech at Montreal, and that it will not militate against him and against this country with the greater, more liberal, statesmanlike, and better man who now controls the destinies of Great Britain.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. BLAKE: The House may remember that, when this measure was first indicated to us in the Speech from the Throne, I ventured to suggest some doubts as to the propriety of the step suggested. I must confess that nothing that has since occurred, either the expository speech of the new agent who is charged with these duties nor the discussion that has taken place to day, has removed those doubts. It may well be that the time has arrived, for a reorganisation of our financial arrangements in England either by a re-adjustment with our present agents, altering altogether the scale and system of remuneration, or by continued and extended employment of the person to whom, for some time, we have confidentially entrusted the management of these matters, Sir John Rose; or, perhaps, by a slight enlargement of the existing agency in London, an arrangement might be made more satisfactory than the continuance of the present too expensive system of commissions. The possible amount to be saved is a question which it is extremely difficult for anyone to decide, certainly for any independent member of the House who is not acquainted with the details of the present and the proposed plan of working the London financial matters. But the other and larger objects which are proposed to be accomplished by the Government, have not been shown to require this appointment. I do not apprehend precisely what it is the hon. gentleman proposes to accomplish by what he calls modifications and alterations in the relations between this country and England. He talked to us this afternoon of our assuming more the position of an auxiliary kingdom, and he suggests that the present Bill is calculated to forward our assumption of such a position, by giving a diplomatic character to this officer who is to represent Canada in England. I was not a little amused, remembering the old and well-worn character which has been ascribed to diplomatists who are said to be generally sent abroad to perform an office not very honourable for the good of their country.

MR. PLUMB: To lie.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. member for Niagara, with his usual bluntness, has

used an expression which I did not wish to use. I was much amused, I say, to hear the hon. gentleman suggesting that any commissioner of a diplomatic or ambassadorial character, would induce the public at large to give much greater credence to the statements of our representative than they would receive if he was a simple agent. But with reference to the more important charge, my apprehension is this: I do not desire to see, under the appearance of a greater measure of control given to the Canadian people, a practical diminution of their present measure of control over their own affairs. I do not agree that we, as a people, will gain a greater measure of control over our own affairs by giving an increased power and facility to our Executive of confidential communication with the Colonial Office, to be carried on by an agent permanently resident in England, and under the shadow and influence of the Colonial Office. I do not agree that more power is obtained by the Canadian people, whom we represent, because our Executive obtains greater power and facilities of negotiation through a resident Minister in England. And having regard to the doctrines, somewhat alarming, as I conceive them, which we have recently heard broached as to the power of the Executive authority to bind the people and Parliament of this country by negotiations with the English Government, I think it is more important than ever that we should have upon this occasion a definitive expression from the hon. the Prime Minister, which, I apprehend, he will not shrink from giving us, and which may prevent suggestions hereafter as to the binding character of negotiations conducted through Sir Alexander Galt. We know there have been discussions over the analogous point: the Treaty-making power. We know the extent to which, within three or four years, the doctrine of the prerogative of the Crown, with reference to the conclusion of Treaties and their binding nature, has been pushed. We know the ground upon which leading Liberal statesmen, who desired to see the prerogative continue, have justified its continuance as consistent in any shape with popular control. That ground is that, under no circumstances, and at no time, for many years, at least, had Gov-

ernment concluded a Treaty unless it had been made perfectly palpable, by preceding public discussion, that that Treaty was but the crystallization of the public will. Now we are dealing in this case with a matter to which these considerations cannot possibly apply. We are dealing with negotiations which are, in their nature, of a confidential and secret character. I need do no more than point to our Minutes for the proof, because we find in the Minute brought down to us during this Session of Parliament, that since last summer negotiations have been in progress with reference to many important matters, among others with reference to the defence of this country, and particularly of British Columbia. But the public does not know anything about these negotiations, Parliament does not know anything about them; we know in no shape or sense what the form of these negotiations was, what the substance of them was, who advanced the questions for discussion, what proposals were made, and what may be the present shape and issue of these negotiations. Considering what has been said, with reference to former negotiations, notably that with Lord Carnarvon, considering the language of this Bill, which makes the person who is to be appointed the representative of Canada, and considering the language of the Minute, I deem it of high importance that there should be a distinct Parliamentary understanding that nothing done by this agent, so called, of the people of Canada, shall be deemed to be more binding upon the Parliament and people of Canada than if it had been done in the ordinary way by the Executive Government; that the Executive Government cannot confer upon this agent, by means of this Act of Parliament, any greater implied or express power to bind us than they themselves have, and, therefore, except in cases in which they have been given specific authority by Parliament to conduct to a conclusion negotiations binding upon us, that we are not to be held in any shape or sense bound by what may be concluded through the medium of this agent. I desire that no more should be accomplished by his action than if, without special instructions from Parliament, without the special authority and sanction of Parliament, a Minister had gone to England and agreed to

certain conclusions which, according to our wholesome practice heretofore, we do not hold to be binding upon the people of this country unless the people in Parliament assembled agree. I think it is highly important to us that that principle should be preserved intact and unimpaired, and that the occasion demands a reassertion and a fresh recognition of that principle. If that view be assented to then we shall no longer hear any such suggestion as that terms and conditions materially affecting the future of this country, and adding considerable burdens to it, are binding on us as a people, simply because the Administration of the day is supposed to have made those terms with a Colonial Secretary. We shall no longer hear of this being a treaty binding upon us and to which we are bound to give effect. There is no doubt that an Administration making such an arrangement is bound to do its best to give it effect, but there is equally no doubt, as I hope and believe, that we shall hold that this House is as free to dissent from as to sanction the arrangement. I think allusion should also be made to a significant circumstance in connection with the policy which, in no obscure terms, was foreshadowed in a speech made by the distinguished person appointed to this mission. This speech, made on the occasion of his departure, was made in the presence of the hon. the Minister of Railways and the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. It is, therefore, under the authority, by the assent and consent of these representative Ministers of the Crown, that this declaration of policy was made by Sir Alexander Galt. Now, when we find it stated in the Minute that the question of defence is an important one, on which negotiations have been going on for many months: when we see rumours in the newspapers, that in the event of a war—much less likely to happen, I fancy, now, than it was a few weeks ago, but still a not impossible event—Canada is to be called on to raise a contingent: and, again, when we hear the distinct statement made by this diplomatist, that his policy is to persuade the British people to close their ports against the grain of the world, in order that their own farmers and ours may obtain a higher price from the millions of British consumers, with compensation, of course, to the English manufacturer, in his easier

admission to our markets: when we find that all these important questions are to be brought upon the carpet, it is of very great consequence to us that our vital interests are not to be more complicated, fettered or entangled by the result of these mysterious and confidential negotiations, protracted for many months, and which we only learned by the accident of the publication of these papers, than if they had been made under the old arrangements. For my own part, I am extremely anxious, as you know, that the position of this country should be fully considered: I am extremely anxious that it should be seen whether we cannot take our place as a part of the Empire to which we belong, but I am not at all anxious, and I say it frankly, to forward any policy which may produce merely a closer Executive connection with England—I am not at all anxious for any change which will practically give a greater power to the Executive, and less power to the people of Canada, to mould their share of the foreign policy of the Empire. So long as the people of Canada have no voice in the foreign policy of the Empire, I shall be wholly opposed to raising forces in this country to engage in wars incurred in carrying out that policy—to shed our blood and expend our treasure in the promotion of a policy which we have no share in moulding. The first Minister has said that it is necessary that Ministers should visit England occasionally, because free personal communication with the Imperial authorities is requisite in discussing the details of matters under controversy or discussion; but it is obvious that if this agent is resident in England, explanation of these details must still be made by some one from this side. Of course the agent will have the advantage of his long experience of Canadian affairs, but he will not have that intimate knowledge of the changes in current public opinion, and of the policy of the Government, which is necessary in explaining these questions to the British authorities. Last summer it was stated that the public business required that three Ministers should visit England upon various questions. It will not be said, I presume, that this agent can combine within himself the knowledge and experience of the whole Cabinet. It is said again that at this period there is to be a general revision of com-

mercial treaties, and I agree that it is quite possible that the interests of Canada, at such a time, may be served by an agent on the spot, but these Treaties once made are intended to last for a long time, and this, therefore, is no reason for making a permanent appointment, so that on none of these grounds can I see that the proposal is judicious, nor am I prepared to say that it will be economical. The salary of the Commissioner, large as it is, will be a small part of the expense. The contingencies and extras, personal and official, will be found to amount to more than double or treble the proposed expenditure for salary, and on the whole grounds, I cannot favour this new departure.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman must know that no arrangement exists by which Canada is to furnish her contingent in case of a foreign war. Such a thing has never been suggested by the Imperial authorities, or considered by the Canadian Government. Whenever that unfortunate exigency should arise, England, I am sure, may calculate upon the people of Canada rendering the assistance which it is their duty, as part of the Empire, to render. In the meantime, I can only say that the rumour upon which the hon. gentleman has based his remarks is utterly without foundation. We have undertaken merely to appoint an Agent-General, as the Australian Colonies have done, to represent the interests, financial or otherwise, of the Colony. We have preferred, instead of sending Sir Alexander T. Galt home as a mere agent, telling him to follow such instructions as might, from time to time, be sent to him, to give him such a position that he can speak with greater authority than as a mere agent for a Crown Colony, or any other colony, whether it has representative institutions or not. I am proud to believe that the Dominion is assuming the position of an auxiliary kingdom of the Empire, and from our population and wealth and probable future, we have a right to say that we ought to be taken out of the category of mere dependencies, like the West India Islands, having Crown agents, and looking after their little interests at the beck of a Colonial Minister. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman is aware, by experience, that the prestige that attaches to a

Canadian Minister is no inconsiderable matter, and we desired to give our agent the full prestige of such a Minister. The hon. gentleman has tried to set aside the financial question, but the Government will not let it be set aside, as it is one of the utmost importance. The hon. member for Centre Huron has admitted in his speech that his experience as Finance Minister has convinced him that a change was necessary in the management of our financial operations in London, and in that view alone there will be a saving of many thousand dollars. The expenses of the Department will not be so large as the hon. gentleman seems to think. In the first place, we have already an emigration staff. I have no hesitation in saying that the emigration policy under which we have been working is a failure. By having a gentleman of ability and prestige to have general supervision of these emigration agencies, not only in the United Kingdom but on the Continent, if they should be established there, these agents can be stirred up to greater activity. Further, this Commissioner will, from the position he occupies, be able to direct to Canada the attention of a class of people who could not be reached by a mere emigration agent. It is proposed to utilise the emigration staff; and a book-keeper and a clerk or two will be all the additional officers necessary. The hon. gentleman has expressed a fear that the country will be committed by arrangements made by the Commissioner. This is impossible. Our agent cannot and will not have any greater authority than those who send him. If he makes any arrangements, they will merely be provisional, having no authority whatever, no value whatever, unless they have been previously or are subsequently sanctioned by Parliament. It will be impossible for him to have more authority than a Minister visiting England. The hon. gentleman has said that a resident Minister will be under the shadow of the Colonial Office, but it will be readily seen that this will be no more the case under the new system than under the present system when a Minister visits England; besides that, the future, as well as the present, of the Commissioner, depends on the satisfaction he gives to the people of Canada, not to the Colonial Minister or to the Imperial Government.

Another objection is, that being a resident of England, he will be absent from Canada, and could not be expected to be so well acquainted with the feeling of the people here. I fancy that an absence of two or three years will not take away from him his knowledge of the people of Canada or their way of thinking, and he will be to blame if he does not keep up a knowledge of, and acquaintance with, the people and their affairs. Besides he is not bound to stay in England. He could do as every resident Minister does—leave England and be here within ten days, receive his instructions from his Government upon any particular question, and return to his post to be on the spot when anything occurred in England which might be taken advantage of for the benefit of Canada. It would be out of the question for the Minister to be continually crossing the Atlantic. The hon. gentleman speaks as if we are going to have the nations of Europe sitting down, and within a short time making and completing negotiations and treaties. These negotiations may go on for years. We do not know what interruptions may take place; when negotiations, broken off for the moment, may be re-opened; we cannot have the Minister of the Crown attending to such exigencies. There is a case going on with France. As I said, when Sir Alexander Galt was in Paris, just as he was about to succeed, and just as the Convention would have been signed, by which there would have been a reduction of the duty on Canadian shipping, an accident caused it to fall through, but it can be renewed at any time. We have ever since been continually in the expectation of having those negotiations renewed; but there have been frequent changes of Administration. The Minister charged with such negotiations has been changed again and again. When the Government has been in immediate expectation of being able to do something satisfactory, some political change or accident interrupted, for the moment, such expectation, Her Majesty's Government are unable to say within what particular week, or on what day these negotiations may be re-opened, and, therefore, it is of great importance that we should have an officer, who understands the subject, and who has received the general views of the

Dominion, always there. We will suppose, for a moment, that an agent comes from France to England, to reopen the negotiations in reference to their commercial relations. The hon. gentleman and everybody else must see the great inconvenience—it would be impossible—but the great inconvenience, if it were possible, of stopping negotiations until Canada's representative should arrive on the spot. We must either have some officer in England able to act at once as an *ad legis*, sitting by the side of, and being continually consulted by, the negotiator; or, as we cannot know, without having a representative on the spot, where the place chosen may be, and as England could not be expected to wait until Canada sends her Minister or representative over—for it could not be expected that they would stop for our convenience—the negotiations will go on without us. We must be always ready. Arrangements are likely to go on with France, Spain, Germany, Austria, Belgium and Switzerland, spreading over many years; and if we desire to be represented from the earliest moment of negotiations to the conclusion, we must always have our Minister there, or we must allow the very unsatisfactory mode to continue, of former days, of the Imperial Government acting of her own accord without consulting us, or we will have to trust to written communications. The advantages of our having a permanent representative there are so obvious, and the disadvantages of the contrary course are so great, that I am surprised at the opposition offered. I can assure the hon. gentleman—if any assurance at all is required—that by no possibility will Sir Alexander Galt, or any other Minister appointed by Canada, be able to bind or pledge, by implication or otherwise, directly or indirectly, the Dominion of Canada, without previous or subsequent sanction of Parliament. If it be important that we should have a person always representing us in the Mother Country, if it be important to have an officer of the kind I describe to supervise, arrange and carry out in a just spirit our emigration system, and if we can save the enormous sums stated by the hon. the Finance Minister, what abler or better man could be appointed than Sir Alexander Galt? He stands well with the Foreign Office,

through which office all negotiations with foreign nations must be conducted. He has become almost an outside officer of that Department, from his successful negotiations in the Fishery Award. To the credit of the late Administration and hon. gentlemen opposite, they selected him in consequence of their opinion of his abilities. As to his speech at Montreal, and his views with regard to an Imperial Zollverein, there must, of course, be a difference of opinion on such a subject. Canada would certainly not suffer anything if such an arrangement could be made after the settlement of the North-West. It would be no bad thing for Canada to have control of the English market if England would give it to her; it would be a grand thing for Canada if we had the exclusive supply of that market, and if we were able to supply it.

MR. MILLS: I thought the Government's policy was to find a home market.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Our policy is to so increase our industries as to fully supply our home market and send the surplus home. That is the policy of the United States; that is the policy under which they rival England and undersell her in her own market, and that is the policy which, by-and-bye, Mr. Speaker, I hope to see followed in a vigorous prosecution of the National Policy. Manufactories are springing up in all parts of Canada, and I believe that, if the people at large enter with heart and zeal into the National Policy, we will, ere long, be able to send the products and manufactures of Canadian industries into foreign markets. Hon. gentlemen seem always to despair of their country, they seem to have no faith in it; they have no hope; hope and faith go together. I believe, and I have a well-founded faith, in the development and increase of our industries and manufactures, and the consequent increase of the wealth of our country, increased employment for our people, and our continued advancement, progress and prosperity.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken when he states that we have no hope, and no faith, and no confidence in our country. It is in the right hon. gentleman that we have no faith and no confidence; and since he is

supported by so large a majority it makes no difference to him, because the country have no opportunity of expressing their opinion. The right hon. gentleman was as hopeful formerly as a Free-trader as he is to-day as a Protectionist. I do not wish to say anything that will be distasteful, but I remember an occasion, not very long ago, when I had to leave the House for a moment, the right hon. gentleman cried out: "Coward." If he had remained in his place I would like to have had an explanation of that expression, which I took a note of at the time, in which he described Canada as an "auxiliary kingdom" of the Empire.

MR. PLUMB: He said exactly those words, and meant them.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I should like to hear from the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). The term "auxiliary kingdom" must be explained, and when the consequence of its expression must be in some way exemplified. If the right hon. gentleman had done me the honour to wait, or if the hon. member for Niagara takes his place—as he will, no doubt, be delighted to do—I should like to know what occupation or position Canada is to have as an "auxiliary kingdom" of the British Empire. Is the High Commissioner, whom the hon. gentleman has sent to England, going to speak for an "auxiliary kingdom?" Does the term "auxiliary kingdom" imply inferiority? Are we a part and parcel of the Empire? These are important questions. The term referred to should not be used carelessly or loosely, for while it might have no significance if used in a newspaper paragraph, it ought to be explained if used in this House by the leader of the Government. I watched the right hon. gentleman to the end of his speech, and I wondered how he would explain that speech of the High Commissioner in Montreal. As the House well knows, I have the highest appreciation of the High Commissioner, as a personal friend for years, and as one of the foremost public men of the country. Does the right hon. gentleman's explanations satisfy this House as to the speech made by Sir Alexander Galt, at his dinner, pronounced by him with a Minister on his right and another Minister on his left, and which we have thus a right to suppose was the utterance

of the Government of this country? I remember a time when the right hon. gentleman denounced the appointment of any agent in London. His argument then was: that our system, to be successful, must be elastic, and not so particularly defined. I was disposed to believe in the truth of that argument, that we did not require an agent in London, and our ordinary machinery for emigration purposes was sufficient and safer than any more stringent policy that could be adopted. But now he has changed his views, but he has not apologised for having changed his mind; he did not even declare that he had changed his mind on this question. But above and beyond all, he did not repudiate the speech of the London agent. He told us a few jokes, and said a few serious words in regard to that speech, but he did not tell us, for instance, whether the London agent was right or wrong when he made that speech in Montreal, and told the people he was charged with certain duties—in which he practically said that, first of all, he was to take charge of the fiscal affairs of this country in London—that the financing of this country in London is to be taken out of the hands of the gentlemen who, for a long time, have managed it well. The hon. gentleman told us that by the Confederation Act the British Government had ceded to us all the powers of taxation, and by the deduction, which he ingeniously carried out, he wished us to infer that the British Government was not equal to the negotiation of a Treaty of Commerce for Canada, except with the consent of this country. I would like to know whether the people have to be perturbed and perplexed by declarations of this kind on the part of the High Commissioner who goes to London, and whether the right hon. gentleman, in explaining that speech, is still to leave the people in darkness as to whether that is his position. I remember that, when the hon. member for Sherbrooke, now the High Commissioner in London, moved a Resolution to the effect that it was necessary for the people of this country to have Treaty-making power wherever their commercial interests were concerned. The hon. the First Minister denounced that doctrine, stated that it was fraught with disloyalty, and generally pronounced it dangerous. I would like

to hear from the right hon. gentleman tonight as to the reaffirmation of that declaration by the London agent, who declared that his point was achieved, and he went to London to carry it out. I would like to know whether that doctrine was as distasteful to the right hon. gentleman as it was in the old days, when he denounced his old colleagues, and when the hon. the Minister of Railways turned livid with distress at the dangers to the Empire which this doctrine indicated. In those days, the High Commissioner, then the member for Sherbrook, pointed out to the member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), that the policy which he was adopting towards the United States, was a dangerous one. He said it was impossible for us to succeed in any policy of retaliation, and I think, if I remember well, he chided the right hon. gentleman for having stated that our neighbours to the south were a hostile people. I would like to know on what ground, then, the High Commissioner, going in a representative capacity to England, alluded to our neighbours to the south of us, with whom we are so intimately connected in trade relations, with whom, at all events, we are compelled constantly to deal, declared that he was dealing with a hostile or at least unfriendly people. Was it an inspiration of the right hon. gentleman that induced him to say so? In England, the other day, the whole press rose up in arms against Mr. Gladstone, because it was thought he had said something distasteful to the Emperor of Austria, who had called him a "pestilent fellow," and he retorted by stating that he had not full confidence in that Emperor. We know what the consequences were, and how many leading Liberals regretted that, in a moment of excitement, this expression was used. Is it always to be our policy to speak of our neighbours as hostile and as to be distrusted? But, notwithstanding those views expressed by the right hon. gentleman years ago, and which were repudiated the other night by his hon. High Commissioner, we have the evidence of the High Commissioner that a retaliatory policy was not a good thing, and for my own part, speaking for myself, I know not exactly how the people will feel, I venture to express the opinion that it will

not be generally regarded as wise that, on every occasion, the public men of this country should seize the opportunity to flaunt defiance in the faces of our neighbours to the south. I should like to know whether the right hon. gentleman thought this declaration was wise in his Commissioner, or conducive to that diplomatic character which, he explained he was to exercise. Then there is another point the right hon. gentleman neglected to speak about. I am sure it was quite like him to remain silent thereon. We all admit that he is very shrewd and takes everything in at a glance—even if some of us do not always admit he is right. The High Commissioner pointed out in the same speech that we should never have undertaken to build the Pacific Railway or settle the North-West without the aid of England. Ministers of the Crown were on either side of him and were silent when he made this declaration. Did the High Commissioner express the opinions of the right hon. gentleman? I think we are entitled to know whether he dissents from this view or not. The right hon. gentleman said a few words about the Zollverein, but nothing about those important points. The Zollverein may be a delightful thing. It may take us back to the old times, before Responsible Government was given to this country, but it is a trifle compared to this burning question which presses upon the people to-day. I am sure it must be forgetfulness on the part of the hon. right gentleman, and I will gladly sit down and hear his explanation, and then continue my remarks. If we are to understand that the High Commissioner made a speech which the Government deny or endorse, where are we? Nearly as blind as when the right hon. gentleman told us we are an "auxiliary kingdom." We do not know what "auxiliary kingdom" means, and we do not know what "High Commissioner" means, and we stand quivering, so to speak, to find out what the Great Powers have in store for us. If it be true that the Commissioner is to urge that the building of the Pacific Railway or the populating of the North-West must not be done without the assistance of England, I do not see any reason for the vote we gave the other day, in which we declared that the road must be driven on regardless of consequences. I

MR. HUNTINGTON.

speak for myself and no one else, and I believe the people are taking account of these things, and the day will come when it will be necessary to explain, not only the speech of the High Commissioner, but the policy of the Government which appears to be entirely inconsistent with that speech, and about which we literally know nothing. The High Commissioner, having stated those and many other things, clearly made it understood that his mission was to fulfil those functions which he pointed out as being essential—that he went to England to assert that position which Canada had a right to assert, namely, that England has no right to regulate a commercial Treaty except with the consent of this country, and that England was bound to assist in the settlement of the North-West, or it could not be settled at all. He went to impress those facts upon the British Government, and the occupants of the Treasury benches are not prepared to tell us whether those functions are to be fulfilled, or whether we are to drive on in this hopeless contest, or call a halt. I was disappointed in the speech of the right hon. gentleman, and the country will be disappointed. If he were to make a supplementary speech I am sure the country would be delighted, especially if that speech were satisfactory, and it was shown that, as they say out West, he took a good deal of stock in the views of his High Commissioner, especially upon the Pacific Railway question.

MR. BOULTBEE: We are bound to believe the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) when he says the Opposition generally have a great hope in the future of Canada, but we must also come to the conclusion that they have a very peculiar way of showing it. They may have great hopes for our future, but the hon. leader of the Opposition spent six hours a few days ago in drawing the most melancholy picture of Canada. He pictured her in decadence, plunged in debt, obliged to break faith for lack of means and unable to meet her obligations. Then the late leader of the Opposition spent hours in reading a voluminous selection of garbled extracts from the reports of the North-West, to prove that the fertile plains of that great country are nothing but a sterile wilderness. The hon. member for

Shefford spoke with a great deal of feeling about certain remarks about our neighbours. Well, if there is any feeling of distrust on this side, if there is any jealousy on our part as to what may be the action of the United States towards the Dominion, we have some warrant for those feelings. In commercial relations, at least, the Americans are not always friendly towards us. But if there is a lack of warm fraternal feeling towards the Americans on this side of the House, it is amply made up by hon. gentlemen opposite, who seem to recognise the people of the United States as something more than brothers, something more to be regarded than the people of Canada. While they never have a kindly word to say for Canada, they never mention the United States except in terms of eulogy and esteem. Can any country flourish when its chief men have not a word to say in its favour? I protest against this attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is neither fair nor patriotic, and it will not find an echo in the hearts of the people. The hon. member for Shefford could not help sneering at the right hon. leader of the Government for calling Canada an "auxiliary kingdom." I do not suppose that when the right hon. gentleman made use of that word he had Webster or Worcester before him, and he did not look for its exact meaning. But what the House understood, and what the hon. member for Shefford understood, and what the people of Canada and England will understand, is that, in using that expression the right hon. gentleman meant to express the hope that Canada would grow up stronger than she is now, bound by trade and commercial relations and patriotic feelings to Great Britain, that we shall always remain auxiliary, always remain a part of the Empire, and giving added strength to the British Empire, always proud to be a colony of England, always proud to be descended from Englishmen, always proud of being part of one of the greatest nations of the earth. But that nation did not achieve her stability, and will not keep it in the future, from such expressions as fall from hon. gentlemen opposite, who are forever decrying our own institutions and lauding those of our neighbours.

Motion made and question proposed:

That the said Bill be now read a second time.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

The House divided:—Yeas, 120; Nays, 48.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Abbott	Kranz
Allison	Lane
Angers	Langevin
Arkell	Little
Baby	Longley
Baker	Macdonald (King's, PEI)
Bannerman	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Barnard	McDonald (Cape Breton)
Beauchesne	McDonald (Pictou)
Bergeron	Macmillan
Bergin	McCallum
Bill	McCuaig
Bolduc	Macdougall
Boulbee	McGreevy
Bourbeau	McKay
Bowell	McLennan
Brecken	McQuade
Brooks	McRory
Bunster	Masson
Bunting	Massue
Burnham	Merner
Carling	Méthot
Caron	Montplaisir
Cimon	Mousseau
Cockburn (West N'land)	O'Connor
Colby	Orton
Connell	Ouimet
Costigan	Patterson
Coughlin	Perrault
Coursol	Platt
Currier	Plumb
Cuthbert	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Daly	Poupore
Daoust	Richey
Dawson	Robertson (Hamilton)
DeCosmos	Robinson
Desaulniers	Rochester
Desjardins	Ross (Dundas)
Domville	Rouleau
Doull	Routhier
Drew	Royal
Elliott	Ryan (Marquette)
Farrow	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Fitzsimmons	Rykert
Fulton	Shaw
Gault	Sproule
Gigault	Stephenson
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Tasse
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Teller
Grandbois	Thompson (Cariboo)
Hackett	Tilley
Hilliard	Vallee
Hooper	Vannasse
Houde	Wage
Ives	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Jackson	Wallace (West York)
Kaulbach	White (Cardwell)
Keeler	White (North Renfrew)
Kilvert	Williams
Kirkpatrick	Wright.—120.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Anglin	LaRue
Bain	Laurier
Béchar	Macdonnell (N. Lanark)
Blake	Mackenzie
Borden	McIsaac
Bourassa	Malouin
Brown	Mills
Burpee (St John)	Olivier
Burpee (Sunbury)	Olivier
Cameron (South Huron)	Paterson (South Brant)
Cartwright	Pickard
Casey	Rinfret
Chandler	Robertson (Shelburne)
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Rogers
Coupal	Ross (West Middlesex)
Dumont	Rymal
Fiset	Scriver
Flynn	Skinner
Gillmor	Smith (Selkirk)
Gunn	Thompson (Haldimand)
Guthrie	Trow
Haddow	Weldon
Killam	Wiser
King	Yeo—48.

Motion resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the salary for the High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom be fixed at ten thousand dollars per annum.

(In the Committee.)

Resolution ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolution reported and referred to the Committee of the Whole on Bill 88.

Bill considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—
[BILL 116.]

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. WELDON: The present system is working very well as far as our harbour is concerned. Whenever a pilot commits a breach of regulations he is brought up and the matter is investigated. The way this Bill now stands, a pilot will be at the mercy of the Board, who may without reason or cause assigned, after the pilot has spent all the labour and trouble in getting his commission, decide that his license shall not be renewed.

MR. WELDON:

The result will be that we shall get an inferior class of men incapable of taking charge of ships. When a pilot goes on board a vessel, he takes charge, not only of the ship and the property in it, but of men's lives, and it is of great importance to have men who are capable, and it is necessary that the men shall find it to their interest to conduct themselves properly by being assured that they will be likely to hold their situations permanently. We cannot expect to get competent men if their tenure is uncertain and fluctuating, and at the mercy of the Board.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I am not going to discuss the capability of pilots. I cannot see the force of the objections raised by the hon. gentleman unless he assumes corruption or incompetency on the part of the Board that manages that branch of the public service. The only difference now proposed is this: that that Board, which controls a body of men who ought to be under immediate and prompt control, shall have the power, when occasion presents itself to them as a just one, to refuse at the end of the year to renew their commission as a pilot. Under the present law a pilot can have his license taken away for cause and not otherwise, and it is only proper. By this Bill he can be removed for cause or at the end of the year, or the Commissioners, at the end of the year, may renew his commission. I cannot see that justice may not be done, for if a pilot is improperly removed, or refused his license, he may have an investigation. We must presume that if a pilot has any complaint made against him, during the currency of the year, they will summon him and try the complaint, and determine the character and nature of it, and ascertain whether it is well founded or not, and if well founded, either remove him or, at the end of the year, cancel his commission. There are many things which a pilot may be guilty of, such as drunkenness, which might warrant the cancellation of the commission at the end of the year. The Board can, under this Bill, in the discharge of their public duty, dismiss a pilot who is guilty of carelessness or dissipated habits, or for other reasons which may present themselves as showing that any particular pilot is not the proper man to perform

the important functions which are imposed upon him. The pilots are left in the hands of the Commissioners, as before, only this gives the Commissioners a more immediate power to deal with a person whom they may think incompetent to perform such an important trust. I ought to say, that it was my duty, at the instance of the Board of Commissioners, to bring before the Ministry the difficulty which these Commissioners have in dealing with the matter as the law stands, and has stood for years, and it was on that ground that I determined to submit this Bill in accordance with the strong desire of the Commissioners, that this particular alteration should be made.

MR. ANGLIN: There is a marked distinction between giving the Commissioners ample and judicial power to deal with a person, and the power conferred upon them by this Bill, which would enable them, without cause, but simply on suspicion, to withhold from a pilot his commission which it has taken him years of apprenticeship and toil to obtain, and after it has taken him many long years of trouble to fit himself for his duties. It is very important that pilots should be competent, and it is very desirable that the Commissioners should have ample power to deprive those of their licenses who are not competent, careful and sober men. The pilots are a large and respectable class of men, one of the most respectable in the Lower Provinces. These men, however, are, to a certain extent, in antagonism with the owners of vessels and the consignees of cargoes of vessels coming to the ports, and these owners and consignees are continually endeavouring to cut down the charges of these pilots. They are continually making bargains with them, and often arrange with some particular pilot to take the vessel at lower rates, and this Bill would certainly place them in the power of those owners and consignees, inasmuch as the Board of Commissioners is largely composed of such men. The men with whom these pilots are in antagonism, would thus have the power to make arbitrary appointments, and the power to grant or take away their licenses. I hope that the House will not pass any such Bill.

MR. BLAKE: What is the reason for excepting the Province of Quebec from the provisions of this Bill.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): Because they have Boards altogether different from the lower ports. In reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from St. John, N.B., as to the importance of having competent pilots, so as not to endanger life and property; and as to the merchants and shipowners being Commissioners, I think that must show that it must have a very opposite effect to that suggested by the hon. gentleman. If shipowners and merchants are generally the Commissioners, they would take care, having the power, to have sober, competent men. Their own interests would require them to do so, and I think there is very much to say in favour of the Bill, taking that view of the question. The Commissioners are generally the leading men of the town, and, as the law stands now, a man may be charged with drunkenness, and without an expensive investigation the Board has no power over him. I think the effect of the Act will be to save a good deal of expense and trouble.

MR. KILLAM: I want to call the attention of my hon. friends from Quebec to the fact that, a few minutes ago, when they thought this Bill referred to that Province as well as the Lower Provinces, they said, "dropped, dropped," but now, when they find it does not apply to their Province, they do not say a word. Before, it was going to be pernicious to their Province, and they commenced to raise an objection at once to the Bill. I appeal to the hon. gentlemen—knowing, as we do that the Bill would apply to the port of Halifax and other ports—why, after they have been told that this Bill would be objectionable, if it were applicable to the Province of Quebec, do they not object to its application against the Lower Provinces?

MR. ANGERS: I was glad to hear the hon. member, who has just taken his seat, apply for assistance. I hope that if ever we require assistance he will give us the same assistance that I am about to give him. I am quite sure that the hon. the Minister of Justice has not changed his mind as to the application of the Bill. I am quite sure it was never intended to be applied to the Province of Quebec, the words making it so applicable were a misprint, and I am told that the hon. the Minister of Justice, when he introduced the Bill, stated that it was to apply to all the other Provinces but Quebec. If I

rise to speak upon this Bill, I have no personal interest in this matter, as representing mariners or others from the Province of Quebec; and the opinion I wish to give is that of a disinterested party. I think the Bill is a bad one. I object to the principle of it, because, although it does not apply to the Province of Quebec, we are not sure whether next year we shall not be inflicted with it in that Province. What does this Bill state? It wishes to deprive pilots of acquired rights. It wishes to take away, or to give the power to take away, licenses from them. It says that "no license granted before the passing of this Act shall remain in force for more than one year." Is it right for a man to go through a long period of apprenticeship, to make voyages, and incur expenses and risks in going to sea watching for vessels, and after all this time, trouble, and labour, that every year he is to be submitted to the risk of losing his license? I think the principle of the Bill is bad. We have been told that one excuse for the Bill is to avoid expense in investigations. Is it ever too expensive to do justice to a man, and is there any fault which a pilot may be guilty of that he cannot be tried for like another citizen? Can any other citizen be deprived of his license? Can I be deprived of my license as a barrister without getting a proper investigation before the Bar? Is it right to subject a pilot to the powers of Commissioners by whom he may be dismissed because his authority is opposed to the ship-owners, because the pilot may insist upon pilotage against the ship-owners? This Bill gives arbitrary powers to the Commissioners, who may refuse to renew any license without any ground given for it. Reference has been made to investigation in relation to a pilot infringing his duty. We have these in Quebec nearly every week. We have numerous complaints because the river is exceedingly difficult to navigate, and these investigations cost from five to ten dollars, and they last from an hour to two hours. Surely that is not expensive. Now, in future, a man may be deprived of his license for no cause whatever. We have a law in the Statute-book of 1873 that provides the ground on which pilots may be removed, and for what reasons he may be deprived of his license. This law of

1873 was made after full consideration, not as the result of one man's thought, but the Board of Trade of Quebec and the Harbour Board of Montreal, fully considered the matter and came to an agreement about it, and that law applies to the Lower Provinces. It states what the grounds of complaint must be and how the complaint is to be tried; but now the present Bill provides that, in future, they should be obliged to take out their licenses every year. Under that system a man will never be made competent. They cannot take their boats out to sea, and make themselves efficient when they know their licenses may be taken from them upon the mere caprice of the Board, and when those boats will thus be rendered useless to them. I find another clause to the effect that no pilot can hereafter become a harbour master. I do not see any just grounds for that, because if any man is competent to perform the duties of that position it is a pilot. I hope the hon. Minister will consider this Bill for a day or two longer, and that he may come to the conclusion that it is not right to deprive the pilots of his own, and the other Maritime Provinces of acquired rights.

MR. BLAKE: I would suggest that it would be better this Bill should not be proceeded with this Session. It certainly is infringing most seriously upon the present status of the whole body of pilots of the Dominion, excepting those of Quebec. The law of 1873 gives them a right to that office, which they have purchased at a considerable expense of time, trading, the purchase of a vessel, etc. The law gives the pilot a license which is to last until he is sixty-five years of age, when it is to be delivered up, but may be renewed from year to year. To change the position of those persons, in the serious manner which is proposed, is certainly a strong step. This Bill was only introduced yesterday, and hon. members have not had an opportunity to enquire into the matter. There has only been complaint from one port about the working of the present system, and that may merely be some local difficulty. Under the circumstances I think it would be well to postpone the Bill until next Session.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: After the strong remonstrances made

against the Bill, and the remarks made by the hon. member for West Durham, I think it would be well for the Committee to rise and report progress.

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou): There is great force in the observations of the hon. member for West Durham as to the want of opportunity for members to consider the Bill, and there is no desire to press an important measure of this character on the House inadvisedly. But no observation that has been made has changed my mind with reference to the expediency of the measure. The Bill does not propose to disturb matters in Quebec; its object is to restore Nova Scotia to the position, in relation to the pilotage authorities, that she occupied before the present law was passed. I am quite willing that the Province of New Brunswick should also be exempt, and they should enjoy the privileges they prize so highly. The Committee can either rise and report progress, or the Bill can go through, confining its operation to Nova Scotia.

Progress ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

209	Department of Justice—To provide for the salaries of one Senior Second-class Clerk and one Junior Second-class Clerk, from July 1st, 1879, and January 1st, 1880, respectively.....	\$1,525 00
210	Auditor-General's Office—Additional amount required for Contingencies.....	500 00
211	Post Office Department—Additional amount required for salaries.....	1,025 00
212	Civil Service Board—Amount required for salaries of the Board.	600 00
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.		
213	Amount required to meet the expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of the Better Prevention of Crimes Act.....	300 00
PENITENTIARIES.		
214	British Columbia—Amount required for School Teacher.....	200 00
215	St. John, N.B.—Amount required for purchase of Broom Corn. ...	2,200 00

LEGISLATION.

216	Additional amount required for stationery for the use of Members of Parliament.....	\$1,546 31
217	Amount required for the printing of the Criminal Laws.....	2,500 00

IMMIGRATION AND QUARANTINE.

218	Amount required to cover cost of repairs to Immigrant Hospital, Partridge Island, St. John, N.B.	1,000 00
219	Amount required to recoup, in part, the large expenditure for Immigration in 1874-75, made by the Government of New Brunswick	10,000 00

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: In 1872 an arrangement was made between the several Provinces and the Dominion that \$70,000 should be appropriated for the encouragement of emigration. New Brunswick did a great deal and spent large sums of money subsequently in bringing out emigrants. They had not the advantages afforded by the Allan steamers. The grant was, however, withdrawn; but the New Brunswick Government, having spent from \$65,000 to \$70,000 in the promotion of emigration, their claim has been fully and carefully considered by this Government, and we decided to ask Parliament to appropriate \$10,000, to which sum they would have been entitled had the arrangement been carried out and had the grant not been withdrawn. They expended the large sum of money to which I have referred on the faith of the arrangement for appropriating the sum of \$70,000 to the Provinces for emigration purposes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: It was not a yearly vote. There was an obligation. It was simply a vote for the one year, and might not be given another year. It was not given to the other Provinces, and why should it be given to that Province? If there was any obligation to one there was an obligation to all. There is no equitable or legal right whatever entitling them to this money.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The other Provinces occupy a different position. The hon. gentleman says it was not a Statutory engagement. I recollect that the hon. gentleman opposite objected to the vote; and, therefore, when a change of Government took place they did not bring down the vote again; but

the Government of New Brunswick having no notice of the fact that this Government did not intend to renew the vote made their engagements as if it would be passed. It was not so with Nova Scotia.

MR. MACKENZIE: What evidence have we of that.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: We have enquired into it. I doubt if Nova Scotia expended much of the amount she received from the Dominion Government. If New Brunswick had been in the position of the other Province, and had not expended any more than she received, she would not have had any just claim; but having spent such a large amount beyond, she is in an exceptional position, and so the Government considered.

MR. ANGLIN: New Brunswick did spend a very large sum that year; very large in proportion to the population of the Province, and very large in proportion to the emigrants brought in. They indulged in great extravagance in their expenditure in bringing emigrants, chiefly from Scotland; there were also some Danes and some English, but care was taken not to bring out any Irishmen. There was feasting on board the steamboats, the emigrants were received by enthusiastic crowds, and a grand demonstration was made all along the route from St. John to their settlement. Houses were built and finished for them, and land cleared. Within a year these industrious Scotch settlers—the very cream of Europe, as Scotch settlers must be—were a great stress, and had to be again assisted. They are, no doubt, a very good class of settlers, and are now doing well, but the expenditure was very much larger than it should have been. There is no doubt that the Government of New Brunswick relied upon what it regarded as the implied, if not the express, promise of the Dominion Government, whose policy it was for some years to aid the various Provinces in the promotion of emigration. It was, no doubt, because they believed that the aid of the Dominion would be continued, that the Provincial Government expended such a large sum, and they have some show of right to claim one year's allowance additional. I always thought this a claim of some merit.

MR. DOMVILLE said if New Bruns-

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

wick was getting her rights, the hon. member for Gloucester should not find fault.

Vote agreed to.

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS.

220 Paris Exhibition (Revote)..... \$25,000

MITITIA.

Special.

221 Amount required for Special Service in the North-West Territories in connection with the organisation of Militia for the protection of settlers..... \$4,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. BOWELL said this amount was expended in the organisation of companies for the protection of settlers at a time when an Indian outbreak was expected.

Vote agreed to.

222 Amount required to provide for the expenditure in converting smooth-bore ordnance into 64-pounder Palliser guns, and the manufacture of two 7-inch 8½-ton guns and carriages..... \$16,500

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said if the Government were undertaking to manufacture eight and a-half ton guns here, they were undertaking something for which the ordinary resources of the foundries of the country were hardly likely to be adequate. Was there not some little error in the statement?

MR. BOWELL said the expense of converting the smooth-bore ordnance into sixty-four pounder "Pallisers" was \$650 a gun. The charge in England for doing the same work is \$850. Mr. Gilbert, who had undertaken the work, had also contracted for the two eight and a-half ton guns, which were to cost \$6,000 each.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: What would the cost be to get the same class of guns from the Royal Arsenal?

MR. BOWELL: I cannot tell at this moment.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said he would like to have that information on Concurrence. It was a somewhat doubtful expedient to attempt to cast large pieces of ordnance in this haphazard way. The casting of guns of this size and weight was a special thing in itself. If there were any imperfections in the guns serious injury might result to the parties using them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: They will be fully tested by Colonel Strange.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I doubt very much whether it is possible to manufacture one or two pieces of ordnance of that kind as reasonably as we could purchase them.

MR. BOWELL: This is guaranteed as good an article as we could purchase.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: At the same price?

MR. BOWELL: I do not say that. The guns are to be thoroughly tested before accepted.

MR. CASEY: Is there any idea of making two or three guns every year?

MR. BOWELL: No.

MR. ANGLIN: Where are these guns to be placed? I dare say they are Garrison Artillery. Are any more required to carry out the intentions of the Government?

MR. BOWELL: I will ascertain.

Vote agreed to.

223 Amount required to provide for the expenditure for transportation in the exchange of "A" and "B" Batteries, Schools of Gunnery, between Kingston and Quebec..... \$2,000

Ordinary.

224 Drill Instruction — Supplement to vote under this head for current year..... 2,520

225 Contingencies — To provide for the payment of a gratuity to Gunner Dempster, of the Toronto Field Battery, for injury sustained at annual drill in 1879-80, by the premature discharge of a gun..... 400

RAILWAYS AND CANALS CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

Railways.

226 { Intercolonial Railway—Amount required for extension into Halifax..... 5,500
 Additional amount required on Construction Account..... 29,000
 Amount required for rolling-stock, Rivière du Loup Branch..... 159,100
 227 Prince Edward Island Railway—Amount required for extension to Souris Breakwater..... 2,000
 Canadian Pacific Railway—Amount required for Pembina Branch..... 25,000
 228 { Amount required for rolling-stock..... 120,000
 Amount required for surveys.... 75,000

RAILWAYS AND CANALS CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Railways.

229 Miscellaneous—Amount required for surveys inspections..... 2,000

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

231 Parliament Buildings—To cover cost of damage by fire..... 12,000

MR. MACKENZIE: For what reason was Mr. Gilmour, the engineer of these buildings, dismissed?

MR. LANGEVIN: I cannot answer that question. He was dismissed before I came back from England.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think this dismissal was one of the most wanton scandals that ever took place. I am quite certain there can be no possible cause alleged for it except a political one. One of the immediate results of the dismissal of this careful, competent officer was the fire in these buildings, through the negligence of others. He was recommended from the Grand Trunk Workshops as an exceedingly careful man, of steady habits. Dismissed without the slightest cause, he was idle for months; and the carelessness of those in charge of these buildings, causing the fire has occasioned the expenditure of these \$12,000.

MR. LANGEVIN: I have no doubt there was a cause for his dismissal. I will procure the information on the subject.

MR. BLAKE: I have been told that the amount of the damage by the fire was by no means so large as \$12,000, but that opportunity was taken of the circumstance to decorate the Chamber, which accounts for a large portion of this item.

MR. LANGEVIN: The damage did not amount to \$12,000, but when a portion of the Chamber is damaged by fire, you have to renew the decorations in other portions, in order to have the whole uniform in appearance and character. In this case the water from the roof destroyed a portion of the decorations. We thought it best to do the whole work properly and avoid patch-work, that would entail a large expense afterwards. I took that opportunity to improve the ventilation of this House, which cost a great deal of expenditure. We had also to renew a large portion of the glass in the roof. Painting and

decoration cost \$4,000; carpets, upholstering, etc., \$4,000; for wire-guards to protect the glass, etc., \$2,400.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: The hon. gentleman has succeeded so far that the air in this Chamber is purer than formerly; but I am sorry to tell him that there has been, all through the Session, an extremely disagreeable draught in the quarter where we of the Opposition sit. It would be better to have less draught in cold weather.

MR. LANGEVIN said that during the coming Recess efforts would be made to remedy the defects in the ventilation of the House.

232	Amount required for improved ventilation.....	\$4,200 00
223	Amount required to cover cost of Telephonic Service, Parliament and Departmental Buildings.....	2,500 00

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

New Brunswick.

234	Dorchester Penitentiary—Additional amount required.....	31,500 00
	St. John Custom-house—Additional amount required.....	60,000 00
	Fredericton Post Office—Additional amount required.....	6,000 00

Quebec.

235	Quebec and Lévis Fortifications including Dufferin Improvements—Additional sum required.....	10,000 00
	Montreal Examining Warehouse—Unexpended balance of appropriation of 1878-79 carried forward by special warrant.....	3,656 64
	St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary—For additions, alterations and repairs.....	7,700 00

Ontario.

236	Ottawa—Amount required for Geological Museum, including purchase of building.....	30,000 00
	Ottawa Drill Shed—To pay Ottawa Gas Company, and balance due to contractor.....	879 49
	Kingston Penitentiary—Additional amount required, including unexpended balance of appropriation of 1878-79.....	7,000 00
	Kingston Military School—Balance of appropriation for 1878-79 unexpended on 30th September, 1879, and carried forward by special warrant.....	3,107 11

In reply to **MR. MACKENZIE**, **SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD** said that when the Government made up their minds to carry out the Act passed two years ago, they looked for a proper place for the Geological Museum. Two places were offered them: the Clarendon Hotel and the Victoria Hotel. Mr. Selwyn came up and examined both places. He reported against the Victoria Hotel as being neither strong enough nor large enough; the price asked for this building was \$30,000. The Clarendon Hotel was offered for \$20,000, and that was the price the Government paid for it. He understood it cost the proprietor \$50,000, and it had been valued to a loan society at a much higher price than the Government paid for it. The report of the Director was that the building was sufficiently adapted for the purpose. The Government felt that, if they desired hereafter to build a handsome Museum, they could easily dispose of this building at a very considerable gain.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought the Clarendon Hotel was not as valuable as the hon. gentleman had represented. A far better building had been sold in this city, last year, under mortgage for \$12,500. He considered the Clarendon Hotel was, in some respects, a miserable building, and totally unadapted for the purpose of a museum. The ceilings were too low and the building was badly lighted. He also considered the situation of the building was a very unfavourable one.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the building was a substantially built structure, and the fact that Mr. Selwyn had reported favourably upon it was a sufficient answer to the objections that had been made to it.

*Vote agreed to.**Manitoba.*

237	Manitoba Penitentiary—To pay for lumber to build a temporary fence.....	\$2,000
-----	---	---------

British Columbia.

238	Victoria (B.C.) Penitentiary—Amount of award of Official Arbitrators in favour of Kinsman and Styles.....	5,632
-----	---	-------

Public Buildings Generally.

239	Additional amount required for salaries and travelling expenses of Staff, etc.....	5,000
-----	--	-------

MR. LANGEVIN.

Rents, Repairs, etc.

240 Rents, Repairs, Furniture, Heating, etc.—Additional amount required.....	45,000	
241 Gas, Public Buildings, Ottawa—Additional amount required....	5,000	
242 Fuel and Light, Rideau Hall—Additional amount required...	3,000	
HARBOURS AND RIVERS.		
<i>Nova Scotia.</i>		
243 West Arichat, Richmond Co.—Amount required to pay salary of Inspector of Works	500	
<i>New Brunswick.</i>		
244 {	Oreomcto River—Amount required to pay G. H. Miles for removal of obstructions....	100
	Richibucto Harbour—Amount required for protection of beach	800
<i>Dredging.</i>		
245 Maritime Provinces—Amount required for special repairs to Dredge Vessels.....	4,000	
<i>Miscellaneous.</i>		
246 Surveys and Inspections—additional amount required.....	15,000	
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.		
247 Amount required in connection with the removal of the wrecked barque <i>Emigrant</i> from Charlottetown, P.E.I., harbour.....	325	
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE.		
248 Amount required for Wharf and Fog-Alarm building, at Head harbour, New Brunswick....	5,000	
249 Amount required to provide for unforseen repairs to Lighthouses in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Miramichi Bay, damaged by the storms in October, 1879.....	3,000	
FISHERIES.		
250 Amount required to provide for protection of the Fisheries in the Gulf and Lower St. Lawrence..	3,000	
MARINE HOSPITALS.		
251 Amount required to provide for the purchase of land and building, at Alberton, P.E.I., to be used as a Marine Hospital....	1,200	
MISCELLANEOUS.		
260 To pay Mr. E. Miall a further sum in recognition of his services in connection with the Halifax Fishery Commission...	500	

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CABT-WRIGHT,

MR. BABY said that Mr. Miall was in attendance during the whole time the Fishery Commission sat. He (Mr. Baby) had seen the papers in relation to the claim; and although Mr. Miall received his salary and his expenses, it was stated

by Sir Alexander Galt that Mr. Miall was a most efficient officer in connection with this Fishery Award, and that he prepared all the necessary papers, tables, etc.

MR. MACKENZIE: I object entirely to this vote. Mr. Miall had a salary, and got his expenses paid down besides a thousand dollars. There is no reason for this. Why should the Government take up this claim after the late Government had dealt with it? Why should our decision be over-ridden in this way? We did not believe he should be paid any more. Every salaried officer is bound to go wherever he is required.

MR. BURPEE: The statements were prepared under the direction of the Customs Department. The officers were working there a long time. The only money paid was about \$140. All the tables and the valuable information and statistics were given in that Department; and I think to pay this claim is entirely out of place.

MR. MACKENZIE: I move that this vote be struck out.

Motion, in amendment, *negatived* on a division.

Vote agreed to.

262 To pay Mr. Justice Armour in full for professional services rendered by him in connection with the northern and western boundary of Ontario..... \$2,000

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought this a very large sum to be paid for a verbal opinion. This gentleman was promoted to the Bench before the actual work was done.

MR. BABY said Mr. Justice Armour was retained, and, although he was promoted to the Bench before the final hearing before the Arbitrators, he was engaged on the case and spent some time in getting it ready. He had put in a claim for \$5,000. It must be presumed that he had applied his time and talents from the time he got his brief, so as to be ready for the investigation. He sent in a claim of \$5,000, and the hon. the Minister of Justice thought \$2,000 would be sufficient.

MR. BLAKE said that Mr. Justice Armour did devote considerable time to the preparation of his case. He had written him (Mr. Blake) from time to time for books, which were forwarded to his residence at Cobcurg; and was often

consulting him on the Canadian and English archives in reference to the investigation.

Vote agreed to.

- 263 To recoup Mr. Blair Botsford, \$105, Warden, and Mr. J. B. Foster, \$66, Deputy Warden of Dorchester Penitentiary, expenses incurred in visiting the Penitentiary at Kingston..... \$171
- 264 To cover amount of grant for relief of distress in Ireland....\$100,000

MR. ANGLIN: Does the hon. the First Minister know how that money has been expended. There was a rumour that it had been applied to the purchase of fishing nets, etc., in certain districts, whereas we thought the money was intended for the purpose of providing food for the famishing people.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the money was transmitted to the Colonial Minister, who would have a better opportunity of knowing, than we possibly could, the best mode of applying it. He was told that the money was for the immediate relief of the sufferers, and he was also told, in consequence of a remark made by the hon. gentleman, that it should be applied in such a way as not to affect the prejudices of any of the persons relieved. We were asked whether we desired money to go to the Mansion House or the Duchess of Marlborough's fund. We answered that we desired to leave the matter very much to the discretion of the Minister, and that we would be quite satisfied if it was divided between those two funds. The answer we got from the Colonial Secretary was that a sub-Committee had been appointed by the managers of those two funds for the purpose of applying this money to the purpose for which it was voted. That seemed to be the best way of appropriating it when the two rival funds, if I may use the term, combined to distribute the money. We have not got a return yet, and we do not know how it has been applied, but that was the mode of distribution.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Ten minutes after

Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 30th April, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Edward Holton, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Chateauguay.

EDWARD HOLTON, Esquire, Member to represent the Electoral District of Chateauguay, having previously taken the Oath, according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took his seat in the House.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

The following Bill was, with leave of the House, *withdrawn* :—

Bill (No. 55) To amend the Act 42 Vic., cap. 72, intituled, An Act respecting the Beaver and Toronto Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Ordered, That the fees paid on the said Bill be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

CANADIAN WATERS NAVIGATION BILL.

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

FIRST READING.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed Resolution respecting the navigation of Canadian waters, and reported the said Resolution.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.), in introducing a Bill (No. 121) To make better provision respecting the navigation of Canadian waters, said: This Bill is simply a copy of the rules in force in England. It is necessary that the rules should be uniform, in order to avoid the possibility of any difficulty arising.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: The rules and regulations having been changed in England, it becomes necessary to adopt the same rules and regulations in this country. It is necessary, therefore, to repeal the rules and regulations upon the Statute-book. Therefore, I quite approve of this measure. I would suggest to the hon. Minister the desirability of inserting a clause giving the Governor in Council power to adopt the rules and regulations under the Act of 1874, whenever any

change takes place, as it would simplify matters very much.

MR. BLAKE said that after the explanations given, the Bill was entirely unobjectionable. But he thought that legislation of this sort should not be introduced at this stage of the Session, because it did not give proper time for consideration. Several Bills had been thus brought down by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and this certainly ought to be the last.

Bill read the first time.

CANADA CENTRAL RAILWAY AGREEMENT RATIFICATION BILL.

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley).

FIRST READING.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY, in moving for a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of the agreement entered into with Her Majesty by the Canada Central Railway Company, on 3rd October, A.D. 1879, said: It is scarcely necessary to enter at length into any statement of this matter, as it is fully set forth in the Resolutions; but I may briefly state or read the following:—

“That by an Order of His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, dated the 18th day of April, 1878, passed under the authority of the Act 37 Vic., 1874, cap. 14, intitled an Act to provide for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and ratified by a Resolution of the House of Commons of Canada on the 7th day of May, 1878, it is in effect provided, that the Canada Central Railway Company are to be entitled to receive from the Government of Canada a subsidy or bonus of \$12,000 per mile, upon the extension of their line westwards to such point as may be selected by the Government as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, near Lake Nipissing, such subsidy to be payable upon the terms and in the manner set out in such Order in Council; and by such Order it is further provided that the Company are to have the option of substituting the payment by the Government of the interest, or part of the interest, on bonds of the Company running over such terms of years as might be approved by the Governor in Council in lieu of the mileage subsidy referred to.

“That the Company elected to avail themselves of such option, and the Government assumed the payment of the interest (but only until the maturity of the principal), or an issue of bonds made by the Company, amounting in all to £500,000 sterling, payable in twenty years from the 1st day of September, A.D. 1879, with interest half-yearly, at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum.

“That the Company, upon the Government so assuming the payment of such interest,

entered into the following agreement with Her Majesty.”

And then follows the agreement. I intend to move the following Resolution:—

“That it is expedient to ratify and confirm the assumption by the Government of the payment of the said interest, and to approve of and confirm the said Agreement.

“That the total interest on the said issue of bonds so assumed by the Government, slightly exceeds the amount of interest which can be provided for out of the said cash subsidy of \$12,000 per mile.

“That so soon as the Government shall have returned to the Company, out of the sum of \$1,527,085.50 so deposited, as above mentioned, a sum equal to the said bonus of \$12,000 per mile, if paid as provided for in the said Order in Council of 18th April, A.D. 1878, the balance of such deposit shall be appropriated and used for the purpose of meeting the interest on the said bonds.”

The object is to make legal this arrangement, the amount guaranteed being in excess of that authorised by previous legislation. That is the object of these Resolutions and the Bill to be based on them.

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Instead of \$12,000 a mile, it was suggested that that guarantee should be given in some form as the work progressed, because difficulties arose and loans would be put on the market at different times which might affect Canadian securities. Then the question of giving a guarantee for the whole work, and what it should be, came up. By the arrangement made they have deposited with the Government the whole amount, which was sufficient to pay the interest on the sum for twenty years, as a security. We have the money in our hands now, and if the work was not completed during next year, or if it was never completed, we still have the money sufficient to pay the interest for that period. As the work progresses, the company will be entitled to have this money released from time to time.

MR. BLAKE: Has the Canada Central Railway Company paid any money to the Government in this regard?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes; ample to pay the interest for twenty years.

MR. BLAKE: If the company has paid this money in, they should be entitled to receive from the Government the

residue of the subsidy as the work progresses, because receiving that subsidy there still remains, of its own funds, the price of the guarantee. But they will not be entitled to receive the sum which they have deposited, because that is only the price of the payment given of the interest on the bonds. If that be the state of the case, there remains nothing but the general question of policy in connection with this matter.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That is exactly the state of the case.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Resolutions.

(In the Committee.)

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 122) To ratify and confirm a certain agreement therein mentioned between the Government of Canada and the Canada Central Railway Company.

Bill read the first time.

CANADA GUARANTEE COMPANY.

EXPLANATION.

MR. ROCHESTER: In March last, in moving a Resolution for copies of papers connected with the Canada Guarantee Company, I made the remark that it would appear from the course pursued by the manager of that company that "they made it a point to contest almost all claims made against them." I considered myself, at that time, perfectly justified in making that remark from reports and information received from different quarters. Since that time I have received the annual report, sworn to, of the company, which shows altogether a different state of things, namely, that the proportion of claims paid to claims made from the commencement to date is 92 per cent. I, therefore, think it but just to make this explanation in regard to that company.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply considered.

Resolutions 22 to 26 and 31 to 52 (April 2) read the second time and agreed to.

MR. BLAKE.

On Resolution 53 (April 12), To meet expenses in connection with the care, collection and collation of public archives, \$5,000,

MR. MILLS enquired, Why the valuable manuscripts obtained at the British Museum were kept in the Department of Agriculture. It would be much more convenient if they were kept in the Library, where they would be accessible.

MR. POPE (Compton) said they were kept in the Department of Agriculture because there was no room for them in the Library. In the Department they were kept quite safe in a fire-proof vault.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Will you take it into consideration?

MR. POPE: Yes.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 54 and 55 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 56, To meet expenses in connection with the Census, \$200,000,

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: The hon. the Minister of Agriculture will recollect that when this item was under discussion in Committee, I suggested that, in taking the next Census, care should be taken to ascertain the classes of houses inhabited by the people, and also the number of rooms in each. That information can be obtained with very little trouble, when the number of inmates of each house is being ascertained. The hon. gentleman promised to consider the matter and give me an answer on Concurrence.

MR. POPE (Compton): I have thought of the matter, and believe it would be difficult to report all the rooms, and it would materially extend our Census Returns which, in 1870, were larger, in proportion, than those of any other country. But I will consider the subject further, and, if I can see my way clear to it, will adopt the suggestion.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Well, I will limit the suggestion and ask that we may have stated simply whether the houses are brick, stone or wood, and of how many stories; that would give a good deal of interesting information.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: There might be objections to certain kinds of enquiries, and difficulty in getting answers.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I will explain my reason for the sugges-

tion. We have had no opportunity for many years of gaining the progress of the people in the important item of the quality of their houses, and man have none but this. The information I seek could be obtained with little trouble to the enumerators who have to visit every house. All he need do is ask the quality of the house, and if that cannot be given the number of the rooms—to ascertain simply to what class the building belongs.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 57, Immigration and Quarantine, \$193,016,

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. the Minister of Agriculture promised to state who those agents in Europe are, to whom these \$5,200 are to be paid.

MR. POPE (Compton): Mr. Dyke is one, and there are Mr. Foy and Mr. Graham, and there is to be one at Dublin.

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE,

MR. POPE: The salary of the German Agent, \$500, is not included in this, but is in another item.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: It would be convenient if we had given us, in the next Estimates, details showing the establishment of the Clerks and Messengers in London, as is the case with all the comparatively small establishments—to show how the \$7,000 is distributed.

MR. POPE: Mr. Annand gets a salary of \$4,000.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Does that salary come out of the item?

MR. POPE: Perhaps not; I am not certain. Mr. Dore gets \$2,500; Mr. Dickson \$800; and another employé \$1,000—the staff is small.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 59 and 60 read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 63 to 75, and 104 to 125 (April 13); read the second time and agreed to.

Resolution 81 (April 20) read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 76 to 80, and 126 to 148 (April 22), read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 149, completion and construction of Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, \$40,000,

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he was prepared to submit the List of Lighthouses included in this vote.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said the following were the Lighthouses referred to in the vote:—

Ontario.

1 Lighthouse at Strawberry Island, north channel, River St. Mary, Algoma District.....	\$1,500
2 Lighthouse at Port Stanley, County of Middlesex.....	1,000
3 On account of a Peir and Light at Colchester Reef, Lake Erie, County of Essex.....	5,000

Quebec.

4 Lighthouse and Fog Alarm at Cape Bauld, entrance Straits of Belleisle.....	5,000
5 Lighthouse at St. Peter's Island or Flat Rock, County of Gaspé....	1,500
6 Two small Lights at Saguenay River, Chicoutimi County.....	300
7 Light on Government Wharf, Rivière du Loup, Temiscouata..	600

New Brunswick.

8 Two Beacon Lights at Buctouche, Kent County.....	800
9 Automatic Buoy and fittings at Split Rock, County of St. John	2,700
10 Beacon Light on wharf at Pokesudie, Caraquet, County of Gloucester.....	700
11 Small Beacon Light at Fox Island, Miramichi.....	150
12 Lighthouse at Hay Island, entrance of Neguac Gully, Miramichi Bay, Northumberland County..	400

Nova Scotia.

13 Lighthouse at Cranberry Island, Guysboro' County.....	4,000
14 Fog alarm at Scatterie Island, Cape Breton County.....	3,000
15 Lighthouse at St. Ann's, Victoria County, Cape Breton.....	1,000
16 Lighthouse at Big Island, Merigomish, Pictou County.....	2,000
17 Lighthouse at Jeddore Reck, Halifax County.....	4,000
18 Automatic Buoy at Canso, Guysboro' County, to replace Bell Buoy to be removed to Big Rock, Halifax County.....	2,700

Prince Edward Island.

19 Lighthouse at Cape Bear, King's County.....	2,000
20 Lighthouse at Savage Harbour, King's County.....	800

Balance required for land, &c.

39,150
850
<hr/> \$40,000

Lighthouse at Sands Head, Fraser River, British Columbia, to replace Light-ship, \$14,000 (provided for separately in Estimates).

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT suggested that the details of the items should be printed, and appear long with the Estimates.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 150 to 152 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 153, grant for Meteorological Observatories, including instruments and cost of telegraphing weather warnings, \$37,000,

MR. MILLS asked whether or not steps had been taken to have Meteorological Observatories in the North-West Territories, in order to furnish such information as, in conjunction with the American Observatories, would enable us to have the course of storms with more accuracy. He would like to know if there were any alterations.

MR. BABY said there were no alterations. The matter was under consideration.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 154 to 159 read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 160 and 161 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 162, Indians, Ontario and Quebec, \$24,800,

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT called attention to the fact that these items were allowed under protest; because the Report of the Department of Interior had not been furnished. He understood that Report was to be furnished to-day, so that an opportunity might be had of discussing the Indian items.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said there were large votes in the Supplementary Estimates in addition to the Indian items passed last night.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT thought these items had better be postponed.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 163 to 165, and 195 to 197 read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 90 to 93 (April 27) read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 94, St. Anne's Lock and Canal, \$150,000,

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said \$180,345 was required to complete this work, over and above this vote.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does that embrace deepening the channel above the lock?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 95 to 103, 198 and 199 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 200, Collection of Slide and Boom dues, \$20,745,

MR. WHITE: I observe that a large amount of slide and boom dues, about \$109,000, remains uncollected. I would like to know if there is any security for their payment, or if any steps are being taken to collect them.

MR. BABY: These arrears have been running on from year to year—indeed they have been accumulating for the last fifteen years. Every effort is being made to collect those dues, and we think that about one-fourth of the total amount will be secured.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 201 to 204, 179 to 185, and 178, read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 1 and 3 to 21 (April 28) read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 186, Collection of Revenues—Customs, \$724,565,

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Did the hon. the Minister of Customs give us the names of the members of the Board of Experts, and their salaries? If not, I should like that information.

MR. BOWELL: The Board consists of Messrs. Fraser and Sinclair, who receive \$1,800 a year each, and Mr. Belford, as Secretary, in the place of Mr. Young, whose salary is \$1,600.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Are there not several departments?

MR. BOWELL: Yes; Mr. Fraser has dry goods in charge and acts also for the hardware department, and Mr. Sinclair has groceries generally.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 187 and 188, read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 189, Salaries of Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors of Weights and Measures, \$40,800,

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: When this item was before the House recently, I called attention to the fact that certain of those officers against whom no complaint had been made, but whose offices had been abolished, had petitioned for some remuneration. The hon. the First Minister stated that, besides returning them the money actually paid into the Superannuation Fund, the Government would consider whether a certain number of months' gratuity could not be given those men who had been free from blame in the discharge of their duties. Has that question been considered and any decision arrived at?

MR. BABY: The question has not been considered yet, but the reimbursement of the parties for the payments to the Superannuation Fund has, and an item was put in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose, which passed last night.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Will the hon. Minister be kind enough to have this matter considered, and tell us by Monday or Tuesday the decision of the Government.

MR. BABY: I will do the best possible to bring the matter forward for examination.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 190 to 194 and 205 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 206, Surveys of Dominion Lands, chargeable to Capital, \$300,000,

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I desire to call the attention of the hon. the First Minister to this item chargeable to Capital, in order that he may state, formally, the decision of the Government as to the mode of crediting the sums to be received for those lands in future. Up to the present time the sums received for lands have gone to the ordinary Income, and it is obviously improper and inexpedient that that practice should be continued if the cost of the Surveys be charged to Capital Account.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is quite correct. I think it is quite clear that under the terms of the Resolutions adopted last Session, on the 13th May, by which 100,000,000 acres were appropriated to defray the cost of the Pacific Railway, there must be a separate account of the sale of those

lands kept, and the proceeds exclusively appropriated to the payment of its construction. In the Resolutions it was proposed that those lands should be invested in two Commissioners to be appointed one by England and the other by Canada. That was done in the hope of our obtaining the cooperation of the British Government in the construction of the Pacific Railway. The lands were to be sold at not less than \$2 an acre, the proceeds to be invested in securities for the exclusive purpose of defraying the cost of the Railway. The cooperation of England has not yet been secured; but, under the new régime, we may be more successful in England. Until Her Majesty's Government choose to cooperate with us in the construction of this Railway, we shall have no right, nor can we ask it, to appoint a Commissioner. There would be no reason for one. The Canadian Government meantime will appoint a Trustee. I consider that every sale of those lands in the North-West, from the time of the adoption of the Resolutions, should be credited to that account, and every expenditure, in the way of surveys and for land management, charged against those sales, so that the net product should be exclusively devoted to the payment of the cost of the construction of the Railway. I have given notice, to-day, of a Resolution for the purpose of amending the Resolutions of last Session in that regard, and in another particular. Last year's Resolutions fixed the minimum price at \$2 an acre. But the Government has thought proper to propose an amendment—to make a graduated scale of prices according to the proximity or remoteness of the land from the Railway, the prices ranging from \$5 to \$1 an acre. In one sense, the land sold at \$1 an acre does not come within the spirit of the Resolutions of May last; because it was then contemplated that twenty miles on each side of the Railway should be exclusively withdrawn from homesteading and free settlement, to be sold for the construction of the Railway. The Government thought this change desirable, and I believe the sentiment of hon. gentlemen opposite, also, was against the principle of locking up the whole of the land within twenty miles on each side of the Railway. I shall move, on Monday, a Resolution,

providing among other things that the minimum price shall be \$1 instead of \$2.

MR. ANGLIN: Perhaps, by Monday, the hon. the First Minister will produce a Return I moved for six weeks ago, with regard to the receipts from the sale of the lands in the North-West.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I thought it was already produced.

MR. ANGLIN: No. A Return asking for the amount of money received for those lands, and another asking for the amount of land sold last year, and the quantity taken up by individuals, have been brought down, though moved for long after the Return I desire.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think I gave the House a statement of the quantity of land sold, and the amount received, and amount of scrip redeemed, in my remarks in answer to Mr. Charlton's motion.

MR. BLAKE: Of course it is obviously necessary that, as those lands are to form a fund for the construction of the Railway, and as we are now adopting the principle of not charging the expenditure to Income, we should cause the expenditure to be made out of the proceeds of the lands. There may be some difficulty in adjusting the account in the way it is voted—for Dominion Lands, Capital Account; the fund will be a trust fund in connection with the Pacific Railway. But it would be well to adopt such an arrangement as may be made very clear in the future; first of all, that an item which formerly appeared in an expenditure on Revenue account, is now transferred to Capital; and, second, that it is paid from time to time out of the proceeds of the lands. I do not know whether the First Minister intends to do it, but he gave notice of a Resolution to be substituted for those of last year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Not for them all, but for the 7th, one of the series.

MR. BLAKE: I am very glad to hear that statement, but shall be very sorry to see those glowing periods with regard to the lands obliterated from our Journals. I presume those parts of the Resolutions which refer to the constitution of the Commission are to be obliterated for the purpose?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. BLAKE: Then the proposals as

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

to the precise mode of dealing with the lands, and the other Resolutions, shall stand as they are?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE: I understood the Premier's policy was to provide in the Act that the lands should be charged with the expenditure on the surveys and other outlays, and the balance applied to Railway purposes. In that case, I presume he intends to apply the expenditure already incurred on surveys. In order to have the account correct it must cover all the lands which have been devoted to Railway purposes. That is not mentioned in the Resolution, nor does the hon gentleman say it in his remarks.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: After the vote took place on the 13th of May last, I said that all these lands, called Railway lands, were set aside for a special purpose, and would be carried to Capital Account, and from that time that all the expenditure of management would be strictly limited to Manitoba and the North-West.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: What has been sold in belts A, B, C, D and E in Manitoba since the 1st of July last goes to Capital Account.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Certainly.

MR. MILLS: In what way does the hon. gentleman propose to carry on these surveys?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is a matter of very considerable importance to get good men to do that work, and it is not a thing you can well offer to competition among all the parties who happen to hold licenses. Many men who hold licenses as surveyors might be very good men to do chores at home but cannot undertake work of that kind. We are asking for tenders from good surveyors, so as to get an idea of what the work can be done for. I believe it can be done for considerably under four cents an acre. Besides that, in the Bill I have before the House, I propose to introduce a clause by which we can introduce the use of the solar compass instead of the more scientific, but more expensive mode of survey now in use. Our present system of survey is perfect, from a scientific point of view, but it is an enormously expensive one, compared with the one adopted in the United States. There is no doubt

that the scientific mode prevents future disputes and trouble in rectifying defective surveys. But it is of so much consequence that the country should be surveyed at once, and inexpensively, it will be well, to a limited extent, that the survey should be carried out as before.

MR. MILLS: No doubt our surveys are somewhat more difficult than those of the United States, on account of our higher latitude and the more rapidly converging meridian lines. But I do not think the hon. gentleman will find, however rapidly the country may be settled, that it is desirable to push the surveys much in advance of settlement. Where that is done the lines become obliterated, the stakes disappear, and the survey has to be done over again. In 1873 the surveys were pushed forward too rapidly, and the result was that it is now wholly impossible to determine where the boundary line between the different sections is; and I have no doubt that if the surveys be pushed in advance of settlement for a few years, the same difficulty will again occur. The hon. gentleman has said that it is desirable to obtain the best men. I would like to see the list of those who have been in the service of the hon. gentleman for the past year. During the whole period of the late Administration a number of the hon. gentleman's political friends were employed on the staff of surveyors, in fact, I think they were in a majority. The hon. gentleman had, under his former Government, men employed in the survey of that country who were recommended to him on account of their political inclinations rather than their scientific attainments. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I say it is an extraordinary thing that in the list of surveyors employed when he was in office, there was not a single individual opposed to him politically. Does he mean to say that those who have passed creditable examinations, because they hold opposite political opinions, are unfit for the public service? I would like to know how many of those who are not in political accord with the hon. gentleman have been retained on the staff. Is Mr. Sinclair retained? Is Mr. Stewart retained? I am inclined to think there is not one of them retained.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not know; I never heard of them.

MR. MILLS: I think the hon. gentleman should bring down a list of those persons whom he has employed. I believe the rule is a sound one that if a surveyor is found to be incompetent, and has put the Department to unnecessary expense, he should not be employed again, no matter what his politics; but I also think a surveyor, who is found to be incompetent, ought not to be refused employment in the public service, simply because he may not belong to the political party of the Administration. Mr. Reed, who was employed during the greater portion of our Administration, and Messrs. Paton and Newton, who were employed four years out of five, all these we knew to be politically opposed to us, but when there was anything to do they were employed. I have received some communications from surveyors who have not been employed, and their impression is that it is because they are not of the political party of the hon. gentleman.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. White, North Benfrew.)

Bill (No. 32) Respecting the Montreal Assurance Company.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

Bill (No. 111) To provide for the winding-up of La Banque Ville Marie.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

MONTREAL TELEGRAPH COMPANY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 65.]

SENATE AMENDMENT DISAGREED TO.

Order for consideration of Senate amendments read.

MR. BLAKE: These amendments are of an important nature, and alter the character of the Bill very seriously. The Senate have reinserted the provisions deliberately struck out by the Standing Committee, to which the Bill was referred.

MR. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier): If this Bill is referred back to the Railway Committee, it will undoubtedly be killed.

The amendment is a very simple one, and can properly be considered in Committee of the Whole.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman must move to disagree with the amendment of the Senate, or the Bill must be recommitted.

MR. GAULT moved that the House disagree to the amendment inserting Clause A, giving power to the company to lease their line or any part thereof.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply further considered.

On Resolution 207, Dominion Lands, Outside Service, Land Agencies in Manitoba, and North-West Territories, \$32,000; extra Clerks at Head Office, Ottawa, maps, printing, advertising, etc., \$14,600,

MR. MILLS asked why Mr. Jaffrey was transferred from the Land Agency on the Saskatchewan to the office at Winnipeg.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY promised to take a note of that, and obtain the information from the hon. the leader of the Government, who was not at present in his seat.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolution 208 read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 209 to 221 (April 29), read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 222, Converting Smooth-bore Ordnance into 64-Pounder Palliser Guns, and the manufacture of two 7-inch 8½-ton guns and carriages, \$16,500,

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. MASSON: The 7-inch 8½-ton guns are not very large pieces of ordnance, and can be manufactured very easily in Canada, at a less cost and better than those manufactured at Woolwich. I have enquired as to the place where these two guns are to be placed, and I am advised that they should be placed at St. John, on the Island, or Partridge Island, I think; and, probably, two or three will be placed at Pictou, but it will be necessary really to have heavier ordnance there. It is a very important port. We can get as good a gun made here for \$650 as in England for \$860. As to risk to life the test has been successfully tried in Montreal. The greatest precautions

MR. GIROUARD.

are being taken with the Gilbert gun. I was particular that it should succeed. After going through a thorough test, to the satisfaction of the Artillery officers and men, I think the hon. gentleman can rest assured that the thing will be a complete success.

In reply to Mr. CASEY,

MR. MASSON said the 7½-in. guns cost \$4,800, including 100 rounds of ammunition, shot and shell; and he thought we could get them here for \$3,750, including the 100 rounds of ammunition. Mr. Gilbert had not been contracted with for the ammunition; but shot and shell could be manufactured in Canada at the same price as in England.

MR. ANGLIN thought larger ordnance was required for St. John; they ought to be of the heaviest. If occasion arose to provide for the defence of our coasts St. John would be absolutely exposed.

MR. MASSON was happy to see that the hon. gentleman approved of the vote.

MR. ANGLIN said heavier ordnance would be necessary if occasion arose for defence.

MR. MASSON said the Minister of Militia was obliged to be guided by the opinions of officers supposed to know more than the hon. gentleman did. The Inspector of Artillery thought these guns would be sufficient, not against an iron-clad, but against any ship or privateer that might escape Her Majesty's cruisers. We should trust upon the Imperial Navy in every emergency; but in case of the escape from ships of Her Majesty's Navy, of any privateers which are not so heavily armed, the shot and shell of these guns would be very efficient. It was important not to go into the fabrication of very heavy ordnance before being satisfied of the success of these. Perhaps next year the harbour of St. John might be put in a better state of defence.

MR. BLAKE: To what particular advantages we owe it I know not: whether it is that we have at our command more raw material and cheap labour we are not told; but we are told that we are able to get out a better gun at \$650 than can be turned out at Woolwich for \$860. I am delighted to note that. I hope it will be very widely spread, and that at

no great distance of time, we may find Montreal rivaling other places in manufacturing artillery for the world.

MR. MASSON: I know the hon. gentleman has not much faith in the National Policy, but we will make this attempt. If we succeed, I am sure the hon. gentleman will have patriotism enough to admit the fact.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 223 and 224 read the second time and agreed to.

MR. MASSON moved to strike out Resolution 225, Gratuity to Gunner Dempster for injury sustained at drill, \$400. He said the vote was not required, as there is a Contingent Fund in the Militia Department to provide for such accidents.

Motion agreed to.

On Resolution 226, Intercolonial Railway, \$193,600,

MR. ANGLIN: I have to day received a copy of the Report in regard to the nut-locks in which there are some peculiarities of an interesting character. There appears to be a great variety of opinions among the officials of the road in regard to the value of the nut-locks. Some declare that they are of the greatest value—that they work to a charm, and save an immense amount of labour—and render the whole care of the road less troublesome and expensive than before. Others qualify this statement by saying the nut-locks are valuable when they fit particularly well. Others go even further and state that they answer very well except when the flanges happen to break, and admit that, in many cases, the flanges have broken. One gentleman said they would be useful if they were applied when the rails were new, and when they fit properly. A great many brakeemen say that it is unnecessary to look so closely after the joints as formerly, but they admit there have been breakages, and, in some instances, the locks have failed in the effect anticipated. I have not heard that any private companies have adopted those locks, and I think the Report has proved quite conclusively that the nut-lock has not had the great result the hon. Minister anticipated.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I account for the dissimilarity of the reports as to

the general bearing value of the nut-locks to the fact that the Government have not paid for twenty-five miles of the road on which they have been placed, because they were not satisfied with the manner in which the work was performed. The reports would probably be dissimilar in relation to those portions of the road, and the other portions where the work was well performed. There is no doubt the nut-locks are more applicable to a new track, because many of the nuts have rusted in such a way as to make their removal difficult. I think that, on the whole, however, the Report is very satisfactory. It is true that not so much personal attention is likely to be given to the road where the nut-lock is in use. There is where its value lies. With all the vigilance and attention that can be given, nuts often wear out, and trains go off the track, and if we can prevent two or three accidents of that kind by the use of nut-locks, we would more than cover the cost of their application to the whole road. I think the result of their use has been satisfactory on the whole, and that a great saving will ultimately be effected thereby.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Has this nut-lock gone into use on the Grand Trunk, the Great Western, or any other Canadian road?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I do not know. It has been applied to several miles on the North Shore road, and has been found to work well.

MR. ANGLIN: I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in regarding it of the utmost importance that the nut-lock affords partial security against accidents, since the men employed on the brakes may be led to be less careful than before. Those locks give way occasionally, and I think the line should be as carefully examined as if they were not in use. They do not afford absolute immunity from such accidents as the hon. gentleman has referred to.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes, they do. The nut is of steel, and of course breaks occasionally; but no accident results from that. The track is just as safe as before the nut broke, but it is to be replaced in order to keep the track safe.

MR. ANGLIN: The hon. gentleman

does not quite understand the circumstances of the case. The nut-lock breaks because a strain is brought upon it, chiefly, I presume, from pressure on the nut itself, and the moment you break the flange the nut is likely to work open, and so an accident may occur. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell us how much rolling-stock this \$159,000 is likely to cover.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It will cover two locomotives, two first-class cars, two second-class cars, two smoking cars, two baggage cars, etc., and we shall have to ask for an additional sum, in the Supplementary Estimates, for a box and platform car.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolution 227 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 228, Canadian Pacific Railway, \$220,000,

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: With regard to the enquiry as to the item for the Pembina Branch, that will complete it in addition to the vote for the year. This is the amount that will be required by the 1st July next. The amount needed for its completion has already been voted in the general Estimates.

In reply to Mr. ANGLIN,

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The new rolling-stock was to be delivered in June, 1880, including five first-class cars, twenty second-class cars, sixty box cars, and sixty platform cars, estimated to cost, in all, \$60,000. This item is in addition to the ordinary Estimates. It is placed in the Supplementary Estimates for this year, because it must be paid before the 1st July next.

In reply to Mr. ANGLIN,

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: We were obliged to obtain the four locomotives for immediate use on the Pembina Branch. Their present value was estimated on their present condition by the Locomotive Superintendents at Moncton and Pembina, to be charged against the Canada Pacific Railway.

MR. ANGLIN: With regard to the \$75,000 for Surveys, I think we have a right to some explanations. Are there location or exploratory surveys to be required by the 30th June next?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: This item of \$75,000 is to cover the Governor-

MR. ANGLIN.

General's Warrant issued for surveys required to be made, the money to be expended up to 1st July next. The general surveys, conducted during the past year, and explorations, were carried on in connection with the general Act. Up to 30th April, there had been charged in all against surveys, \$267,392, to be transferred as properly belonging to construction. Out of that amount is \$113,688, leaving a balance of \$153,703, chargeable to Surveys. The vote last year for that purpose was \$100,000. The balance of this Special Warrant of \$75,000, unexpended on the 30th April, 1880, was \$21,296, against which there will be the expenditure for two months, in connection with two parties who remained out during the winter to complete the work in which they were engaged—one from Nipegon to Thunder Bay, and the other from Nipegon eastward. Up to the autumn they had passed Long Lake, coming down to Nipissing from Nipegon. They were anxious to conclude the surveys, which they will do by the 1st July next. The only work then remaining will be the location surveys, as the construction of the Pacific Railway proceeds across the prairies.

MR. ANGLIN: The sum seems very large, even although the surveys described are progressing. Will the hon. gentleman tell us the result of the surveys towards Lake Nipegon? What sort of route, on the whole, has been discovered?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: This item of \$153,000 covers all the explorations of the past year. Of very large tracts of the land in the North-West, we know nothing, consequently exploratory surveys were carried out, and the result has been very satisfactory. Our most sanguine expectations, as to the great prairie region, have been exceeded. Then we had surveys of the two routes, and by Fort Simpson through to the Pine River Pass, and surveys from Winnipeg westward, locating the first 100 miles of the Railway across the prairies, and afterwards very difficult and elaborate surveys for the second 100 miles, with the result of obtaining a very good line through an admirable country for settlement, which section is being let at a cost not exceeding that of the first 100 miles, which is very low and satisfactory. Then there were

exploratory surveys from that point to the base of the Rocky Mountains, which also resulted satisfactorily in the discovery of a line to the north of Edmonton, which will save ten miles in distance, and carry the road out of a difficult country, through a good district for settlement, while saving much money in construction. The result of the surveys through the Peace River country is also gratifying. Then we had almost a location survey from Nipissing westward to the Sturgeon River, sixty or seventy miles of a line that will ultimately run north of Lake Superior, and is expected to be on the same line as the extension of the Canada Central; and subsequently a survey from Spanish River, so as to make us quite certain that we shall have no difficulty in obtaining a good line to the Sault Ste. Marie from Nipissing. There was a survey, not concluded, from Nipegon, westward, to connect with the line from Thunder Bay to the Red River. It was also necessary we should strike that line about fifty or sixty miles west of the present terminus at Fort William. But no very satisfactory line has been obtained in that direction. The surveys of the past season now terminated, established the fact that we can get a good line from Nipegon to Fort William that will be found preferable to connect with the road further west. It will decrease the length of the line. The last account received from the party exploring and surveying from Nipegon to Nipissing states, we can carry the road up to Lake Superior, below Nipegon, connecting with the navigation at the head of Nipegon, at Lake Helen, at the head of Lake Superior, a very fair line, much better than we supposed, can be obtained as far as Long Lake. We are informed that a very good line, not difficult to construct, will be found from the head of Lake Superior down to the point to which the survey was carried, and westward of Nipissing to Sturgeon River. Those surveys will be completed by the 1st July, and this provision is simply made to carry them up to that point. Although the amount appears large, the results are commensurate. We have obtained valuable information, which will enable us to effect a very great saving in the expenditure in the ultimate construction of the line.

MR. ANGLIN: I think the House

must be of opinion that a very large expenditure in surveys, where there is no intention of building the Railway, is premature and unwise. The outlay on the sections eastward from Nipegon, and from Nipegon to Fort William, where the road will not be built for years, should not have been incurred. We are not in a position to spend money thus prematurely and unnecessarily. Expenditures, however, on the prairie sections, to make known the character of the country, may be useful. The surveys in the Peace River and other districts, seem to have been productive of no result whatever. The line to Fort Simpson was well known, and the country adjoining it was well known before. Two parties went through the country, as if on a pleasure excursion, making no instrumental surveys, I believe, but merely looking around the country and forming a superficial opinion as to its character. The Report, so far as it goes, is entirely in favour of the adoption of the Northern Route to the Pacific, as the Chief Engineer advised, distinctly, in his Report, based on the reports of those parties, that the selection of the terminus should be deferred until further examinations were made. It is to be hoped those exploratory surveys will not be resumed until there is some reasonable expectation that the work of construction in the regions surveyed will be commenced in a few years.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: No doubt there is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin) says; but the examination of the country eastward from Fort Simpson, was indispensably necessary to the final adoption of a route. So far from no instrumental surveys having been made as just stated, ten miles of the road in that section were actually located, to be submitted to contract. Should the Government adopt that route, we stood pledged to Parliament to commence construction during the season, and had to prepare for it. Consequently, the Government adopted that route. With reference to the surveys initiated in the Lake Superior region, the Government having propounded a scheme for the construction of the Canada Pacific Railway as a whole, and looking to the probability of launching the scheme in all its entirety, we felt we should be able to deal with it much more advantageously.

than we found possible last season, when we shall have 700 miles of the road in successful operation, and when we should be able to state definitely not only the cost of the road, but, from actual surveys, the period of its probable completion. For this object, it was desirable to get this additional information. Besides, a great deal of money has been expended on those surveys, and it was thought much easier to complete our information, while it was fresh and available for this object, in that way. It was considered we should thus be better able to present the whole question of the construction of this Railway than to leave the surveys in abeyance till we were obliged to deal with the subject, and when, without being able to give an answer, we might be asked the probable cost of the road from Thunder Bay to Nipissing.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolution 229 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 231, Parliament Buildings, to cover cost of damage by fire, \$12,000,

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT : There was a question asked on the first reading of these Resolutions as to the dismissal of Mr. Gilmour, the Engineer in the Parliament Buildings. A good deal was said about the fire having occurred through the incompetency of his successor. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Public Works would give the explanation now.

MR. LANGEVIN : I was not aware the other evening whether the dismissal took place under my predecessor or under myself, but I find it was under myself. Mr. Gilmour, like any other of the firing staff, carpenters, or labourers employed about the Public Buildings, held no permanent appointment, but was employed simply during the pleasure of the Minister at \$75 per month. The situation was merely Assistant Supervisory Engineer of the heating staff and ventilation of the Parliament Buildings. His employment dated back to 1876. The situation Gilmour held was abolished in September last, on report, for the following reasons: It was considered that Foreman Engineer Smith, of Public Buildings, could also attend to the duties required of an engineer in the Parliament Buildings during the Session—during the

Recess the duties being nominal. Experience has now shown this assumption to be correct. The members generally, and the occupants of the Parliament Buildings, openly expressing their appreciation of the improvement. Mr. Smith has been employed on the Buildings since their commencement, and on the heating staff over ten years—and his present salary, \$85 per month, was authorised by Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, in April, 1875—and no increase of pay has been allowed him for the additional duty he now has to perform. It was found that much clashing occurred by having two engineers in the Buildings under whom the workman and staff had to work—interchangeable as it were—and Mr. Gilmour, being of a very irritable disposition, was on speaking terms with but few of the staff; and his frequent noncompliance with orders made it a serious matter to have such disorganisation existing in connection with steam boilers, upon which so many lives were depending. Everything is now running smoothly throughout all the Buildings in connection with the heating and ventilation—and by the abolishment of Mr. Gilmour's situation, the Department saves in salary alone, \$783.55 per annum. The hon. gentleman must see that the office was suppressed, because it was necessary for the proper working of the establishment. The officer who had charge of the same apparatus in the other buildings is now in charge of this one also; and his salary, which was fixed by the hon. member for Lambton at \$75 per month, has not been increased. He performs both duties. The remark of the hon. member for Lambton that the fire was due to the dismissal of Mr. Gilmour is unfounded and frivolous. The fire that took place had no connection with the heating apparatus, but it occurred from heating some paint by the men who were repairing the ceiling. Mr. Gilmour's office has been abolished, and we have thereby effected a saving of \$783.55 per annum.

MR. MACKENZIE : Will the hon. gentleman say that there is an engineer the less in the Buildings than before ?

MR. LANGEVIN : Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE : Was Mr. Gilmour the junior appointment of those who were here ?

Mr. LANGEVIN : He was the last appointed.

Mr. MACKENZIE : Who were the others ?

Mr. LANGEVIN : I do not know. Mr. Smith is the party who replaced Mr. Gilmour.

Mr. MACKENZIE : Mr. Smith was not in this building.

Mr. LANGEVIN : He was not in the building, but he was an officer in the Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE : I do not deny the absolute right of the Government to dismiss Mr. Gilmour, but it was an act of tyranny—it was a miserable business to dismiss a man for his political opinions. The hon. gentleman no doubt led the House to believe that there was an office dispensed with in this building, that there was an engineer less in this building than before. Now it turns out that, in order to make room for the dismissal of Mr. Gilmour, he has counted engineers in another building altogether. He might as well count the engineer in the Examining Warehouse at Montreal, or the Post Office at Toronto, and say there is one less.

Mr. LANGEVIN : I am sorry the hon. gentleman was not present when I gave the explanations, as I am sure he would have been saved the trouble he has taken now. I stated that a report was made to me that the office held by Mr. Gilmour, in this building, could be dispensed with, and that the public interest would be better served by suppressing the office of Mr. Gilmour, who was the junior appointment, and have his duties performed by Mr. Smith, the corresponding officer in the other building. That was done, and it has worked successfully. Mr. Smith's salary has not been increased by a cent, and Mr. Gilmour's salary of \$783.55 has been saved.

Mr. MACKENZIE : That was not his salary.

Mr. LANGEVIN : I stated the salary was \$75 per month.

Mr. MACKENZIE : That was \$900, where did the other money go to ? The hon. gentleman says there was only \$700 saved after dismissing a man getting \$900. Who got the other \$200 ?

Mr. LANGEVIN : That is the account that was given me. At all events

Mr. Smith has not received a cent additional.

Mr. MACKENZIE : If the hon. gentleman comes with information, we must have it made accurate. Some one has got that \$200.

Mr. LANGEVIN : The hon. gentleman should be accurate. He said there was \$200 not accounted for, he should have said \$116.

Mr. MACKENZIE : The hon. gentleman said \$700 was saved, and that Mr. Gilmour's salary was \$75 a month, which would be \$900 a year. The hon. gentleman has not given the figures correctly. I am exceedingly sorry he has lent himself to this miserable business of dismissing a worthy officer to make room for a political partisan, dismissed him because he was a political opponent of the hon. Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD : I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to have said that in presence of the statement of my hon. friend. My hon. friend says no successor has been appointed to Mr. Gilmour ; that Mr. Smith looks after the heating of the two buildings, which was formerly done by Mr. Gilmour, and it was found that one man could do the duty for the three buildings. My hon. friend says Mr. Smith is asked to look after the heating of the three buildings at his own salary, and that no man has taken Mr. Gilmour's place. The hon. gentleman is not in a position to contradict that, and he ought not to make that statement ; it is very improper that he should make that statement ; it is unworthy of that hon. gentleman to make that statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE : The hon. gentleman will not tell me what is worthy and what is not. I know my place. I will not be lectured by the hon. gentleman. It is part of a system the hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted, ever since they came into office, of removing everyone who has a taint of political Liberalism about him. The hon. gentleman is afraid to defend these dismissals in this House. If the hon. gentleman brings a list of the engineers and firemen about the three blocks, it will be found that there is not one less. I challenge the hon. gentleman to bring this list.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

MR. MILLS : In relation to Item 207, respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion, I understand Mr. Jaffray, who was appointed agent of the Dominion Lands out on the Little Saskatchewan, has been removed from that office, and is transferred to the office at Winnipeg, and that some one else has been sent in his place. I enquired why that was done, because I had information that the change was not in the public interest. I was anxious the hon. gentleman should inform the House why the change was made.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will follow the course of the hon. gentleman who has spoken last, and say that Mr. Jaffray was removed for political reasons. It was conceded to be in the interest of the Department that Mr. Jaffray should be removed to Winnipeg. At six o'clock my hon. friend asked several questions about some surveyors. He referred to Mr. Stewart, Mr. Pierce and Mr. Sinclair.

MR. MILLS : I mentioned Mr. Stewart and Mr. Sinclair simply as instances, but I think there were many others. If the hon. gentleman will look at the list of surveyors employed by his predecessors, he will see that they were not employed with reference to their political predilections. There were at least as many of his supporters on the staff as there were others. I understand that is not the case now, and I am desirous that the hon. gentleman should bring down the list.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I can only tell the hon. gentleman that the settling of the names of the surveyors was left altogether to the heads of the Departments. I do not know any of the surveyors, nor did I know or did I enquire into their politics. Mr. Stewart has just finished his last employment, and most likely will be employed again in the spring. He is one of the nominees of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Simpson has been continuously employed, and is now employed.

MR. MILLS : He is a political friend of the hon. gentleman.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Mr. Pierce, I do not know what his politics are, is still employed.

MR. MILLS : I mention these names as personal friends of the hon. gentleman,

MR. MILLS.

and I pointed out that they had not dealt with our friends as we had dealt with theirs.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I am not open to that charge. I have never enquired into the political leanings of the surveyors appointed, and have left their selection to the heads of the Department.

MR. CURRIER : A few moments ago I was called into the lobby by a surveyor, who said he could not get appointed on a survey. He also told me that the Government had appointed one who, I knew, to be an opponent of this Government. That is one case, proving that the Government do not in all cases make appointments for political reasons.

Resolutions 232 to 251 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 260, to pay Mr. E. Miall a further sum, in recognition of his services in connection with the Halifax Fisheries Commission, \$500,

MR. MACKENZIE : Mr. Miall received a stated salary of \$2,400. He was absent for some months in Halifax, for which the late Government gave him \$1,000 additional. The Government have now provided to give him still more. I think he has been paid a very large sum for the extra services rendered, for he received his salary regularly in addition to this bonus, or whatever you may please to call it. I do not think it right that the case should be reopened again by hon. gentlemen opposite and another payment of \$500 proposed. I think it is altogether unjustifiable.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : This subject was very carefully considered by the Government, and they were satisfied, after the fullest investigation, that the most valuable services had been rendered by Mr. Miall, in connection with this important adjudication in regard to the Fisheries. The uniform testimony of the officers of the Government and of Sir Alexander Galt, satisfied the Government that Mr. Miall was entitled to this additional compensation in consideration of the valuable services he had rendered—services which largely contributed to obtain the result which was obtained.

MR. MACKENZIE : I move that the item be not concurred in. The late Administration paid a liberal amount for the time given, and I think no one can justify the payment of this additional amount.

All his expenses were paid. If the hon. gentlemen are determined to throw away money in this way, they must vote for it.

MR. POPE Queen's (P.E.I.): There are a great many of these claims not settled. There are actions or intimations of intended actions. Several professional gentlemen deny that they have been paid the amounts alleged to have been paid to them, and claim that they have never been settled with at all. And so it is with regard to this. I do not think an officer who gives his time to a particular department can be called upon to go to Halifax, and spend days and nights working over figures, and doing all he can to establish the claim made by this country, and assisting in making good that claim to the extent of the very large amount received by this Government, without being remunerated for this extra trouble. We may require such services in the future, and they should be properly recognised and paid for.

Motion made and question proposed:

That the said Resolution be now read the second time and agreed to.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

The House divided.—Yeas, 103; nays, 44.

YEAS:
Messieurs

Allison	Longley
Arkell	Macdonald (King's, PEI)
Baby	Macdonald (Victoria BC)
Bannerman	McDonald Cape Breton)
Barnard	McDonald (Pictou)
Benoit	Macmillan
Bergeron	McCallum
Bergin	McCarthy
Bill	McCuaig
Bolduc	Macdougall
Boulthbee	McGreevy
Bourbeau	McLennan
Bowell	McRory
Brecken	Masson
Brooks	Massue
Bunster	Méthot
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Montplaisir
Carling	Muttart
Caron	O'Connor
Cimon	Orton
Colby	Patterson (Essex)
Connell	Perrault
Coughlin	Pinoaneault
Cuthbert	Platt
Daoust	Plumb
Dawson	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Desaulniers	Poupore
Desjardins	Richey
Doull	Robertson (Hamilton)
Dugas	Robinson
Elliott	Rochester

Fitzsimmons	Ross (Dundas)
Fortin	Rouleau
Fulton	Routhier
Gault	Royal
Gigault	Ryan (Marquette)
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Rykert
Grandbois	Shaw
Hackett	Sproule
Hilliard	Tassé
Hooper	Tellier
Hurteau	Thompson (Cariboo)
Ives	Tilley
Jackson	Tupper
Jones	Vallée
Kaulbach	Wade
Keeler	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Kranz	White (Cardwell)
Langevin	White (North Renfrew)
Lantier	Williams.—103.
Little	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Anglin	Haddow
Bain	Holton
Bécharid	Killam
Blake	King
Borden	LaRue
Bourassa	Mackenzie
Brown	Malouin
Burpee (St. John)	Merner
Burpee (Sunbury)	Mills
Cameron (South Huron)	Oliver
Cartwright	Olivier
Casey	Paterson (S. Brant)
Chandler	Rinfret
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Robertson (Shelburne)
Dumont	Rogers
Fiset	Ross (West Middlesex)
Fleming	Rymal
Geoffrion	Skinner
Gillies	Trow
Gillmor	Weldon
Gunn	Wiser
Guthrie	Yeo.—44.

Motion resolved in the affirmative.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

MR. CARON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) was not in the House when the question was put.

MR. SPEAKER: Was the hon. gentleman in the House?

MR. CAMERON: I was just at the door.

MR. SPEAKER: Was the hon. member in the House?

MR. CAMERON: I was within the walls.

MR. BLAKE: It is quite enough if the hon. gentleman was within the walls.

MR. CAMERON: I was standing at the door.

MR. CARON: The hon. gentleman was certainly not in the House when the

question was put. He may have been within the walls.

MR. CAMERON: I heard the question put.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is not that part outside that railing, because sometimes we see strangers there. Was the hon. member outside that railing or outside the House.

MR. CAMERON: You were just putting the question as I got to the door.

MR. SPEAKER: Did the hon. gentleman hear the question put?

MR. CAMERON: Yes; you were just commencing to read it when I got to the door.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: If the hon. gentleman heard the question at the time it was put, he has a right to vote. It was observed by hon. gentlemen on this side that he could not possibly have heard it.

MR. O'CONNOR: The hon. gentleman did not come in until the nays were called.

MR. ROCHESTER: I saw him come in after the yeas were called.

MR. MACKENZIE: Neither of the hon. gentlemen could see the hon. member coming in at that time.

MR. O'CONNOR: Oh, yes.

MR. MACKENZIE: Can the hon. gentlemen see through a board?

MR. MACMILLAN: I saw the hon. gentleman as he passed through the porch coming in, and it was certainly some time after the motion was put. He may have been in the alley-way.

MR. FULTON: The yeas were being taken as the hon. gentleman took his seat.

MR. CAMERON: I was at the door when the question was being put, and I was about to enter the House to the left of the Speaker's Chair, but I turned round and entered by the door at the end of the alley-way, and took the seat I occupied when I voted.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is not whether the hon. gentleman had taken his seat or not. He has stated that he heard the question put and, therefore, his name must be registered.

MR. ANGLIN: And, having made that statement, it was a gross insult—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I deny that entirely. People must have

the evidence of their own senses, and if twenty hon. gentlemen saw that hon. member, honourable only by courtesy after to-night—

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The member for West Durham rises to a point of order.

MR. BLAKE: I ask whether according to the rules of the House, a member is allowed to call an hon. gentleman "honourable only by courtesy."

MR. CAMERON: I do not complain of what has been said. I dare say hon. gentlemen stated what they believed to be correct, because they saw me coming in at the rear door; but I have reason to complain of the fact that I am disbelieved after I explained that I heard the question put.

MR. ROCHESTER: If the hon. gentleman was there when the question was put, I certainly saw him come in after the yeas and nays were called.

MR. SPEAKER: That question is settled.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: The question raised is whether the words used "honourable only by courtesy," are Parliamentary or not. We are quite able to return insult with insult, as hon. gentlemen opposite. If you, Sir, are able to maintain the courtesies of this House, we will be bound by them; if not, there are plenty of ways and means of retaliation.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. the First Minister will surely withdraw that expression. I would rather not put the question of order, as I think the right hon. gentleman will feel more comfortable to-morrow if he withdrew the expression, otherwise I will ask the Speaker's ruling on the point. Probably the explanation of my hon. friend for South Huron was not heard at the far end of the Chamber—that he could not be seen, but that he heard the question and came and took a seat on the floor. Hon. gentlemen have disregarded his word and indicated that he told a falsehood, and the hon. the First Minister declares that the hon. member for South Huron is "honourable only by courtesy after to-night," which is a gross breach of Parliamentary rules, contrary to all decorum, and calculated to degrade this House, because such attacks will lead to recrimination.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I have simply to state that I do not think I am out of order, and that I do not think the language I used was unparliamentary—indeed, I am satisfied my language is not unparliamentary. I will ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) to go with me to the place where the hon. member for South Huron stated that he was at the time the question was put, and I will convince him that the hon. member could not by any possibility have heard the question.

MR. MILLS: The hon. member stated that he was this side of the door.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman has not stated so; I will leave it to himself.

MR. CAMERON : No; I did not state I was inside the House. I said I was at the door when the Speaker was putting the question.

MR. SPEAKER : I hope there will be an end to this. I am afraid that the words used are not exactly Parliamentary.

MR. BLAKE : I do not desire to pursue this disagreeable subject, but I wish to say that by the clear rule of Parliament, the statement of the hon. member for South Huron that he was within the precincts of the Chamber when the question was put, should have been accepted. I wished the Speaker's ruling on that, so that we might know whether disputes of this description are to arise on future occasions. I have always found the statements of hon. members accepted, except some other hon. gentleman moved for an inquiry in regard to some disputed point.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The hon. gentleman stated that he heard a portion of the motion; he did not state that he heard it put by the Speaker.

MR. CAMERON : The hon. the First Minister is quite right. I do not state I was inside the Chamber, nor inside the door. I did not state I heard the whole question. My words were that I was at the door when the Speaker was putting the question, and that I turned back and came round the other way.

Resolutions 262 to 264 read the second time and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Customs.

265	{	Additional amount required for various Customs ports.....	\$6,000 00
		Amount required for Board of Experts and outside Detective Service.....	10,000 00
		To pay claims for arrears of salary of officers and ex-officers of the Customs of Prince Edward Island.....	2,233 86

MR. BUNSTER said that the hon. the Minister of Customs had not given any consideration to the claims of the port and city of Nanaimo, from which \$18,600 in duties were collected last year. It had only one Customs-house officer, when it was fairly entitled to two or three. There was considerable dissatisfaction at present owing to the great injustice done the port in this respect. The late Government had appointed an officer, but the present Government thought the port of so little importance as to place New Westminster ahead of it in the number of officers appointed. Nanaimo had more tonnage entering it than any port in British Columbia. He thought that the Government were derelict in their duty in not doing justice to Nanaimo, and hoped that the injustice would be remedied immediately.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked the hon. the Finance Minister to let the House know, on Monday, the amount received for Customs and Excise during April, 1880.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY promised to furnish it.

MR. BUNSTER said he was entitled to an answer from the hon. the Minister of Customs respecting the claims of Nanaimo.

MR. BOWELL promised that the city of Nanaimo should receive every consideration—justice included. He had not been able to meet the wishes of all the members who had asked him to increase the salaries of the different officers or make new appointments. Had he done so, he would have to ask \$30,000 or \$40,000 additional, which he thought he would not be justified in doing at present.

MR. BURPEE (St. John): I understood the hon. the Minister of Customs to say something about my not paying the arrears to officers of the Customs Department in Charlottetown during the Administration of the late Government.

Their claims were doubtless before the Department for a length of time, and a part was paid by the Collector irregularly some time ago, namely, \$828. I think that arose from a mistake in the Department, as the Collector said he did not give the instructions to the corresponding clerk to order it to be paid; but the Collector understood he was ordered to pay certain officers in Charlottetown for arrears of salary from the time of Confederation to July, 1873, \$1,400 odd, for the outside service, for officers, some of whom were not appointed by either Governments. I do not consider those officers were entitled to the additional salary they claimed. They claimed it under an understanding with the late Commissioner (Mr. Bouchette) who, it is said, held out the expectation that they would be paid at the rate of salaries given after Confederation, for the period previous to the entrance of the Island into the Union. He told me he understood himself that the officers of the Preventive Service should get the rate from the time of Confederation, that was allowed from the time of their appointment by Order in Council, but he would not say he promised anything of the kind. I admit there was an irregularity in paying these six officers of the Customs-house in Charlottetown, because I do not think they were entitled to the consideration given them.

Mr. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): I may remind the hon. gentleman that, when Minister of Customs, he told me during two Sessions, that he thought the claim of these men for the extra payment would be all right, that as some had been paid the others should be paid. It was only two or three days before the end of the second Session when he was Minister, that I could get a positive answer with regard to that matter. He submitted it to the Treasury and received a Report from his own Commissioner recommending the payment of the amount. After Prince Edward Island entered the Union in July, 1873, in August Mr. Bouchette visited it to look after some Customs matters, and he told those officers that their salaries would be paid from 1st July, at the rate fixed for Dominion salaries, but the change never took place. These men performed their work, and on Nov-

ember 3rd, the Government, previous to going out, passed an Order in Council fixing those salaries. Almost every one was an old appointee. They came in with the Province, and as much belong to the Civil Service of the Dominion as any other officers. Some of them were twenty years in the service, but were discharged without the slightest cause. I could name one, a good, honest man, who was afterwards employed by the late Government to go to Cape Traverse on important business. The salaries of those men were fixed after their appointment was formally made; the order distinctly declared that they should be paid at a certain rate from 1st July, 1873, but they were afterwards dismissed, whether properly or improperly I do not know, but I hold that they were entitled to their pay at the time they were dismissed at the rate named for the period from 1st July. They belonged to the Civil Service of Canada months before the Government went out of office, but the men who cheered for Mr. Laird when he came down to the Island as a member of the late Government, and who deserted their party, were afterwards paid by the Collector at the Dominion rate, while the other good men, who were improperly dismissed, were paid at the old salaries fixed by the Province. Some eight or nine items were paid by authority received from the Customs Department here, and the Government never had the honesty—I was going to say the courage—to admit the wrong and say that it was improperly paid by the Collector. Seven years have passed and they have never collected that money, if improperly paid, from the recipients. The Act was allowed to stand as against Mr. Bouchette till after his retirement and death. What remains then now, is the charge against Mr. Kelly. If improperly paid it was the duty of the Government to take the amount out of his salary or to call upon the officers to pay it back to the Dominion, and not to leave the favourites of the late Government to receive salaries different from those of the men turned out without cause. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for St. John say that he considered the amount should not be paid, after he told me repeatedly that it would be when the matter was before the Treasury Board, and his own officer,

Mr. Johnston, had, in 1877, recommended the payment.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) : I told the present hon. Minister of Marine that I would refer the matter to the Treasury Board, who never gave the authority. The men who were paid the amount mentioned stood in a very different position from those not paid. They were in the Charlottetown Customs-house, for many years, receiving salaries from the Government. Most of all those servants outside, which this money goes to pay, were not appointed on 3rd November by this Government. They are outside entirely. They served, true, under the regulations on the Island for many years, and they got the difference in addition to the old salary—the difference between the Island and the Canadian currency. Standing in a different position, it was on that account that I was not allowed to carry out the order of the Commissioners, as to the dismissals complained of ; it was a purely Island matter. After the Union, the officials were appointed, half from each party. But the appointments made by the late Government were not the whole of the servants employed. Only twenty-six were appointed, and forty-six were not discharged at all. Sixty-three since of those in the Charlottetown Customs-house received their additional payment. It is true the Collector made the payment from instructions from the Customs Department without my knowledge, and the Commissioner says without his knowledge. It was done by a letter, he said, from the chief clerk of the Department. In July, 1878, it was about \$800. I had agreed to pay that, and the Commissioner had prepared a Memorandum for me to charge it to the Revenue. I went to New Brunswick in July, and left the order which was supposed to be sent to the Government and passed, but when I came back, I found it had not been touched. In September, after the Elections, I left the Memorandum with him, and told him to submit it to Mr. Fraser, as whether it should be charged, and he refused.

MR. BOWELL : I think the hon. gentleman is correct in that respect. I hold copies of the Order in Council in my hand. Prince Edward Island came into the Confederation on the 1st July, 1873. At that time certain officers of the Customs

were in the employment of the Island. The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says it was proposed to pay those amounts to the officers who were not in the employment of the Island Government at the time of Confederation.

MR. BURPEE : You misunderstand me.

MR. BOWELL : Perhaps I did ; then these remarks do not apply. On the 3rd November, 1873, an Order in Council was passed appointing all the officers who were in the employment of the Island Government at the time of Confederation. The Order stated that these appointments, with the salaries attached, should date from the 1st day of July, the date the Island entered Confederation. Immediately on the access to power of my hon. friends opposite, in 1873, or shortly after, they rescinded the Order in Council making the appointments. Subsequently, a portion of them were paid at the salaries fixed by the Order in Council, and my hon. friend says that, just before leaving office, he gave instructions that the amount of \$800 should be charged to the Revenue, and credited to the Collector. The question now arises as to whether these appointments, having been made by Order in Council, fixing their salaries at a certain amount from the 1st day of July, whether they were not all entitled to the amounts specified in the Order in Council. Under the circumstances, the Government thought it only proper that all these officers should be placed upon an equal footing, particularly as the Order in Council appointing them states their salaries should date from the 1st of July. I can inform my hon. friend that it is not proposed to pay one cent to any officer who was in the employment of the Island Government at the time it entered Confederation, and who was not mentioned in the Order in Council. Applications have been made, but constantly refused.

Vote agreed to.

Weights and Measures.

- 266 To liquidate liabilities incurred under the Weights and Measures Act of 1873, which could not be settled until after the vote for 1878-79 had lapsed.... \$3 500

Railways.

- 267 Canadian Pacific—Amount required to defray the cost of operating line from Emerson to Cross Lake, to 30th June, 1880... 50,000

268 Windsor Branch Railway—Main-
tenance of Way..... 10,000

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: This is a mere matter of account. The Government have resumed control of the Windsor Branch Railway, and they are to operate it by the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company. The company pay all the expenses of operating the road, with the exception of the maintenance of the track, and receive two-thirds of the gross receipts, the Government receiving one-third, and paying the maintenance of the track. The result is that we have to ask a vote to pay for the maintenance of the track.

MR. BLAKE: How long has this arrangement been in force.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Since last August.

MR. ANGLIN: Attempts are being made to bring about an adjustment between the Windsor and Annapolis Company and the Windsor and Yarmouth Company. Can the hon. Minister state how those negotiations stand?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: No doubt the whole matter is not in a satisfactory position. The proposition has been made that by settling all the difficulties we would dismiss the disputed claims against the Dominion Government, and that proposition is under consideration.

MR. MACKENZIE: What claims are there against the Dominion Government?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company long ago filed a petition of right, which has been pending in the Courts for two years or more; and the Western Counties Company are about to make a claim for the road being resumed by the Dominion Government, under the contract which was made with them, so that really we are between two fires.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman has placed himself between two fires by interfering and taking the road out of the possession of the company, as long as there was a chance of finishing it.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: There is no chance of finishing it whatever.

MR. MACKENZIE: I would like some particulars about Item 59.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: These figures are merely conjectural, but I can say no expenses are being incurred. The receipts are paying the expenditure.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

But we have to take a conjectural amount beyond what is supposed to be acquired.

MR. ANGLIN: I think there is much room for doubt as to the propriety of the course taken by the hon. Minister in insisting upon the literal carrying out of the arrangement between the Western Counties Railway and the Dominion Government. It is certainly taking away from that company the means of obtaining credit to enable them to raise money in the English market. It is to be hoped that the hon. Minister will do all in his power to bring about such an arrangement as will promote the speedy completion of that road, as carrying out a project in which so many people in his own Province are interested.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension as to the position of matters regarding the Western Counties Company when the Government resumed possession of the Windsor Branch. The Western Counties Railway Company had received large sums of money from Nova Scotia which they expended in constructing the road from Yarmouth to Digby. But the company became completely bankrupt and was unable to finish the line. A year passed over, and all their efforts to obtain aid to finish the road were completely abortive. They were taking the receipts of the Windsor Branch, but as for accomplishing the construction of the road they were unable to do it alone, until the Government of Nova Scotia came forward and guaranteed their bonds for the amount they required. Practically they had to build the line from Yarmouth to Digby, leaving the section from Yarmouth to Pictou entirely unprovided for. But their credit was gone and they could obtain no funds. It will cost about half a million dollars to complete it. That was the position of matters when, there being no prospect whatever of anything being done, and the trade of Nova Scotia being completely dislocated, the Government took the only course which, in their judgment, was at all conducive to the public interest, and resumed possession of the road.

MR. ANGLIN: We all know that this company started with very little capital, and its whole existence was a struggle. I would like the hon. Minister to say what time he allowed to

elapse after the period at which the company were bound by their arrangement with the Dominion Government to have the road built before they took possession. My own impression is that he treated the company with peculiar harshness, when he demanded the fulfilment of the bond almost to the letter.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : No time was allowed to elapse, for the simple reason that the inability of the company to carry out their contract was made apparent, and so thoroughly manifest, as to render it quite useless to allow time.

MR. ANGLIN : Mr. Plunkett, one of the contractors, was in England at the time trying to raise money on the bonds of the company. It is said he had a fair prospect of success, and could have raised the money he urgently required, had the Government not acted as they had done. I trust the hon. member will not interpose any objection to any arrangement that may be suggested for adjusting this matter.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : The hon. gentleman is entirely misinformed. Mr. Plunkett had hawked the bonds of the company all over London for months and could not raise a dollar, and the attempt was abandoned before this procedure took place. The Government would be glad to give their consent to any arrangement of a character which would justify them in giving that consent.

MR. KILLAM : I desire to ask what policy has been considered and decided upon by hon. gentlemen opposite to fulfil the obligations of Parliament, two years ago, to build a railway between Halifax and Yarmouth.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : If the hon. gentleman will not remain in his place, I cannot, for his special convenience, repeat the statements I have already made to the House.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT : While I was Minister of Finance, I had to repeat information, not once, but a dozen times, for the benefit of the hon. gentleman's followers, under precisely the same circumstances as those which exist in this case.

MR. ALLISON : The hon. member for Gloucester has insinuated very plainly that an opinion, which appears to prevail among certain of his party in the Province of Nova Scotia, is that the motive which

prompted the Government in this matter was a political one. I think, both from public statements of the hon. member for Gloucester and private utterances of his, which I could not help overhearing, that he has insinuated very plainly that the motives of the hon. the Minister of Railways, in taking this action, were of a political nature. While I would be glad to see the question settled in an equitable manner, I think if any railway company in the Dominion has ever had fair consideration, with regard to an extension of time and an increase of the original subsidy, it is the Western Counties Railway of Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Gloucester complains that the company was not given additional time, but it is well known that there was a strong feeling in Nova Scotia that the hon. the Minister of Railways should have taken the step he has taken much earlier than he did. I had an interview with the hon. Minister in his own office on the subject, and in answer to my representations, which, perhaps, might have had some political application, he said, as nearly as I can recollect :

“That may be very true, but so satisfied am I that the people along the route of this line have been suffering from the inconvenience resulting from this state of affairs, that I am determined to regard and treat the matter entirely apart from political considerations.”

MR. ANGLIN : It is happily, Sir, a novel proceeding in the House for an hon. gentleman to stand up and base a statement upon something he imagines he has overheard passing between two gentlemen in private. I did not say the hon. gentleman was actuated by political motives; nor did I insinuate that he was actuated by political motives. My sincere object was to try to get him to take such a view of the case as would, perhaps, lead him by-and-by, to provide the accommodation which is of the utmost importance to that section of the country. It is said out of doors, that the hon. the Minister of Railways was actuated largely by political motives, in his extraordinary conduct with regard to this matter, in not allowing the company a single day's grace. I brought the matter up for the purpose of giving him an opportunity of explaining why he took that course, and his intentions in regard to the future. I did say to my hon.

friend behind me that his action would still be considered political. That is still my impression, and if I have to say so in public, I say it now.

MR. KILLAM: I desire, in the first place, to call attention to the answer the hon. Minister of Railways has seen fit to make, or rather the insult he has thrown across the floor in answer to a very proper question I put to him. As far as the absence of members is concerned that is a matter for themselves. It is frequently necessary for members to be absent from their places, and when I consider it to be my duty to be elsewhere, or when convenience demands it, I shall do as the hon. Minister of Railways himself does, leave my seat and return when I please. Only to-day I had occasion to ask a question of the right hon. the First Minister on a matter connected with the affairs of his Department, but he was absent from his seat, and I had to repeat the question when he came in. I had no objection to repeat the question, because courtesy should be extended by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I have been very careful, knowing the treatment the hon. Minister of Railways adopts to those who are politically opposed to him, not to provoke him; knowing that under the influence of political feeling he would do what he would regret in calmer moments, and that to the injury of his own friends who are interested in this work. The Bill brought in in reference to the Canada Central Railway is a laudable Bill, and it can be justified on financial grounds, as it will place in the hands of the Government, \$1,500,000 without their going into the market as borrowers. The scheme for the Railway under consideration would have placed \$5,500,000 in the hands of the hon. the Finance Minister, and would have saved him from the necessity of going into the market and borrowing, or from issuing a great part of his new paper currency. Nothing but spite, nothing but a desire to injure and destroy the counties who have not supported the hon. the Minister of Railways has been the cause of preventing the Government from carrying out that scheme. I can stand here and defend my conduct in connection with the Western Counties Railway, as well as the hon. gentleman can defend any of his political actions. I can appeal to

my friends in all the counties interested in this work, and am sure all those who know me will say that nothing I have done in connection with it has been done with a desire to put money in my pockets or to obtain political favour. The people of my county have acted as independently as any people in the Dominion. My record in connection with this Railway is clear. I defy the hon. the Minister of Railways to bring up anything against me in connection with it from first to last, or to cast one shadow of discredit. I am sorry to have had to call this up so distinctly, but it was forced upon me. I would not have done it except for the insult of the hon. the Minister of Railways. In 1874, an Act was passed transferring the Windsor Branch to the Western Counties Railway Company, in pursuance of the agreement made with hon. gentlemen opposite in 1873. In 1877, the agreement was made that the road should be opened in two years, during which litigation arose and delayed the work. Other railways have been projected without being completed in the time intended. The Canada Pacific Railway was projected a good many years ago, and it was to be completed in ten years; and the Government have not succeeded yet in getting far on with it, though nine years have elapsed. How about the Intercolonial Railway? It was to be built in five years from Confederation, and yet was not finished in ten. The Western Counties Railway have done everything they could to complete the road. They spent a large sum of money given by the counties and by the Province, and raised from their own and other sources until the Windsor Branch was handed over. While the line was in progress, the hon. gentlemen stepped in, and from pure political motives and personal spite, took the branch Railway back, and for the sake of punishing Yarmouth injures the county of Digby, whose member I do not see in his place, and the county of Annapolis, whose member is silent on the subject, and destroys communication with Halifax for whose interests he pretends to be so anxious, and one of whose members is not in his seat, and all to kill the member for Yarmouth. Let the hon. gentleman try it; let him go on for the three years he may remain

in office, and do what he can to injure those people. They are independent; they will put up with some inconvenience, in spite of his petty revenge and the wreaking of his animosity on those opposed to him, rather than accept the policy of taxation of the hon. the Minister of Finance who has been so unwise as to refuse to do what was so manifestly to the advantage of the Dominion as the proposed guarantee.

Vote agreed to.

Canals.

269	{	Additional amount required for repairs and working expenses, as follows:—	
		Cornwall.....	\$1,700
		Welland.....	30,000
		Rideau.....	1,800
		Chambly.....	3,500
		St. Lawrence.....	4,000
		Miscellaneous.....	1,000

Post Office.

270	Additional amount required to complete this service.....	60,000
-----	--	--------

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. O'CONNOR said the amount was required for increased Post-office accommodation, also owing principally to increased railway communication, more especially in Ontario, and the appointment of additional men. The increased railway communication was shown as follows:—In 1877-78, there were 4,779 miles; in 1878-79, there were 5,121 miles; in 1879-80, there were 5,752; and in 1880-81, there were 6,052.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT asked what railways these were.

MR. O'CONNOR said he was not prepared to give full particulars. The Credit Valley comes in next year; the Picton and several other railways come in part of the present year. There is an increase for mail clerks' salaries. In 1877-78, their salaries amounted to \$146,487; in 1878-79, to \$156,160; in 1879-80, to \$169,000; and in 1880-81, to \$171,600.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said the increase was very large. The present Government, in that particular Department, were not only unable to reduce the figure it had attained under the late Government, but had found it necessary to add over \$100,000 to the expenditure which the late Government had incurred. It might be right. He

was not disposed to question the necessity for the expenditure, but it showed that the hon. gentleman was in error in condemning the late Government for spending too much.

MR. BUNSTER: I am obliged to the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) for drawing attention—for drawing my attention in particular—to the fact that there is such a large increase in the expenses of the Postal Department, for in British Columbia it is \$29,000 less. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Postmaster-General to the serious neglect of Nanaimo, and the carelessness with which that port has been treated.

In reply to Mr. BLAKE,

MR. O'CONNOR said he was unable to give details as to the probabilities of mileage to be used for Postal Service during the next year. He had the Estimates from the Deputy, and they were made up by him before he (Mr. O' Connor) came to the Department; but perhaps, at Concurrence, he would be able to furnish the information.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) asked if the construction of railways had the tendency to decrease the expenditure of postal arrangements.

MR. O'CONNOR said it was quite the reverse.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: When the Estimates were made up for the current year, it was supposed that, by means of contracts and the application of principles of economy, we might reduce the estimate; and we did reduce it, taking into account the reductions that would be made by the renewal of the contracts and by the expiring contracts being let again. The estimate was made with good care. Under the system of reletting, wherever we adopted the use of railways instead of the ordinary system, we find it adds to the accommodation given, and for that increased accommodation the country must necessarily pay. When the Supplementary Estimates came down, it was stated by the Secretary that a new system was introduced; he said, if I remember aright, that the Postmaster-General had been in the habit of deducting his commission for stamps, and remitting the net amount; this made a practical difference of \$75,000. That system is altered, and the Postmaster remits the

money in full, and a cheque is retained for the commission." But still there is, no doubt, an increased expenditure, and a very large one, in the Province of Ontario. It results from the increased facilities given, and from increased mileage by railways, and from the fact that the amount saved by reletting of contracts has not been so great—perhaps, from the effect of the National Policy—because business has been improved and people would not contract so low as before.

MR. BLAKE: We have had two explanations. Perhaps if the hon. Minister who prepared the Estimates were to give us another we would have the explanation complete. The Postmaster-General evidently was not posted in this matter. He gave us a lot of figures, not having anything to do with the question put to him. It would be advantageous if the Government could give us a definite and precise statement of how this large increase is made up, and what branches it divides itself into. It would certainly appear that the hon. gentleman did exhibit faith in the accusations that had been made. They expected to let the contracts much cheaper and more economically; but even if they were ever so much better managers of such matters than their predecessors, perhaps they spoiled their own little game themselves.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The country is not such a cheap one to live in.

MR. BLAKE: We know that to our sorrow. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has been informed of that by the members for Prince Edward Island. It is not so cheap for men or horses, and, consequently, more money has to be paid. We might fairly know, first of all, how much of this is simply cross-entry, and how much is occasioned by the unexpected difficulties to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: If I remember correctly—and I have no doubt the hon. the Postmaster-General will correct me if I am wrong—Ontario is about the only Province in the Dominion which returns a surplus to the Revenue over and above the amount expended for Postal Service in it.

MR. O'CONNOR: No.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT:

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

Then it comes closer to it than any other Province.

MR. O'CONNOR: Yes.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I think I am also justified in saying that when increased facilities are given in Ontario, the expansion in the Revenue is generally pretty equal to the amount expended. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the income derived from the Post-offices has increased at all during the last year up to date?

MR. O'CONNOR: I think not.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I am sorry to hear that, because that would be a very decided sign of the improvement of business.

MR. BUNSTER: The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) states that Ontario is the only Province that returns a surplus in favour of the Post Office. I beg to differ with him. According to the Terms of Confederation with British Columbia, the Dominion agreed to carry our mails, on certain routes, as part of the purchase of our Province.

MR. BLAKE: Was British Columbia purchased?

MR. BUNSTER: I heard the hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) say the other day that she was seduced. We have not been treated well by the hon. the Postmaster-General, and the ex-Postmaster-General, and I feel it my bounden duty to call attention to the great injustice being done to British Columbia by reason of not giving us the mail accommodation we were promised on entering the Union. Very few of the hon. Ministers have done us justice, but I must say that the hon. the Finance Minister did a graceful thing in taking off the tax from powder when he found out it was distasteful to our people, and against their interests. I have only one fault to find against that hon. gentleman, namely, that he did not comply with my request to put a duty on rice in order to help us keep out the Chinese. I trust the hon. the Postmaster-General will take into consideration the advisability of giving us better postal accommodation, and so fulfil the Terms of Union.

MR. O'CONNOR: I will, at all events, see that no Chinamen pass through the British Columbia Post Offices.

MR. HUNTINGTON: When I had—the good fortune, shall I say—of pre-

siding over the Post Office Department, my hon. friend (Mr. Bunster) used to make some representations to me about British Columbia; and although I showed a disposition to meet his views, I was never complimented as the hon. gentleman opposite have been complimented by him. I thought, when the hon. gentleman's friends came into power, they would do something for him; but while he complains that they also have dealt unjustly with the Province, he still expresses unbounded confidence in the Government and supports them all the same. I compliment the hon. gentleman upon the manner in which he stands up for British Columbia, and declares that she is oppressed day after day. I am sure the British Columbians must be proud of the representative they have in this House; and I must compliment him also for his declaration that he will stick through thick and thin, to the men who deal out this oppression to the country he represents. I am inclined to think the Post Office Department is growing in expense in consequence of the railway facilities that have to be afforded. I am inclined to think the hon. gentleman (Mr. O'Connor) has found that it costs something to supply the public with the accommodation they expect from that Department. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is not to be blamed because he cannot give the details at the moment, which have induced him to ask for a further vote in the Supplementary Estimates. I am willing to wait until he gets the information and gives it to us. But if it should turn out that the hon. gentleman finds that he is not able to administer that Department more economically than it was administered by those whom he and his friends denounced for their extravagance, I am sure he will come and say frankly to the country: We were mistaken when we brought those charges against you; we were mistaken when we thought you were extravagant; we have been obliged to exceed those expenditures for which you were responsible; we have the responsibility of office on us, and we want to admit the mistake. My own opinion is that the hon. gentleman should say that whenever he gets a chance, in order that we may see he is sorry of the wrong that was done when those false accusations were fulminated against the

late Administration. The great Conservative party does not wish to stand before this country as having for years fulminated slanders against the Post Office Department, which, to-day, they see they are not able to justify; and having denounced that Department for extravagance, which to-day they find necessary to exceed. I am sure, if the hon. the Postmaster-General has not the candour to come down with the statement I suggest, the people will understand that, having obtained office, he is placed in position to justify those whom in years past his party slandered.

MR. O'CONNOR: I had not the honour of having a seat in the House at the time the hon. gentleman speaks of, when his Administration was denounced, and I know nothing about this except what I learned from the newspapers. I have just this to say, that the postal communication of this country is continually increasing. The accommodations in British Columbia, the North-West Territories, Manitoba and the new settlements in the older Provinces, have to be increased in accordance with the advance of settlement. It is not necessary to say anything further than that to account for the increase at the present time.

MR. BUNSTER: I challenge the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) to show where I have been inconsistent. It is my bounden duty to get up and point out to any hon. Minister of the Crown, where any injustice has been done to British Columbia. The hon. gentleman has given me a lashing that I do not deserve, simply for doing my duty to my constituents. I have supported the Government because they have exhibited more good will towards our Province than any past Administration, and I shall continue to support them in the hope and belief that all our demands will ultimately be carried out.

MR. GILLIES: I am of the impression that there are other places that have reasons to complain of the treatment received at the hands of the hon. the Postmaster-General's Department besides British Columbia. I wish to draw attention to an affair that occurred in the riding I come from. About the latter part of last Session I brought to the notice of the hon. Minister the fact that the Postmaster of

Carnegie, in North Bruce, was about to retire from his position, and another person near by, who could suitably fill the position, was prepared to take it. But I received no definite reply at that time. Shortly after the prorogation of Parliament, and on the final resignation of the postmaster at Carnegie, I again communicated on the subject with the hon. the Postmaster-General, but still the reply was indefinite. Meantime, a report was current in the locality that the office was to be closed. On hearing this I further solicited information from the hon. the Postmaster-General as to the cause of closing the office, and whether its being kept open was a loss to the country? My object in making this enquiry was for the purpose of showing that the road on which the post-office in question was situated was between two points, Paisley and Cheeley, that being a post road travelled daily, and therefore the service could not incur any expense, so far as that office was concerned. But all I could learn was, on communicating the above facts, that the post-office had to be closed. It will thus be seen that the consideration of expenditure could not have actuated the Post Office Department in closing that office. I then endeavoured to investigate the cause, when I learned that representations had been made to the Postal Department by parties in the neighbourhood, who are opposed to me politically, that it was as well to close the office; that the people in that neighbourhood were all strong Reformers, Grits, thus indicating as much as that they are scarcely worthy of the common postal facilities. Those were the reasons given. I know that several persons in the neighbourhood, opposed to me, wrote to the Department desiring the closing of the office. I do not say positively that that was the reason why it was closed, but I could find no other. This office was opened in 1863, and continued open for sixteen years. It served about forty families and 100 adult individuals, and at which no less than forty Canadian papers were received.

MR. O'CONNOR: Did the hon. gentleman move for the papers?

MR. GILLIES: I did, but they have not been brought down. One reason why the office should be allowed to remain open, on the hon. Minister's own

showing, is that it did not incur any additional expenditure to the country. Again, many of the people who carried on correspondence through, and received papers by, this office, will cease to correspond as largely as before, and therefore a loss to the postal revenue must ensue. I desire to learn now, from the hon. the Postmaster-General, the cause of the closing of that office. If there is no better reason than hitherto shown to be offered, I am sure it should be reopened, for the people are suffering from the want of postal convenience in that locality. The hon. the Finance Minister referred to the matter of economy. It is desirable certainly to economise; but when the economical intentions of the Department and of the Government will not be interfered with, surely we ought to be allowed, in that section of country, to have the common conveniences allowed in connection with the postal service elsewhere in the country. The hon. the Finance Minister also stated that the postal necessities of the country are increasing. No doubt; they must increase along with the development of the country and the increase of population, which is a good reason why more offices should be opened and not closed. Therefore, if no better cause can be given than that certain individuals in that quarter of the country, without consulting myself, as its humble representative, take upon themselves to correspond with the hon. the Postmaster-General, and that upon their statements he chooses to close the office, it occurs to me to have been anything but creditable to the hon. gentleman to have done so on any such questionable grounds. On those particular points, to which allusion has been made, I hope I shall receive a satisfactory reply this evening, or, at all events, such as will set forth the actual state of the case.

MR. MÉTHOT: I rise to give my testimony to the economy of the Government in my county. I find a little too much of this virtue. For instance, on the Arthabaska and Three Rivers Railway, there used to be two mail conductors, one paid \$800 and the other \$600 a year. As soon as this Government came to power, they removed both, and the mail now goes without any conductor. We desire economy as much as anybody, but not that it shall all be effected in one

place. I have received no satisfactory reply to my questions on this subject. Instead of two officers receiving \$1,400, I am asking for only one at \$500 a year. The people in my county are suffering at present on this account. The \$500 I ask for a conductor will not be all lost, because the Government will be obliged, I am afraid, at present, to pay the people who distribute the mails. The postmasters in Arthabaska and Three Rivers are asking an increase of salary, because of an increase of work. I hope in this respect we shall receive justice.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: If the Postmaster-General cannot answer the remarks of the member for North Bruce (Mr. Gillies) just now, he can on Concurrence. Remarks on a grievance of the kind described by that hon. gentleman, ought to be answered. We ought, before the item is passed, to have an understanding that the information will be given on Concurrence.

MR. O'CONNOR: I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) should have given notice of his question. At present I am not sufficiently informed to answer it, but hope to be on Concurrence.

Vote agreed to.

Dominion Lands.

271 Surveys — Amount required for balances of outstanding accounts for subdivision and block surveys	\$5,000
272 Cost of publication of pamphlets, advertising Dominion Lands, etc.	13,600

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: Should there not be a contribution to this item from the United States authorities? It includes the praising of their lands by means of the pamphlets we have heard so much about.

MR. BLAKE: The item is for "advertising Dominion lands, etc." I suppose the "etc." is a place in the United States.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The only State we advertise is Texas.

MR. BLAKE: This item would be included in the costs connected with the lands in the North-West, as coming within a separate account?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think fairly so.

Vote agreed to.

273 Additional amount required for contingencies	\$1,000 00
--	------------

274 Unprovided items of 1878-9, vide Auditor-General's Report	234,678 20
---	------------

In reply to **SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT**, **SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY** stated that the principle item was \$210,183, expended on account of Intercolonial Railway over and above the vote taken.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: It would be a very considerable convenience if the Finance Minister would cause to be laid on the Table of the House, when we meet again, those several classes of Returns that the hon. gentlemen on this side, charged with the financial affairs of the Opposition, has always to move for. It would save a great deal of time and trouble to the Department as well as to the Opposition; also the details of the receipts and expenditures. The *Gazette* returns are not sufficiently extended to give us any real information.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes; they shall be prepared in advance, and will save a great deal of trouble.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

NAVIGABLE WATERS OBSTRUCTIONS LAW AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 107.]

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

In reply to **MR. ANGLIN**,

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said he did not see how the provision holding the owners of wrecked vessels pecuniarily responsible for their removal from navigable waters could be modified. The parties blameable for those obstructions would be obliged to remove them or pay the cost, instead of throwing it on the public as at present. Many of the wrecks in Lake Erie and other waters are those of foreign vessels, the owners taking no trouble to remove them. Where the parties can pay the cost of their removal, the Government should exact it. Under the law in Quebec, if a vessel is sunk and obstructs navigation, the owner is bound to put some signal there to warn other vessels of the obstruction, until it is removed. If he does not do it, he is

liable to a penalty. In all other places there is no such law, and I do not think the people of this country should be called upon to pay the expense of removing obstructions to the navigation of our rivers.

MR. BLAKE: There is already a remedy existing, at any rate in Ontario, for such offences as this Bill proposes to deal with. At present, no person can leave an obstruction in any navigable water without being subject to proceedings in the Civil Courts to compel him to remove that obstruction, and these proceedings are not unfrequently taken. I have in my mind at this moment two cases, in which sunken vessels, one in the harbour of Owen Sound and the other in the harbour of Toronto, were required to be removed by order of the Court, because they were public nuisances and an infringement of the right of navigation. The difficulty is that we seem to be interfering, in these matters, with civil rights. The law, up to this point, has been within our jurisdiction and in the exercise of our power with reference to the navigation of harbours, etc., declaring that the Government has a right to give notice to remove obstructions, and in default of the owner of the vessel doing so, to seize and sell the obstruction and apply the proceeds towards the expense. What you now propose to do is, that the party should be responsible in damages beyond the amount realised by the sale of the wreck. It seems to me that is going dangerously near to the domain of civil rights. I do not think the hon. gentleman has met the difficulty which I pointed out before. I remarked that, as far as our jurisdiction goes, we ought to deal summarily with persons who buy a water-logged or bad vessel with her cargo, and then run her aground in a harbour for the purpose of breaking her up and taking what there is in her. But there may be cases of a different character, in which the wreck is caused by stress of weather or otherwise, and when the owner is not at all responsible. It seems to me it would be hard to apply, in such cases, the sharp methods proposed by the Bill, especially as our existing laws afford a means of dealing with them.

MR. SPROULE: The hon. member for West Durham referred to a case in

Owen Sound. That case is still before the Courts, and, though considerable money has been lost in expenses, the hulks are lying there still.

MR. BLAKE: They went against the wrong party.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): There may be some hardship, but I do not see that it affects the principle of the Bill. The question is whether a party should be compelled to remove an obstruction which is his own property, and which has become an obstruction of the navigable highway through his own negligence. I understood my hon. friend would not go so far as to say the Bill is *ultra vires*, because I fancy that under a true construction of the British North America Act that can hardly be said. The question, then, is only as to the expediency of the measure my hon. friend has introduced. I do not myself see the hardship. Of course there are always cases where rights are interfered with. If a man is driving along the highway and wrecks his carriage against an impediment he did not observe, it can hardly be said that he would have a right to walk away and leave the carriage on the highway to wreck the next passer by in the same way. The principle is the same. A harbour is a public highway. If a vessel is sunk there by the owner's negligence and becomes a nuisance, the party who owns the vessel is the one who ought to remove that obstruction. It is true the Government have the power of removing it and of indicting the party who willfully obstructs the passage, but at the same time I fancy it is the bounden duty of the owner of a wreck to remove it before it causes a loss to others. While I think cases of hardship may arise, it appears to me the principle of the Bill is well founded, and that the Bill ought to pass.

MR. BLAKE: If it is the bounden duty of such persons to remove the vessel, the law is already sufficient, and if the party does not do it, the law can compel him to do it.

MR. McDONALD: It won't do for a party to wait until the law enforces that duty. We say: If you do not do it we will do it for you, and make you pay for it. You must do your duty properly; if you do not, we will not per-

mit the general public to suffer injury from your negligence.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 96) To repeal the Act extending the Dominion Lands Act to British Columbia, and to make other provision with respect to certain public lands in that Province.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 57) To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the North-West Territories.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1879.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes before

Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 3rd May, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY delivered two Messages from His Excellency the Governor-General.

MR. SPEAKER read the Messages, and they are as follows:—

“LORNE.

“The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1881; and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“OTTAWA, 3rd May, 1880.”

“LORNE.

“The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons the additional Supplementary Estimates of the amounts required for the service of Canada, for the year expiring 30th June, 1880; and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“OTTAWA, 3rd May, 1880.”

Ordered, That the said Messages, and the Estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The late Finance Minister asked me if I would lay on the Table of the House a statement of the Customs and Excise Revenue for the month of April. I have prepared that statement, and have thought it advisable to give also a comparative statement for April, 1878 and 1879. I may state, for the information of the House, that the Customs receipts for April last were \$1,152,260; Excise, \$382,342. For April, 1878, the Customs receipts were \$901,661; Excise, \$310,306—making an increase of the Customs receipts of 1879, as compared with 1878, of \$250,599, and of Excise of \$72,036. Last April the Customs receipts were \$628,785, and Excise, \$139,588; making a difference in Customs of \$523,475, and of Excise, \$242,754.

PRIVILEGE—THE MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU.

REMARKS.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Before proceeding further, I beg leave to address a few words with reference to the petition presented by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). It is a petition against the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Massue).

MR. SPEAKER: I must tell the hon. member that no debate is allowed on the presentation of the petition without he has some motion to make.

MR. MOUSSEAU: It is only a preliminary motion I am going to make, which will not give rise to a debate. I will, at least, lay the facts before the House before we take any action.

MR. MACKENZIE: We do not want to know.

MR. BLAKE: The petition has not been received.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Then I rise to a question of privilege. I desire to ask two things: first, that the petition be ordered to be printed in the Journals of the House, so that hon. gentlemen may know, when the debate comes up, the facts of the case. When the motion to receive the petition is made I shall oppose it on the ground that, if the allegations made therein are true, they are allegations

that should go before the Courts and not before the House.

MR. LAURIER: I suggest that the petition cannot now be received. To-morrow we will be called upon to proceed or not with the petition, and then I apprehend it will be in order for my hon. friend to give his objections to its being received.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I do not understand the opposition of my hon. friend. I must say the petition comes at a very late period of the Session.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will do well to wait until to-morrow, when the motion is made for the reading and receiving of the petition.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I hope no one will oppose the motion I am going to make, which is that the petition presented by the hon. member for Quebec East be printed.

MR. BLAKE: I think it would be highly inconvenient to set a precedent ordering that a petition be printed before it is proposed to be read and received. It may contain allegations that should not have the degree of publicity, which would be unvalued by printing the petition. We know not what there may be in it at present.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I move that it be read and printed.

MR. BLAKE: It is a general proposition that a petition should not be printed without previous notice.

MR. MOUSSEAU: The allegations in the petition are very serious, and it will only prevent the petition going before the public, because the House will be pro-rogued on Wednesday or Friday, and justice will be prevented. From what I hear—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. DESJARDINS: I move the adjournment of the House. That will prevent any injustice.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I will say one word more.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), has moved the adjournment of the House.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Now, the allegations in this petition—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. CASEY: It is not allowed—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. CASEY: I shall have order.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

The point of order is this: I claim that it is not in order to speak of or discuss anything on a motion for adjourning the House. It is out of order to discuss this petition, which it would not be in order to discuss before. I claim that it is not in order, according to the Rules of the House.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You can discuss anything.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is not regular to discuss the petition just presented. It is not before the House upon the question for adjournment.

MR. MOUSSEAU: The House ought not to adjourn before that important case is disposed of; if it does it will be a great injustice. The hon. member for Richelieu—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. MACKENZIE: This is out of order to attempt to discuss this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not in order to discuss a petition presented to the House, a petition which is in fact not before the House.

MR. CASEY: That is just what he is doing.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a question of privilege, affecting the seat of an hon. member of the House, and generally speaking it might be considered.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Then I ask it as a question of privilege. The petition is attacking the honour and dignity—

MR. LAURIER: I understand the object of my hon. friend is to have the petition read and received, or to know whether it can be or not. I would suggest it should be done to-morrow, as we are so near the end of the Session. He will find that course the best if he objects to let it stand over until Wednesday.

MR. MOUSSEAU: Do I understand the hon. gentleman that it shall be printed now and presented to-morrow?

MR. LAURIER: Not printed; but to decide whether it shall be received or not to-morrow.

MR. DESJARDINS: Then I withdraw the motion for adjournment.

Motion (*Mr. Desjardins*), with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

MONTREAL TRINITY HOUSE AND HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.), in introducing a Bill (No. 124) To amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, said: The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are most anxious to have authority for three of their own members to investigate the skill of pilots. It is very difficult to get five together, and they want to give that authority to three. I move that the sanction of the House be given to that effect. It is not necessary to do more than pass one clause giving this authority.

MR. BLAKE: If I rightly understand the hon. gentleman, the sole purpose is to confer on three members of the body, to be selected by themselves, powers which at present belong to a quorum of the whole body.

MR. POPE: Yes.

Bill read the first time.

MASTERS AND MATES ON INLAND WATERS.

REMARKS.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.): With regard to a Resolution on the paper in regard to the examination of masters and mates of vessels sailing on the lakes, I may state that it is not intended to introduce a Bill this Session. Great necessity has been shown why masters and mates navigating the inland waters should receive certificates of competency. A serious loss occurred last season on Lake Superior, and it turned out that the officers of the boat had no certificates, and were not required to obtain them. After acting as pursers for a year or so, sharp young men are often put in as masters of vessels, and they do very well during the summer season; but it is absolutely necessary that persons navigating those lakes, which are really inland seas, should be thoroughly experienced and competent men. We will allow the matter to drop now, and bring in a Bill next Session.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: It is not intended that the examination shall be the same as for the officers of sea-going ships?

MR. POPE: It will be a different standard altogether.

MR. MCCALLUM: The hon. gentleman has spoken rather strongly of the class of persons in charge of vessels navigating the lakes. I think they are as good a class of men as any in the world. Of course, accidents have happened, and may happen again, owing to circumstances over which the officers have no control. I think the hon. gentleman will find that most of the officers will be able to pass any examination he may deem necessary to convince him of their competency.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Baby.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. BABY, in moving for a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

“That it is expedient to amend the Acts respecting the Inspection of Petroleum, and to provide for raising the fire-test of Canadian Petroleum from 105 degrees to 115 degrees, Fahrenheit; and for reducing the fire-test on Foreign Petroleum from 130 degrees to 120 degrees, Fahrenheit; and for placing the responsibility as to the quality of Petroleum on the vendors thereof,”

Said: From the discussion which took place in the House some evenings ago, it was found necessary that certain amendments should be made to the law. In the Bill which will be introduced upon those Resolutions, there is a provision to secure a uniform system of testing petroleum. At present some of the officers have not the knowledge or the instruments to make proper tests, and it is the intention of the Government, whenever any difficulty occurs between the officers and importers of oil, to have the matter referred to a central office, either here in Ottawa, or at Quebec or Toronto. The Bill will also transfer the responsibility from the officers and place it upon those selling the oil. I hope the changes in the law will meet the approval of the trade.

MR. COLBY: Having spoken at considerable length on this subject on the second reading of the Bill, which I had the honor to introduce, I do not propose to occupy the attention of the House for any considerable time now. I will simply say that I have seen no reason to change the opinions, which, after considerable consideration, I deemed necessary to express. My own conviction is that a test of 115° is sufficiently high for

the purpose of safety, applied either to Canadian or American oils, and that there is, intrinsically, no difference between them in the matter of safety, if they stand the same flash test; that if there be a larger percentage of volatile materials in the one oil than in the other, the test detects it. I know this is a controverted point, and that it is urged very strenuously by experts that there is a difference; that instead of the more volatile constituents being all eliminated from American oil by distillation, a certain proportion is held in suspension, in connection with paraffine, and that there should be a discrimination. However, that is a theoretical point. Since I have understood the proposition of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, I have taken some pains to ascertain, by communication with dealers in Portland, Boston, and New York, whether this difference of five degrees between the American and Canadian oils is of any practical significance, whether it would place the consumer of American oil in a worse position. My information goes in the direction of showing that, practically, it is of very little consequence whether the test be 115° or 120°; so I am not disposed to spin too fine a point in the matter when the hon. Minister has shown a disposition to meet the views of the country, not only in respect to the fire test, but other matters. The result of my enquiries is, that there are substantially three classes of oils manufactured in the United States. One class is manufactured for export, and stands 110° burning test, which is lower than any we have ever received in this country, and, in my judgment, too low for safety. Another is an oil standing a burning test of 150°, a superior oil for export—a most economical oil for general consumption; the price of this oil in the American market is 14c. a gallon. The third class embraces special oils manufactured to meet the requirements of countries where very high tests are adopted. This class is higher in price and inferior in quality to the class last mentioned. The difficulty under the old test was that we were not permitted to use the 150° burning test oils, but were driven to purchase a special oil, and we had to pay a very much larger price for an article that was inferior as an

illuminating oil. I believe the proposition of the hon. Minister will relieve us from the difficulty of purchasing these high priced special oils, and will enable us to purchase freely the superior oils made in the interest of the consumer. Under these circumstances, without by any means admitting the proposition that there should be a discrimination, and maintaining the views I formerly expressed, that a test of 115° is sufficient for safety, I am not disposed to divide the House. But, if it should be found that I am mistaken in my assumption as to the classes of oils which will be admitted under the 120° test, and that practical inconvenience results, and that we are compelled to buy higher priced oils, I will, next Session, feel it my duty to call the attention of the House and Government to this subject again.

MR. FLYNN: I regret that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue did not adopt the fire test contained in the hon. member for Stanstead's Bill, which made it uniform at 115° on all oils. For years we paid the large duty of 15c. a gallon on American oil, as a protection to the Canadian manufacturer. Some time ago it was considered, in the interest of the people of the Maritime Provinces, who are large consumers of American oils, that the duty was too high, and should be reduced. The people of the Maritime Provinces invariably used the American oils, even at the payment of this very high duty. As regards the test, no reason has been assigned by the Minister of Inland Revenue for a difference between the tests on Canadian and American oils. In 1868, the first Act in reference to inspection, the fire test for petroleum was made 115°. It was, after some years, in 1871, reduced to 105° on Canadian and foreign oils. No reason has been assigned why the fire test should have been increased last Session. Experience from 1871 to 1879 showed that the fire test of 105° was sufficiently high to assure every necessary safety. American oils has been found safer and more convenient for general use than any other. I fail to see any reason for the difference now made between the American and Canadian article. The British fire test on all foreign oils is only 100°, which Parliament considered sufficient to secure all requisite.

safety. Why, then, should the people of the Dominion be asked to submit to a fire test of 120° on American oil. If the test be raised to 120° it will still exclude a large portion of foreign oil. I have seen a letter from the Collector at St. John, to the hon. Minister of Finance, in which he says that oil which stands the test of 115° is a good, safe and merchantable article. Now, there is no doubt that if, by any refining process, you bring it up to a test of 120° , you not only reduce its illuminating power, but you add to its cost by 2c. or 3c. per gallon. This will, to a great extent, exclude American oil from the Maritime Provinces. One great advantage in favour of American oil, is that it is of less offensive odour than Canadian oil. Even in Ontario, where the oil is produced, I find, by the Returns of 1879, that they imported 241,000 gallons of American oil, while the imports into New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island that year were 628,000 gallons. I do not see why there should be a difference in the fire test of American and Canadian oils. I think it is an unfair discrimination against the Maritime Provinces, and will injure their trade and commerce. If the Government are determined to apply their policy of Protection to the manufacture of Canadian oils, if they desire to protect oil rings, let them do so by raising the duty. If 6c. a gallon is not enough let them raise it to 10c. or 15c., but do not interfere with trade in the manner contemplated in this Bill. Let us know what we really have to pay to protect oil rings, and do not compel us to use oil so offensive and disagreeable as the Canadian oil is. The Act of last year fixing the test at 130° was a practical prohibition of American oil, and if any was used in the Maritime Provinces, it was smuggled in. I have no doubt that even if the test is lowered to 120° a large quantity of oil will still be smuggled. If, from 1871 to 1879, a fire test of 105° was found sufficient, I see no reason why it should not be sufficient still. I do not know of any accidents having occurred under that test. If in England a fire test of 100° is considered high enough, why should we adopt 120° ? I cannot see why there should be a discrimination between the two oils, and I think the Government would do well to adopt the suggestion of

the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr Colby), which made the test 115° on both Canadian and American oils.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex): I am exceedingly pleased the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue has seen fit to increase the fire test, and thus increase the safety of Canadian oil. The number of deplorable accidents that have occurred in this country, during the last year, called for some additional guarantee of safety. I notice hon. gentlemen take exception to the proposition of the hon. Minister, on two grounds: first, that the fire test proposed is higher than that adopted in England. But the circumstances of the two countries are different. A fire test that may be perfectly safe in a moist climate, like that of England, would not be safe in our climate during the heated summer months, nor yet in that of the Southern States. Another objection taken is that by increasing the fire test we reduce the illuminating power of the oil. Experts tell us that the illuminating power of oil depends upon its specific gravity. You will observe that, by the proposition of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, the specific gravity of Canadian oil is fixed at 8.2, so that we have in that fact a guarantee that the American oil introduced into this country, will be equal in illuminating power to Canadian oil. I think the simple fact of there being an absolute necessity to provide greater security in the consumption of coal oil is in itself a sufficient justification for the increase of the fire test on Canadian oil. Experts tell us, moreover, that the explosive material found in American oil is proportionately greater than in Canadian oil, and fully justifies the Minister in exacting a discriminating test as between Canadian and American oils. The discrimination is very light, indeed much lighter than it was under the old law, namely, five degrees. I think this discrimination, while, perhaps, it may not be quite just to the Canadian oil, will at least indicate the relative explosive character of the two oils. As to the other objection, that it has a tendency to prevent the importation of American oils, I think that is not borne out by the Return brought down by the Minister of Inland Revenue some time ago. I notice that, within the last six months, we imported nearly

400,000 gallons of American coal oil, which paid duty. How much came in that did not pay duty I cannot tell, but we have the fact that nearly 400,000 gallons did pay duty during that six months. During the corresponding six months of the previous year there were 624,000 gallons of oil imported that paid duty. Of course this is really a large decrease, perhaps, relatively, a larger decrease in this article than in many of the other articles imported from the United States. But there is the fact still remaining that a large quantity of the oil consumed in Canada comes from the United States; and if it comes in at a higher fire test there is additional safety, and with the uniform specific gravity proposed by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, there will be a uniform illuminating power. I think that the Bill, in the form in which it is brought down, should be acceptable to the House, inasmuch as it provides for those two important points to which I have referred, namely, safety and illuminating power.

MR. PLUMB: Having taken some part in the debate upon the Resolutions introduced by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) in respect to the test of petroleum, and taking a very strong interest in the promotion of every measure which shall be calculated to increase the consumption of the product of the Canadian wells, I was gratified to hear that the Government had decided to take up the question, feeling confident that it would be dealt with in the spirit of promoting, as far as it could be done with regard to the consumer, one of the great industries of the Dominion. I believe that the oil refiners of this country have to blame themselves only, for not having secured the home market; and I trust that the change in the fire test now proposed by the Government, will have the effect of compelling Canadian manufacturers to do what they are perfectly able to do if they choose, that is, to make the quality of their oil as good as that manufactured in the United States. I think there will be no difficulty about securing the Canadian market if they will take the pains which the American manufacturer takes in deodorising, bleaching and purifying their product. I have no doubt that the illuminating

power of Canadian oil is greater than that of American oil, and that it contains a far less proportion of explosive gases. I am very glad to see that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue has found it within his sphere of duty to accept, in some degree, the proposition which was made by myself and others in the debate which took place the other night. I think the compromise effected between the views expressed by the hon. member for Stanstead, by the hon. member for East Middlesex, and by myself, will be considered a fair one and acceptable to all parties, and will give the consumer a Canadian oil fully as agreeable for use as the best American, and possessing the superior recommendations of cheaper price, higher powers of illumination, and greater safety.

MR. CASEY: I think there is no part of this Bill which calls for any objection except the discrimination, small as it is, which it is proposed to make in favour of Canadian oils. I think no valid reason has been shown why any such discrimination should exist. It is, of course, absurd to argue that, of two oils which stand the same flash test, one will explode at a lower point than the other, since both explode at the same point. The only remaining argument is that there will be more danger with American oil after the explosion than with Canadian oil; but it has been shown, by the admission of the refiners themselves, that the difference between the flashing point and burning point of American oil is greater than with Canadian oil, and, consequently, that the former is less liable to burn after explosion than the latter. The House and the country should understand that by this discrimination, protection is intended to be given to refiners in addition to the enormous protection they already have. I think consumers of oil throughout the country will feel that they are still unnecessarily mulcted by this Bill, although it is a better measure than the one which precedes it.

MR. CONNELL: The practical result of the Bill of last year was that a great deal of dissatisfaction arose in the country. The people were willing to purchase Canadian oil provided that they could get it of equal value as to its illuminating properties with the American oil, but the fact was that the oil that was brought to

our part of the country was no better than before, and, in consequence, we had to purchase the American oil at a higher price; thus the purpose of the Bill was defeated by the action of the oil refiners of Canada themselves. I perceive that in the Resolution introduced by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, he has made the test for Canadian oil 115°, and for American oil 120°, the reason for which difference I am unable to comprehend. From information received from experts, I am of opinion that there is scarcely any difference between the oils of the two countries as originally obtained from the reservoirs from which nature has stored them. I hoped that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue would see his way clear to make the tests equal and not more than 115°. With respect to the test of 115°, I am confident from what I have learned, after a careful study of the question, that beyond 110° the illuminating powers are injured, and the cost of production increased, thus making at once the oil more costly and less serviceable. The proposed plan will be somewhat better than last year's Bill, but I am confident that, after a year's trial under the present arrangement, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue will be satisfied that he has not placed the test where it ought to be, and that he will be compelled to change the test so that they will be alike.

MR. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.): I think the test proposed by the Government will enable us to bring in about the same quality of oil as came in under the 115° test. It might be well to give the new test a trial for a year, but, personally, I favour equality in the test. I think that while we are willing to give the Canadian manufacturer a fair Protection, so as to enable him to put his oil on the market on a favourable footing, still there should be an equal test. As the Government has taken a step in the right direction this year, and reduced the test on American oil from 130° to 120°, and increased the test on Canadian oil from 105° to 115°, it may result in inducing the Canadian refiner to put an oil on the market that can be used. So far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, Canadian refiners have failed to put an oil on the market which will compare with the ordinary American oil we import.

The American oil of 115°, or even less, that we have heretofore imported, was far superior to any Canadian oil we have yet received there. Hoping that the result I have indicated will be obtained, I will support the motion of the hon. gentleman in favour of the proposed test.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole and reported the said Resolution.

MR. BABY introduced a Bill (No. 123) To amend the Act respecting the inspection of Petroleum.

Bill read the first time.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK BILL.

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

FIRST READING.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY, in moving for a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, said: It will be remembered by hon. gentlemen that one of the conditions in regard to this matter was that a guarantee of 5 per cent. on £100,000 should be given for ten years for the construction of the dock. On the application of the British Government to the Government of the Dominion in 1873, it was agreed that \$250,000 should be given in lieu of that guarantee. By an Act passed in the 37th year of Her Majesty's reign, chap. 27, advances were authorised to be made by the Governor-General in Council to the Province of British Columbia out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for the construction of such Graving Dock, upon certificates of the progress of the work, to an extent not to exceed in the whole the sum of \$250,000, in lieu of the aforesaid guarantee of the interest. The Government of that Province commenced work some two years since, and they expended about \$180,000. They have recently entered into an additional contract with a party to complete the work by taking over the material the Government had on hand, and the work which had been performed, which is valued at something like \$200,000. The contract for the completion of the work is, I think, a little under \$400,000.

MR. BLAKE: \$400,000 more money!

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes; in addition to the \$180,000 that has been

expended. The Imperial Government have agreed to contribute towards the cost £50,000 sterling. Application has been made to, and is now under consideration of, the Imperial Government for a sum in addition to the £50,000, but no additional concession has been made in that direction up to the present time. A representative of the Local Government of British Columbia was in Ottawa in December last, and he brought the whole matter under the consideration of the Government. An Order in Council was passed upon the recommendation of the Finance Minister, which is as follows:—

“The undersigned has the honour to report that he has had under consideration despatches received from the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia, on the subject of the advances proposed to be made by the Dominion Government for the construction of the Graving Dock at Esquimalt, and that in order to arrive at a settlement of the question, he has had several interviews with the hon. the Attorney-General of the Province, who has been deputed to confer with the Dominion Government in connection with the same subject.

“The undersigned has given the subject his most careful consideration, and now begs leave to state that, in his opinion, it is desirable to modify the Order in Council of the 13th November last, and to substitute one in accordance with the following provisions and conditions:—

“Firstly, The hon. the Attorney-General having stated that the plans and specifications of the Dock, prepared by Messrs. Kinniple and Morris, of London, England, have been left for inspection with the Department of Public Works, and are those upon which tenders have been invited. The undersigned recommends that advances be made to the Province as the work progresses, to an extent not to exceed in the whole the sum of \$250,000, such advances not to include the value of any material or plant already obtained by the Provincial Government for the purposes of the Graving Dock.

“Secondly, That such advances be made on the certificate of the Engineer of the Provincial Government, countersigned by the Agent of the Dominion Government in British Columbia.

“Thirdly, That in case the Government of British Columbia should fail, from any cause, to proceed actively with the construction of the work for a period of three months after the receipt of a written request from the Dominion Government to prosecute the same, then that the latter shall have the right to enter upon and take possession of the works and premises, and complete the same.

“Fourthly, That in case of such entry, the Canadian Government shall be entitled to claim and receive from the Imperial Government the promised grant in aid of £50,000 sterling, or any increase of such grant. It is understood that if any balance of such grant in aid should remain unexpended after defraying the outlay made by the Dominion Government in conse-

quence of the failure, as aforesaid, of the Province, such balance shall be paid to said Province; while, on the other hand, if said grant in aid should prove insufficient to complete the works, the amount of the deficiency shall be placed to the debit of the debt account of the Province. It is further understood that the right of property in the Dock shall, subject to the temporary right of possession, as before mentioned, remain in the Government of British Columbia.

“Fifthly, That the Imperial Government shall be made a party to this arrangement, and its approval obtained.

“Sixthly, That the sanction of the Legislature of British Columbia be also obtained to this agreement.

“Seventhly, That, subject to the foregoing conditions, the advances so made of \$250,000, shall not bear interest, and shall be considered as a grant of money in lieu of the 12th Article of the Terms of Union between Canada and British Columbia.

(Signed) “S. E. TILLEY,

Minister of Finance.

“FINANCE DEPARTMENT,

“February 11th, 1880.”

That is now before the House for approval. It is considered desirable that the Dominion Government should have some guarantee that as they advance this money as the work progresses that the guarantee should not be discontinued, and that if the Local Government should cease to complete the work, the Dominion Government should be able to take the money to be received from the Imperial Government, and if there is any balance left after it is completed, that it should be paid over to the Local Government, or if the expenditure exceed the amount to be received from the Imperial Government, the balance shall be subtracted from the amount due the Province of British Columbia. In order to make that secure, the assent of the Local Government and of the Imperial Government is required.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have a very serious objection to this amount being paid in the way suggested. The practical result of this motion is that we are to pay as a free grant £50,000, or a sum equal to \$250,000, to British Columbia. After due consideration of the matter, I am unable to see why we should do it. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in office in 1873, by an Order in Council, a few days or weeks, or at any rate, a very short time before they went out of office, provided for the substitution of advances in

money, in lieu of the guarantee provided by the Terms of Union. Now we have to consider what this guarantee meant; it meant simply this: that we were to endorse the bonds of British Columbia to a certain extent, and for a certain time, for the money to be raised by them for building this Graving Dock; we were not to hand out any sum from the Treasury of Canada; we were simply to endorse their bonds, to enable them to get a loan on cheaper terms than they could upon their own security. However, the hon. gentlemen opposite were in a strait in September 1873. Something in the shape of political support led to that Order in Council, by which it was provided that advances might be made in lieu of the guarantee. The Chief Officer of Finance, then Mr. Langton, stated that it was not contemplated that this money should be paid as a free grant to British Columbia, but that we were simply to advance the money which was to be charged against the balance of the debt. Accepting that definition of the Order in Council, we felt it incumbent upon us, in 1874, to confirm the arrangement by Act of Parliament. In the meantime, when the Act was passing through the House, the British Columbia representatives wanted to have it altered so as to provide for it being made a free gift. I refused such a modification. They then applied to the hon. the former Minister of Finance, who was at that time Governor of the Province of New Brunswick, and he furnished them with a certificate or letter that such was his intention. But whether it was his intention or not the Order in Council did not bear that interpretation. The hon. the Minister of Finance adheres to that interpretation of it; but if he wanted to make a gift, his Order in Council should have been worded differently. However, we have now a direct proposition to set the matter beyond all doubt by declaring it to be a free gift. Why this Dominion should, in consequence of this Columbian Union, assume another burden of \$250,000, in addition to the other burdens imposed upon us, is beyond my comprehension. There is no possible justification for it. Why should we build a Graving Dock at Esquimalt or Victoria any more than at Halifax or Quebec? I protest most earnestly against such an act, because it

was not originally intended that we should incur this cost. If it were intended it was wrong; and further, we will, by assuming this obligation, not only have the present cost of \$250,000, but afterwards the dock will very likely fall upon our hands, and we shall have to maintain it or allow it to go to destruction. For these reasons—unless British Columbia will prefer us to charge the expenses against their subsidies, although wrong to undertake that in 1873—I object most strongly to the passage of these Resolutions.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The hon. gentleman says that, in 1873, and at a time when he supposes there must have been some influence brought to bear, the Government agreed to a certain proposition which he does not approve of. If the proposition were such a proposition as the hon. gentleman has referred to, I should like to know what objection there could be, when, in fact, it was simply an advance out of the Dominion Fund of \$250,000, which British Columbia was entitled to.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, no.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Under an Act that the hon. gentleman himself brought in, there was a provision by which any Province might receive advances on account of their debt, and there could be nothing wrong in the Government paying \$250,000 to British Columbia under that Act without the conditions contained in the other Act.

MR. MACKENZIE: It was simply to be a guarantee.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The Government of British Columbia pressed the Dominion, stating that they were anxious to build the dock, but could not obtain the means necessary for its construction; but if the proposition that was made and accepted was simply to advance them their own money, there could be nothing extraordinary in that, absolutely nothing to justify the remarks of the hon. gentleman that the Government were in particular straits when they entered into this agreement. I was written to a year or two afterwards, and I simply stated that what the Government intended was, that this \$250,000 was in lieu of the guarantee under the Terms of Union, and if you look at the Act you will find that

it was based on Resolutions similar to these.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then why was the British Columbia members so anxious to have the wording changed?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It was changed.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, it was not.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It is in pursuance of these terms and conditions—and the building of the dock having become necessary—that the Government have arranged to advance the \$250,000, with the approval of Parliament; and they now ask for that approval.

MR. DECOSMOS: The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) denied that he confirmed the agreement made.

MR. MACKENZIE: I did not deny anything of the kind. There was an Act to confirm an arrangement, but I deny that it was to give a free gift. The hon. members from British Columbia endeavoured to induce me to alter it; and the hon. the Minister of Finance wanted it as an absolute payment. That was what I said.

MR. DECOSMOS: He stated that he brought in an Act to carry out the agreement with British Columbia with respect to the dock. The hon. gentleman did bring in a Bill, and one of the clauses with respect to the dock was, that the money would be paid as dock work progressed, and be charged against the debt of the Province. I took exception to that clause of the Bill. Now allow me to go into this matter. In the year 1873, I came here and negotiated this matter with the Government led by the right hon. gentleman. It was agreed that \$250,000 should be paid to British Columbia, and that that sum should not be charged against the debt of the Province, but that it should be a bonus given to the Province in lieu of Article 12 of the Terms of Union. In 1878, before the General Elections, I took occasion to have this whole question placed on record, and, with the permission of the House, I will read part of the record. The first document is the following letter:—

“OTTAWA, November 3, 1877.

“DEAR SIR,—With respect to the conversation I had with you respecting the Dominion aid towards the Graving Dock, and your application to the Minister of Public Works upon the subject, I have consulted my colleagues, and we are prepared to submit to

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

Parliament a formal proposition to the following effect: That in lieu of the interest of £100,000 for ten years, which was secured by the 12th Section of the Order in Council, dated July 1st, 1871, we propose that advances should be made to you from time to time, upon certificates of the progress of the work, not on the whole to exceed £50,000 sterling.

“I have, etc.,

(Signed) “S. L. TILLEY.

“To Hon. A. DECOSMOS, M.P.”

I was here in 1873 to negotiate this matter, and I had also to go to England in order to negotiate another bonus for the Graving Dock from the Imperial Government. I waited upon the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Mackenzie) in that year, 1873, after he had become Premier, and subsequently I had the following letter from him:—

“OTTAWA, 14th November, 1873.

“MY DEAR SIR,—With reference to the proposal you submitted in behalf of the Government of British Columbia, namely, to advance £50,000 to aid in the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, in lieu of the guarantee of interest at five per centum on £100,000 for ten years, provided by the Terms of Union, I have to say that any change in the mode of aiding in the construction of the work, from that agreed to, will require the sanction of Parliament. I can only say, at present, that the Government will submit a measure to Parliament to carry out your proposal, or some scheme equivalent to that.

“I am, etc.,

“A. MACKENZIE.

“Hon. A. DECOSMOS.”

That letter was delivered to me by the hon. gentleman in the Executive Council Chamber. It was after the question of guarantee had been considered by the Chief Justice of Quebec (Mr. Dorion), then Minister of Justice, that this letter was given to me in the full faith and understanding that the advances meant nothing more and nothing less than a grant of money.

MR. BLAKE: Hear, hear.

MR. DECOSMOS: The hon. gentleman says “hear, hear.” If I mistake not, I saw the hon. gentleman when he was an ornamental member of the Ministry, stalking through the Privy Council Chamber whilst this matter was under discussion, and I also recollect the ex-Minister of Finance passing through there, and if the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries were here, I think he would not have the confidence of the hon. member for Lambton to stand up in this House and say that was not the real understanding between the late Govern-

ment and myself. Having mentioned the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I may state that he said to me before I received this letter: What will your other members do? Will they support the Government if they come down to Parliament with this grant? I said: Yes, they will; and to show that the members for British Columbia will support the Government on this grant, I will quote the statement of her representatives:

"OTTAWA, Nov. 11, 1873.

"British Columbia Representatives to the Hon. A. Mackenzie:

"SIR,—We fully agree with the proposal of the late Government to ask Parliament to grant to British Columbia £50,000 sterling, in lieu of the guarantee under the Terms of Union, for the construction of a first-class Graving Dock at Esquimalt, and now have the honour to say that, if the same be submitted by the present Government to Parliament for its sanction, it will receive our undivided support.

"We have, etc.,

(Signed), "A. DECOSMOS,
"E. DEWDNEY,
"J. S. THOMPSON,
"R. W. W. CARRALL,
"H. NATHAN,
"H. NELSON."

In this statement we do not ask for an advance. We said we fully agree with the proposal of the late Government, to ask Parliament to make this grant; and I believe in ordinary Parliamentary language "grant" does not mean a loan. After the difficulty between the hon. gentleman and the Government of British Columbia, when the terms proposed by Mr. Edgar had been refused, the hon. gentleman raised objections to carry out the solemn and deliberate agreement made by himself on behalf of the Government of the Dominion, and through myself on behalf of the Government of British Columbia. Allow me to draw attention to a telegram I received from this hon. gentleman on the 6th February, after I had returned to British Columbia from England. The question was raised in the Province at the time of the Election that the late hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Tilley) had not written the letter that I have read, which I believe was left by accident in possession of the hon. gentleman in the office of the Public Works Department. I telegraphed him to send me a copy of this letter, and I received the following despatch in reply:—

"OTTAWA, 6th Feb., 1874.

"Your telegram went astray. Government

offer is to pay (\$250,000) two hundred and fifty thousand dollars as dock work progresses, in lieu of guarantee provided by Terms of Union.
(Signed) "A. MACKENZIE."

MR. MACKENZIE: That is all right.

MR. DECOSMOS: That is all we want.

MR. MACKENZIE: We could not advance without pay.

MR. DECOSMOS: That will not pass muster.

MR. MACKENZIE: You will find it will.

MR. DECOSMOS: I find that it will not. When I brought this matter before the House, in 1878, the hon. gentleman worked himself up into a huge fidget, and wanted to know privately why I had brought this matter up, but he could not and did not say a word against one of the documents I had produced. He did not get up in this House and say the statement was untrue, and I challenge him now that if he would allow some of his Privy Council to be put on oath, I will prove it at the Bar of the House, and I believe those hon. gentlemen will state there was a deliberate agreement that the Province should receive that money as a bonus.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have no objection to the hon. gentleman taking evidence in any way he likes.

MR. DECOSMOS: On February 6th, I received this telegram, stating that the hon. gentleman would pay this money. I made my report to the Government of British Columbia on the 2nd February, 1874, four days before the receipt of this telegram:

"As a matter of record, it may here be stated that the nature of the guarantee in Section 12 of the Terms of Union respecting the Graving Dock, was considered during the negotiations with Mr. Mackenzie, and that the decision was that the £50,000 sterling in lieu of the guarantee of interest, in Section 12 of the Terms of Union, should be given to the Province as a grant or bonus, and was not to be charged as a debt against the Province."

More than that, however, the hon. gentleman said the Auditor-General said this was an advance. Now, in the presence and in the office of the ex-Minister of Finance, Mr. Langton said he never made such a statement to the hon. gentleman, and that if he had made any statement whatever with respect to the negotiations, it was with relation to taking over the

difference between the actual and the allowed debt of the Province, and that he knew nothing about the other matter. Further than that, when our members gathered around the hon. member for Lambton on the floor of the House, to insist upon the proper wording of the Bill for aid to the Graving Dock, by insertinig that it was given as a bonus, the hon. gentleman stated that, if it could be shown that the agreement of the late Government was to pay this money as a bonus, he would pay it over. I wrote to Lieutenant-Governor Tilley, now the hon. the Finance Minister, and received the following reply:—

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“FREDERICTON, 28th May, 1874.

“DEAR SIR,—In reply to your communication of the 23rd inst., I beg to state that the £50,000 sterling agreed to be advanced to the Government of British Columbia towards the Graving Dock, was in lieu of the facilities secured for that purpose under the Terms of Union. I cannot see how there could be any misunderstanding in the matter, as my letter of the 3rd November, 1873, appears sufficiently definite, and the Act just passed cites the conditions in the first section.

“I have the honour to be, dear Sir,

“Yours faithfully,

“S. L. TILLEY.

“To Hon. A. DeCosmos, M.P.”

Inasmuch as some doubt might arise on this matter, as to the meaning of this letter, I sent a telegram:

“OTTAWA, 2nd June, 1874.

“Your letter of May 28th and telegram of May 29th received, and I understand them to mean that the £50,000 sterling, promised to be advanced in aid of the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, was to be a gift to British Columbia in lieu of Section 12 of the Terms of Union. Is that your meaning?

(Signed), “A. DeCosmos.

“To His Excellency Governor S. L. TILLEY, Fredericton, N.B.”

And I received this answer:

“ST. ANDREWS, 3rd June, 1874.

“£50,000 sterling was not to be charged to debt, but given in lieu of guarantee Graving Dock. Thought my letter explicit.

(Signed), “S. L. TILLEY.

“To Hon. A. DeCosmos.”

In order to have still further evidence to place before the hon. gentleman on his second agreement, in the presence of the members for British Columbia, I wrote to the hon. the

Minister of Public Works, and received the following reply:—

“QUEBEC, 1st June, 1874.

“MY DEAR MR. DeCosmos,—Your letter of the 29th of May has just reached me. In answer, I have no hesitation to say that the Government to which I belonged promised to grant to British Columbia, as a bonus, the sum of £50,000 sterling in lieu of the guarantee contained in the 12th Section of the Terms of Union. We were convinced that British Columbia could not build their Graving Dock with that guarantee; and inasmuch as the intention of both parties to the Terms of Union was to secure that Graving Dock, we thought it but just to replace it by such a sum as would secure it to your Province, British Columbia and Great Britain contributing their share, or British Columbia supplementing the balance. Of course this sum of £50,000 sterling was not to be an advance of money, but a bonus in place of the guarantee. We knew we would have to obtain the sanction of Parliament to such an arrangement, and we told you we would do so. I am very positive about these negotiations, inasmuch as I was conducting them, chiefly, previous to the return of Mr. Tilley from England. I hope the above will prove satisfactory, and remain, my dear Mr. DeCosmos,

“Yours very truly,

“HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

“Hon. A. DeCosmos, M.P.”

Now, with the letter and telegram of Mr. Tilley, with the letter of the hon. Mr. Langevin, I attempted to place this matter before the hon. member for Lambton, then the Minister of Public Works, but he was impatient, and would not listen to an explanation. I then went to the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and if the Sessional Papers were produced it would be found that I enclosed those letters to the Secretary of State, stating that he might take a copy, providing that he would return the original; and I sent those letters in at the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But no action was taken by the Government, except the return of the original. Subsequently I went to the hon. the Minister of Finance, and it was on that occasion Mr. Langton was brought in, when he said he knew nothing of this transaction whilst Mr. Tilley was in office. He (Mr. Cartwright) recommended that the Province take the \$250,000, and fight out the question afterwards—that it would be better to take the money, and leave it to be determined in the future whether it was a bonus or not. I told him that neither I nor the Province would

accept it on any such terms—that there was an agreement, and if the Government wanted to repudiate it they could. The hon. member for Lambton did repudiate it, and told me in his own office that it was not his intention to give this money, and that it was only to save us the interest, between 5 and 6 per cent., or 1 per cent. on the sum, \$250,000. That was his last excuse, when he wanted to shirk the agreement. His course in this transaction left me open to the charge of stating an untruth, and when I made that statement to him, in 1878, he said: "I do not wish to charge you with untruth or question your veracity in any way." Some of the hon. member's friends asked me why I brought this matter before the House, and I said because I wanted to place the whole facts before the country, and to show that we had made a final agreement for \$250,000, and that it had been repudiated in the face of a multitude of evidence that proved indisputably that I was right, and that the position taken by the hon. gentlemen was a violation of the agreement. When I returned from England, I called upon the hon. gentleman, and he wanted to know how I got along with the negotiations with Mr. Goschen. I told him that I stated to Mr. Goschen that, in joining the Confederation, we surrendered certain rights and certain sources of revenue to the Dominion, and that one of the conditions of the surrender was that a guarantee should be given us for the construction of the Graving Dock, and that this money was to be given in lieu of this guarantee. The hon. member for Lambton said: "Not wholly," and I said: "Not wholly," it is the difference between the capitalisation of the guarantee at 5 per cent., and the \$250,000. That is what the hon. gentleman meant by "Not wholly." I think there were some warm words between us at the time about other things. At any rate, I state here, on my honour as a man and a member of this House, that a deliberate agreement was made between the hon. gentleman and myself, that this money should be given from time to time as the work progressed, and that it should not be charged against the debt of British Columbia.

MR. MACKENZIE: I never heard of such an agreement, and I utterly deny it.

MR. DECOSMOS: Then the hon. gentleman denies that which is true.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole and reported the Resolutions.

MR. BLAKE: The original arrangement between British Columbia and Canada, as appears in the Terms of Union, was that Canada should guarantee interest at 5 per cent. on £100,000 sterling for ten years, for the purpose of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt. That, of course, involved no charge on the Dominion Treasury, except in case of the insolvency of British Columbia; and British Columbia having in the hands of Canada a very large sum to her credit, on her debt-account, it is perfectly clear that Canada was perfectly secure in respect to that guarantee. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) has stated, in the course of this discussion, that this claim makes itself up in this way: He said you guaranteed us 5 per cent. for ten years on £100,000; that amounted to a guarantee in the gross, payable by instalments, of £50,000 sterling, which, capitalised, would be about \$190,000; so you ought to pay us £100,000 and the difference between that and \$250,000 and interest. I entirely deny it, and assert we did not agree to any assumption of the interest, or to pay the interest on £100,000. We agreed only to guarantee the interest. The obvious intention was that the bonds of British Columbia for £100,000 should be issued in order to raise funds for the Graving Dock, the negotiation of the bonds to be facilitated by the interest thereon for ten years being guaranteed by Canada. But the interest was to be paid by British Columbia; it was a charge on British Columbia, and no ultimate charge on the Canadian Treasury was contemplated by this provision in the Terms of Union. Now it is conceded that any alteration in that arrangement involving an entire charge, or a further charge, contingent or absolute, on the Dominion Treasury could take place only by an Act of Parliament. It is alleged that an understanding was come to in the dying hours of the Administration which preceded the late one, and a bargain made whereby the Government agreed

to submit to Parliament a scheme substituting the payment of \$250,000 to British Columbia, in lieu of this guarantee—that is the allegation at present. The language of the then, and present Finance Minister, in the letter he wrote to the member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos), does not, in my view, bear that construction. I do not understand that an advance means gift. I think the interpretation the word bears is a repayment. Repayment of an advance is the ordinary phrase used, and, therefore, there can be no doubt that the word does not, of itself, plainly—I think not at all—indicate that there was to be a free gift of £50,000 in cash to the Province, in lieu of the guarantee, which would involve no legitimate charge on the Treasury of the Dominion. Then there is another allegation, that the Administration which succeeded the first Canadian Administration, undertook to carry out the agreement of its predecessor with British Columbia, namely, that this amount should be made a free gift. That was denied. The Act then brought in uses precisely the same word “advance,” and during the discussion on that occasion there appeared a doubt in the minds of the British Columbia members as to whether they should get this difference, but there was no attempt made to alter the language of the measure. Parliament did not agree to make this a free gift. It is now proposed, for the first time, to substitute a free gift of \$250,000 in lieu of the guarantee of £5,000 a year for ten years on the loan required for the dock. The hon. the Finance Minister says that British Columbia has expended \$180,000 on this work, and has contracted for its completion at \$400,000 more; that the Imperial Government is to give £50,000 towards it, and Canada \$250,000 more, making, for both, a contribution of \$500,000, and the total cost \$580,000. The practical result is that this Graving Dock is to be built by England and Canada, with the exception of \$80,000 to be contributed by British Columbia. That is the proposal at present. It does not seem to me that any ground has been laid why Parliament should determine to give £50,000 for this purpose. It is an obvious increased charge in connection with the Terms of Union with British

Columbia. These charges are believed to be, by the large majority of the people, enormously too onerous as they stand without any additional charge. I move, therefore, in amendment:

That all the words after “That” be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—
“The Terms of Union with British Columbia, provided only for a guaranty of interest for ten years, in respect of part of the cost of the British Columbia Graving Dock.”

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I greatly regret that my hon. friend from West Durham has made this motion, and still more greatly regret the remarks made by the hon. member for Lambton. I think it unjust and unfair to British Columbia, and, coupled with the action of hon. gentlemen opposite, with respect to British Columbia, it cannot but be considered as a deliberate attempt to drive her out of the Union—to insult and injure that Province, that, out of regard to her material interests and self-respect, and to the position of her people, as an aggregation of British subjects, they should have no other course but break up the Union. I grieve to think that party objects—because I cannot conceive that hon. gentlemen opposite are actuated by objects of economy—should induce the member for Lambton to abjure and repudiate the agreement which, according to the statement of my hon. behind me (Mr. DeCosmos), he and his Government deliberately made with British Columbia, not only to advance, but pay this money to her. I cannot but believe that the House and country will reject with indignation the course taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite. What are the facts of the case? British Columbia arranged with the Dominion that she should guarantee, for ten years, 5 per cent. interest upon a sum not exceeding £100,000 sterling, as might be required for the construction of a first class Graving Dock at Esquimalt. The hon. member for West Durham says we had security in our own hands that the guarantee involved repayment. It was nothing of the kind. We were to guarantee that five per cent., and, if the profits of the dock were sufficient to pay the interest, our guarantee was gained. If it was not sufficient, we were to pay it. That was the common sense of

it—the real, honest and honourable understanding.

MR. BLAKE : That was never stated.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The British and Indian Governments have, again and again, guaranteed to the shareholders of the Indian railways a certain percentage of profit or interest, the guarantee merely meaning this—if the profits of the railways reached the percentage the Government was free, if they did not the Government would make up the deficiency. They have no recourse afterwards against the railway, the shareholders or the work. The honest, fair, common sense arrangement was made. The dock was rather a grave undertaking for British Columbia with its sparse population and scanty means, being necessary for the military and commercial interests of the Dominion on the Pacific. It was absolutely necessary, in the interest of a Canadian Pacific commercial fleet, that we should have such a dock, and, therefore, we agreed to guarantee those bonds, and if the emoluments from the work would not pay the whole of the 5 per cent. we were to pay the balance or deficit. Now hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to repudiate that bargain. It is enough to make one blush with shame, the sight of any statesmen taking that course, men professing to be upholders of the credit of Canada. The work could not be completed by British Columbia; it was found the money necessary could not be raised on that guarantee, and we knew it was more than doubtful that a work so difficult in its inception could recoup us for the interest we paid. We felt that our engagement to guarantee the interest for ten years was equivalent to a promise to pay 5 per cent. for that time; and, therefore, as we wished to have this great work finished, instead of paying £5,000 a year for ten years, we agreed to pay in advance £5,000 a year as the work progressed. There can be no doubt as to our intention. It was shown by the telegram of the then and present Finance Minister, and by the letter of the then and present Minister of Public Works, we desired the construction of the dock, when it was certain a mere guarantee would not effect that object. The arrangement was made, perhaps, as alleged by the hon. member for West Durham in the dying hours of the Admin-

istration which preceded the last; but it was made to carry out honourably the bargain with British Columbia. But in 1878, before the Elections, what happened? Then political considerations might be supposed to have actuated the hon. member for Lambton. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) then, in his statement, went into the matter at greater length than to-day. He narrated all his conversations with the hon. member for Lambton, and stated that that hon. gentleman had agreed it should be a payment. It will be seen from the *Hansard* that although that statement was made in presence of the late Premier, and corroborated by another hon. member from British Columbia, the motion was unanimously carried, and not a single word in denial, explanation or refutation was uttered by that hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, when told that the money was a gift and not a loan to British Columbia, admitted it as plainly as man could admit a statement made to his face, in relating his own conversation, and going into a long detail of the circumstances connected with this obligation. And yet, to-day, he denies it, repudiates it, and disputes the accuracy of the statement of the hon. member for Victoria. The telegram of the hon. gentleman is specially remarkable. It appears that by some accident the hon. member for Victoria had left behind him the letter of the hon. the Finance Minister, in which he distinctly stated the money was to be a payment. The letter reads as follows:— [*Vide* p. 1926.] That letter states distinctly that the grant to British Columbia was a bonus and not a loan.

MR. BLAKE : No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Your telegram, that went astray, states that the Government is to pay \$250,000 as the work progresses, in lieu of the guarantee, as provided by the Terms of Union. There is not a word about a loan. The hon. gentleman knew what the hon. gentleman behind me wanted. He knew that he wanted a statement that it was a bonus and not a loan; he could not be mistaken about that. It was urged upon him; he knew perfectly well that British Columbia, as one man, said it was to be a bonus and not to be a loan, that a mere loan would be of no value to them, and that it was not to be a payment, if it was

not to be a bonus it would be of no value to them. The then First Minister declared that the Government offered to pay \$250,000 in lieu of a guarantee, a corroboration on that point which cannot now be gainsaid without dishonour. It was a pledge by that Government to pay this money instead of to loan it. My hon. friend behind me has stated now, as he stated before, that in conversation with the hon. member for Westmoreland (Sir Albert J. Smith), then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the latter asked him what support was to be got? how the members for British Columbia would go?

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting us on that particular question—not to support the Government, but upon that particular vote.

MR. DECOSMOS: The ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked me if the members for British Columbia would support this particular vote. I said I would prove to him and the Government that they would, and I then made this statement.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Then came the Act of 1874, to carry out the arrangement. I would like to have the hon. member for West Durham—sitting as a judge in this matter and not making the motion—give his opinion on this point. I have every confidence in his judgment, and I do not think there would be any necessity for appealing from it. Now this Bill, introduced on the 26th of May, 1874, by the hon member for Lambton, as First Minister, I think has two clauses. The first clause applies to this advance of \$250,000 to British Columbia; the second clause provides for advances made to other Provinces. The first clause is absolute in its terms. The hon. gentleman says advances mean loans. Now, I take it that no Court, no dictionary, will say that advances mean loans. Advance means payments in advance. A loan is to be repaid; an advance is simply a portion of a sum of which the rest is to be paid when the work is done. That, I take it, any Court would view it to be *ex necessitate*. A loan is one thing, an advance before the work is done is a different thing; but the construction of this Statute does not depend upon that. In the first clause, which applies to the advance of \$250,000, there is an absolute provision that the money

shall be advanced; while the second clause provides that to any Province any sums may be advanced on condition of repayment, on condition that it be taken out of the Annual Subsidy. There is, in fact, no necessity for the first clause, as regards British Columbia; it might be struck out altogether, because the second clause provides that any Province may get an advance of \$250,000, or any other sum that may be agreed upon, if it is charged upon the subsidy. The amendment before you, Sir, to-night, would be equal to dishonour, to repudiation. It would be doing a great injustice to British Columbia, which is not going to be treated as a spoiled child and subjected to every kind of injustice, as manifested by the whole course of hon. gentlemen opposite, with reference to that Province. But I know British Columbia will survive all that. I know that the Graving Dock will be built, and that a few years hence those who are now attacking that Province will regret that they have done so, and they will wish that they had taken the advice of the philosopher: "Let no man prophecy until he knows."

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman had better take this lesson to himself, as he made a prophecy in the last sentence he uttered. It is natural that the hon. member for Victoria (Sir John A. Macdonald) should get himself in a heated passion about this matter. That is his constituency, he is working for his votes. I am not at all sure but the hon. gentleman should be prevented from recording his vote on this question, as being an interested party. The hon. gentleman imputes all sorts of evil motives to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. That is getting to be his habit. He ought to know that we are just as capable of being loyal to the Confederation as he is. He ought to know that every public man in this country has got as much interest in the country as the hon. gentleman, who abuses every man who differs from him. What right has he to cast imputations on us for the views we take of public affairs? The hon. gentleman is endeavouring, by his whole policy, to create a feeling against British Columbia. It is he who, by his extraordinary conduct in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, is labouring to create an impression in British Columbia

that the people in the east are hostile to them, when they are only loyal to themselves. It is he who is endeavouring, by his policy, to set British Columbia above all law, who has set the interests of the Province he represents so ably above all other interests in the country. If there should be such a feeling, as he says is getting abroad, he will have himself to blame for for it, in asking, in the first place, for British Columbia extraordinary privileges, and in the next place, endeavouring to force all the other Provinces, by his official wand, to come under his dictation, and do whatever is wanted for that Province. As to what the hon. gentleman says, respecting my messages and conversations, I cannot pretend to recollect any conversation I have had, but I am certain that my conversations were in unison with the view I took of the Order in Council of October, 1873. The Act of Parliament we passed proved this, and that I could not have done, or said, anything less, and what was not consistent with that Act. The use of the word "pay" in the telegram, instead of the word "advance," is a mere verbal alteration and means nothing. Whatever money we advanced we did as a matter of course, expecting it to be repaid. Why should we have intended to make a gift of \$250,000 without any consideration for it? Why should we not, on the same ground, pay for the Graving Dock at Quebec, and pay for graving docks elsewhere? But, as I said before, we are not only providing for the payment of this as an absolute gift to that Province, but we are assuming other obligations. One of the Resolutions reads:

"That in case the Government of British Columbia should fail, from any cause, to proceed actively with the construction of the work, for a period of three years after the receipt of a written request from the Dominion Government to prosecute immediately the work, then the latter shall have the right to enter upon and take possession of the works and complete the same."

That is we are encouraging British Columbia to take such a course as to compel us, if she wishes, to complete them ourselves. I have only to say that I look upon the whole proposition as unjustifiable; and the evidence of Mr. Langton, as to what he understood when the Order in Council was drawn up in 1873, was, in my opinion, quite conclusive as to the

intention of the Government at that time, although they may have veiled it in language for the purpose of working an impression which it was not intended to convey.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The hon. gentleman asks why should we pay this? He asks why should we give \$250,000 to British Columbia over and above the amount that was proposed to be given? In the first place, that is begging the question. The proposal to give \$250,000 was simply to carry out the agreement which was perfectly well recognised on both sides. Did the hon. gentleman suppose, when he came to negotiate with British Columbia in reference to this matter, that the guarantee of interest would be repaid by the Province out of the profits on the dock? I will undertake to say that the hon. gentleman will not say that he expected the guarantee of interest would be repaid, and that he would not call for it because the profits of the dock would render it unnecessary.

MR. BLAKE: It would be a charge.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: It would be no charge because he undertook to guarantee the interest, to a certain extent, and that would be an absolute gift from the Dominion Treasury provided it was called for. The hon. gentleman cannot show a word in the undertaking that assumes that that guarantee of interest that is paid by the Dominion Government would be repaid from the British Columbia Exchequer. Let me answer the hon. gentleman on this question as to why he should do it. Why ought we to undertake the payment of so much money to be advanced as the work proceeded? There were two or three reasons. One was that it was found that they would not be able to perform the work with a guarantee of interest, and that it was necessary for its construction that the same amount, as was provided for in the former arrangement, should be advanced as the work proceeded. But there was another reason, I suppose, that induced the hon. gentleman to engage to spend \$4,000,000 for the construction of a road from Nanaimo to Esquimalt. The hon. gentleman knows there was great disappointment in British Columbia at the Terms of Union not having been carried out by Canada, and the only excuse the hon. gentleman

can have for having engaged to contribute so great a sum of money to construct a road which he was not called upon to build, was in order to allay the feeling of irritation that was excited, and in order to compensate British Columbia for the delay. Now I ask the hon. gentleman if it would be unreasonable to suppose that, when he put this Act upon the Statute-book, providing for a contribution of so large a sum of money, that he did not mean it should be something else than a loan? I assume that the hon. gentleman had some idea in his mind that it was desirable to meet the views of British Columbia, even a little outside the Terms provided in the Act of Union. The hon. gentleman wants to know why this \$250,000 should be given? Will he tell the House why \$750,000, were proposed by him—and acquiesced in by the member for West Durham—to be given to British Columbia in lieu of the construction of the Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway? There was nothing in the Act of Union which required it. Yet these hon. gentlemen did propose to take \$750,000, over and above any engagement that was made in the Terms of Union, to compensate British Columbia. So I answer the hon. gentleman by saying that this \$250,000 is less by half a million, is a third in fact of the amount of money which he proposed to take from the Exchequer of Canada to give to British Columbia. Although I am not a lawyer, I will undertake to say that, if common law is common sense, this law is common sense; and I challenge the hon. gentleman opposite to consider the terms of this Act, put upon the Statute Book by the hon. gentleman from Lambton, when at the head of the Government, and put any other construction upon it. The Act of 1874 says:

“1. In lieu of the guarantee of interest at the rate of five per cent. per annum, for ten years, from the completion of the works, on such sum not exceeding one hundred thousand pounds sterling, as may be required for the construction of a first-class Graving Dock at Esquimalt, as provided by the terms of the Order of the Queen in Council, for the admission of British Columbia into the Union; advances may be made from time to time by the Governor in Council, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for the construction of such Graving Dock, upon certificates of the progress of the work, such advances not to exceed in the whole, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

Now mark what follows. Read the next clause of this Act, and tell me if it will bear any other construction in the world than that it would be a contribution to British Columbia; than that it was to be paid by the Government and not to be repaid by British Columbia. The next clause provides that inasmuch as it is proposed to give to British Columbia \$250,000, so in like manner any other Province may have advanced to it such sum of money as may be agreed upon, providing that the debt which the Province was entitled on coming into Confederation will allow a margin on the advance. I will read the words of the Act:

“2. The Governor in Council may in his discretion advance from time to time to any Province of Canada, such sums as may be required for local improvements in the Province, and not exceeding in the whole the amount by which the debt of the Province for which Canada is responsible then falls short of the debt with which the Province was allowed to enter the Union,—such advances to be deemed additions to the debt of the Province, with permission to the Province to repay them to Canada, on such notice, in such sums and on such other conditions as the Dominion Government and that of the Province may agree upon; any amount so repaid being deducted from the debt of the Province in calculating the subsidy payable to it.”

Now, what does that mean? Does it mean that these advances are to be repaid by the Province receiving them? No member of the House will claim that, because we are advancing—and we have advanced, where the debt of the Province would permit it—that they are to be repaid. We have made advances in like manner to the several Provinces. Are they to be repaid? Not at all. The Act goes on to provide that, in case the Province wishes to return the advance to the Treasurer, it can be done, and that return shall be taken into consideration in calculating the amount of the subsidy. The amount payable to each Province was a fixed amount, an amount of 5 per cent. upon the balance of debt remaining due to the Province. And here it is provided distinctly, in so many words, that the other Provinces may receive that which they never were to be called upon to repay, but simply in reduction of their debt. I think it is impossible to read this Act without coming to the conclusion that the hon. the First Minister had then in his mind to place this on the Statute-book, for the

purpose of carrying out the engagement of the former Minister of Finance, to change this guarantee of 5 per cent. on £100,000 into an absolute contribution of \$250,000. I think that, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman must have had that on his mind, and it affords an explanation of the telegram he sent. I think, under these circumstances, that it is very desirable at this late hour, that an engagement entered into in good faith between the Canadian Government and British Columbia should not be treated as a question open to reconsideration.

MR. CASEY: If this Act of 1874 authorised the gift to British Columbia, what is the necessity for getting another Act now, or for introducing a series of Resolutions on which to found another Act. It is plain from the fact of the hon. gentleman having brought down these Resolutions, that they know the existing Act does not authorise the giving of that money. It is plain, also, that the hon. leader of the Government and his first lieutenant (Sir Charles Tupper), differ as to the meaning of the Act. The right hon. the Premier said that the case of British Columbia was made a special one, by the authorisation given in that Act to make "advances" to that Province without any special provision for repayment, while in the next clause provision was made for the repayment of advances to other Provinces. The other hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), held, on the contrary, that the Act authorised advances to the other Provinces on the same terms as to British Columbia, and that no repayment could be expected from any of them under the Act. This argument was drawn, forsooth, from the very clause which the right hon. the Premier held was a provision for reimbursing the Dominion out of Provincial Funds under its control. This was an inconsistency they must settle between themselves, but it showed the hollowness of the argument that a prior obligation to make this gift existed.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): When the question of the construction of the Pacific Railway was under discussion, I had no hesitation in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham; as I believed, and do still think, that, while perfect faith should be kept with British

Columbia, the true interests of the whole country would be best subserved by affording every facility for opening up the fertile prairies of the North-West for settlement, by constructing railways through them, as fast as this can be done, from the proceeds of the Public Lands, and by the efforts of those individuals or companies who are willing to furnish the means for so doing. This would secure to us such a large addition to the population and resources of the Dominion, as to enable us the more readily to pay for the much more difficult work of getting across the Rocky Mountains and down to the Pacific Coast. In carrying out this latter portion of the road, I think we ought to make haste slowly. In my judgment, the proposition now put forward by the Government, for the construction of the Esquimalt Graving Dock, is of an entirely different character; and as I have always understood that the interest on the £100,000, which the former Government were prepared to guarantee, must ultimately fall to be paid by the Dominion, I shall now vote with the Government

Motion made:

That the said Resolutions be now read the second time and concurred in.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

Motion in amendment made and question proposed:

That all the words after "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"the Terms of Union with British Columbia provided only for a guaranty of interest for ten years, in respect of part of the cost of the British Columbia Graving Dock."—(Mr. Blake.)

The House divided:—Yeas, 42; nays, 109.

YEAS:
Messieurs

Anglin	Gutherie
Bain	Huntington
Béchar	Killam
Blake	King
Borden	Laurier
Bourassa	Macdonell (N. Lanark)
Brown	Mackenzie
Burpee (St. John)	Malouin
Burpee (Sunbury)	Mills
Cameron (S. Huron)	Oliver
Casey	Olivier
Chandler	Paterson (South Brant)
Charlton	Rinfret
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Robertson (Shelburne)
Dumont	Rogers
Fiset	Ross (West Middlesex)
Fleming	Rymal
Flynn	Smith (Westmoreland)
Gillies	Thompson (Haldimand)

Gillmor
Gunn

Trow
Weldon—42.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott	Longley
Allison	Macdonald(Kings P.E.I)
Angers	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Arkell	McDonald(Cape Breton)
Baby	McDonald (Pictou)
Barnard	McDonald (Vict., N.S.)
Beauchesne	Macmillan
Bergeron	McCallum
Bergin	McCarthy
Bill	Macdougall
Bolduc	McGreevy
Boulbee	McKay
Bourbeau	McLennan
Bowell	McLeod
Brecken	McQuade
Brooks	McRory
Bunster	Merner
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Méthot
Carling	Mousseau
Cockburn (W. N'th'd)	Muttart
Colby	Orton
Connell	Patterson (Essex)
Costigan	Pickard
Coughlin	Platt
Coursol	Plumb
Daoust	Pope (Compton)
Dawson	Pope (Queens, P. E. I.)
DeCosmos	Poupore
Desaulniers	Richey
Desjardins	Robertson (Hamilton)
Doull	Rochester
Drew	Ross (Dundas)
Dugas	Rouleau
Elliott	Routhier
Farrow	Royal
Fitzsimmons	Ryan (Marquette)
Fortin	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Gault	Rykert
Gigault	Shaw
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Smith (Selkirk)
Grandbois	Sproule
Hackett	Stephenson
Hesson	Tassé
Hooper	Thompson (Cariboo)
Houde	Tilley
Hurteau	Tupper
Jackson	Wade
Keeler	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Kilvert	Wallace (West York)
Kirkpatrick	White (Cardwell)
Krausz	White (East Hastings)
Lane	White (N. Renfrew)
Langevin	Williams
Lantier	Wright—109.
Little	

Motion resolved in the negative.

Main motion agreed to.

Resolutions read the second time and agreed to.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 125) To confirm a certain Order of the Governor in Council respecting the Graving Dock at Esquimalt.

Bill read the first time.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

BRITISH COLUMBIA,

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. BUNSTER: The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington), tried to read me a lecture for demanding the rights of my constituents. I want to express my disapproval of this. I do not want the right hon. the leader of the Government to be under the impression that I have a bad feeling towards him. I am satisfied that when the time comes, and it is a good way off, when he will want us to stand by him, we shall send him back with double the majority he had last time. I hope the right hon. gentleman will always do us the same justice as he has done to-day; and as for the hon. member for Shefford, I do not intend to put up with his—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. BUNSTER: Order. I am in order; if I am out of order I would like to know how.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I feel my hands very much strengthened by the remarks of the hon. gentleman.

HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY'S CLAIMS.

REMARKS.

MR. SCHULTZ: Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct attention to the statement made in the Ottawa correspondence to the Toronto *Globe* of 30th April, which I will read:

"According to a Parliamentary Return in 1870, the Hudson's Bay Company preferred a claim against the Imperial Government to defray losses sustained by them during the Red River Rebellion, owing to the loss of five months' interest on the purchase money for the territory, by the plundering of goods at Fort Garry, and by the ransom paid to the Provisional Government for a stock of furs seized by them. The Imperial Government replied that they were not responsible, and the matter was afterwards continued by the Company's preferring the same claim against the Dominion Government. The Hudson's Bay Company assessed the losses sustained at £30,000 sterling. In 1877, Hon. David Mills, then Minister of the Interior, reported that the Canadian Government was not responsible for the losses, as the territory had not been transferred to them at that time, and was still in the possession of the Company. He suggested that it was desirable the Government should purchase the Company's remaining proprietary rights in the territory. The Hudson's Bay Company suggested that the whole question should be referred to the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council for settlement. This was acceded to, and the present Government, in June, 1879, asked the Company to

present a full statement of their case. This has now been done."

I wish to call attention to this statement for the purpose of eliciting what information I can regarding it, and, at the same time, of expressing a hope that if the claim of this Company has been referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England, it will not be forgotten that this country has a certain account of a \$1,500,000 which it cost us to put down the rebellion which was caused by officers of this Hudson's Bay Company, who are now pressing their claim for indemnity.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 83.]

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

THIRD READING.

Bill considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

The following Bill was, with leave of the House, withdrawn :—

Bill (No. 77) To facilitate the detention and safe keeping, in certain cases, of persons convicted in the North-West Territories or District of Keewatin, and sentenced to imprisonment.—(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

INVESTIGATIONS UNDER OATH BILL.
[BILL 113.]

(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT : Does the Bill empower the heads of Departments to summon parties who are not in the office ?

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) : It enables them to summon every person who may be able to give information in the matter to be enquired into. The Commissioner is authorised to issue his subpoena and the penalty for disobedience is \$400, enforceable in a summary manner before the Courts.

MR. BLAKE : The law may be a judicious one, if it is confined to enquiries into the conduct of public officers in discharge of their duties, so long as they are not charged with criminal offences, under the law of the land. It seems to me it would be an innovation of serious consequence, one which would hardly commend itself to Parliament or the country, if we were to permit enquiries in this

matter into matters which come under the law of the land. Two observations have occurred to me : First, that the law ought to be expressly so framed as that the power should not extend to any such investigations ; and second, that there should not, at any rate, be power to force the examination of the party charged. I think the hon. gentleman will see that the language is quite wide enough to enable an investigation to be held, providing that a person was charged with felony in connection with his duties, or powers which he performed in the execution of his office, and I do not think any such enquiry should be permitted.

MR. McDONALD : If the person were charged with felony, he would not be required to answer, and could not convict himself. Supposing a man was charged with the fraudulent appropriation of money, surely it would be a proper subject of enquiry to ascertain whether the charge be true. But the Commission will have no power to convict, but would recommend the Department to take legal proceedings and have the offender punished according to law. It seems to me the words of the Bill embrace only that view.

MR. ANGLIN : This is one of the measures which should have been introduced early in the Session, so that hon. members might have an opportunity to consider how far it was within the bounds of propriety. It seems to me a very startling proposition that the heads of Departments should have the power to compel subordinates to answer questions respecting any matter supposed to be offensive to the head of the Department, or against the public interest. Perhaps the hon. Minister can tell whether there is any such law in operation in England. I do not think there is any such law, and that the powers to be bestowed by this Bill are inconsistent with the whole spirit of the British Constitution and the administration of justice. Indeed I doubt whether we have power to create a tribunal of this kind.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : If the hon. gentleman's memory will carry him back two Sessions, he will find that, while he was Speaker, an Act was passed authorising the Auditor-General to do exactly what this Bill proposes to give the heads of Departments power to do. It

provided expressly that that officer, in relation to any matter or subject of audit in his Department, could confer the power to take testimony under oath, and he has the power to issue a Commission which enables the person investigating to take testimony under oath. The object of this Bill is to extend the same power to the heads of Departments. It is not for the purpose of inquisitorial investigation, but for a very different object. The necessity for such an Act was suggested by the complaints that are made against public officers. Complaints of a serious character, which, if true, would warrant the dismissal of an officer, are made to the Departments, and you are at present obliged to hold an *enquete* by a party who has no power to administer an oath, and who must receive the unattested statements of the parties making the complaint, who are often disposed to deprive the officer of his position. The effect of this Bill, if it becomes law, will be to enable the heads of Departments to authorise a Commissioner to take testimony in such cases. It is, in fact, a protection to the officer attacked, and a protection to which he is entitled.

MR. McDONALD: There is another precedent in the Act relating to Penitentiaries passed in 1875, which gives the Inspector power to investigate any irregularities, and examine witnesses under oath. Under that Act, in my capacity of Minister of Justice, I could appoint a Commissioner to visit any penitentiary to make an enquiry, and that Commission would not only have all the powers contained in this Bill, but power to commit to jail any person refusing to obey its summons.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: My impression is that the powers to which the hon. the Minister of Railways alluded, were conferred, if not in the precise words, in substance, by the former Auditor. If it was a new power it was transferred from the hon. the Minister of Finance to the Auditor-General.

MR. ANGLIN: The hon. Minister has referred to precedents, of the value of which I do not pretend to say anything just now. There seems to me strong room to doubt the propriety of this proceeding. There may be instances in which it is desirable to ascertain the truth or falsity of charges made against officers

employed at a distance from headquarters, but single instances do not justify wholesale proceedings; and I think hon. members must consider this a startling innovation on what we have been accustomed to regard as right and proper in such matters.

MR. MILLS: The purpose of this Bill is exactly the same as the Act providing for the appointment of a Royal Commission. The Government have a right to appoint a Commission, by Order in Council, to enquire into those matters. I do not know whether that power has proved inadequate or not, but I am not aware that any difficulty could arise out of the existence of the power conferred by that Act. If that has not been found sufficiently convenient for all practical purposes, why is there any necessity for this Bill, or if this Bill is necessary, why should that Act continue on the Statute-book? I can see no advantage to be derived from this Bill that that Act does not sufficiently provide for.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I wonder that my hon. friend did not think of that when he passed the Auditor-General's and the Penitentiary Bills. If those enquiries could be made as to any irregularity in the Penitentiaries, or as to the Public Accounts, under the general Act to which he refers, why were those Acts passed. But you can quite understand why the hon. gentleman drew the distinction. The general Act, which was introduced immediately after Confederation, provided that when any matter arose affecting the well-being of the Dominion, a Commission might issue under the Great Seal of Canada, and the Commissioners would have the power of taking testimony under oath. That was a very formal proceeding, and it established a tribunal somewhat in the nature of a preliminary impeachment. The hon. gentleman found it would be absurd that a Royal Commission should issue for all enquiries respecting the Penitentiaries, and the measure was therefore introduced, authorising the Inspector to examine witnesses and make the necessary enquiry. If the Speaker can do it *quoad* the Public Accounts, with the consent and advice of hon. gentlemen opposite, and if the Inspector of Penitentiaries can do it, surely the head of any Department should be able to do the same thing with-

out all the expense and formality at present necessary. I do not think it lies in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to oppose this Bill. If evidence of crime or a felony be discovered, there is only one thing to do—to send the offender to trial. But the preliminary investigation may be limited. Committees of the House of Commons have often held such investigations; they have reported irregularities, and have recommended to the Crown to order the Attorney-General to prosecute. There are an infinity of instances of this kind. So, here, if the head of any Department has to make an enquiry as to any irregularity, and a distinct case of felony appears, it can be reported for trial by the ordinary tribunals, by a recommendation of the prosecution of the offender.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria) : I understand the hon. member for Bothwell objects to the Bill on the ground that particular Ministers or Departments can only be responsible, while under the Royal Commission the whole Government are responsible for investigations. That objection has no foundation, because the Minister has only power to issue a Commission with the authority of the whole Government, while the Government is responsible for what is done by Order in Council. This Bill seems perfectly harmless, and one that, no doubt, in the administration of departmental duties, will frequently be found very effectual, and, as it is founded upon the authority and precedent of the hon. gentlemen opposite, I am in favour of it. I do not see any objection to its passing even at this late stage of the Session.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

(In the Committee.)

MR. BLAKE said he was not satisfied with the reasons given in support of the Bill. He did not think that the precedent of the Auditor-General's Bill was pertinent to the powers granted by this Bill. His substantial objection to it was that he did not think it would be regular or judicious, but contrary to our general dealings with criminal cases, to permit an enquiry to be entered upon or to proceed in an investigation when once we have touched a charge of crime. He could not agree with the hon. the Minis-

ter of Justice that this would be a useful preliminary enquiry. The law provided for preliminary enquiries. Once a man was believed to have committed a crime, he could be charged with it, then there would be a preliminary enquiry in open Court according to the rules of law. They were proceeding here a great deal further than in the Auditor-General's Bill—providing for a power that might be exercised with reference to some hundreds or thousands of persons. All the employés of the Civil Service would be almost, practically, at the discretion of the Ministers of the respective Departments. They ought, in such a general Act as this, having such an extensive operation, guard against such an injurious innovation as to permit enquiries to proceed in the way proposed by the Bill, once offences have reached the border land of crime. Irregularities in the conduct of business, misconduct, negligence or improprieties of various kinds, might be properly enquired into. Charges, not crimes in law, might be fit matters of investigation, the proof of the truth of which might result in censure or deprivation of office. For such offences a Commission might be right. But to render it possible that there should be a private enquiry of this description into matters which go beyond that line, and enter the territory of crime would be wrong. He would propose to add, after the words "as may relate to his official doings," the words "not, however, embracing any matters involving a charge of crime," or equivalent words. According to the British Constitution, there was but one mode in which men ought to be charged, preliminarily or otherwise, with crimes against the law, and that was in the ordinary process before the ordinary Courts.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou) said, if he understood the hon. member for West Durham, he was very much surprised at his doctrine. To say that an officer in the discharge of his public duty should be free from investigation as to his acts in any form whatever, was a surprising doctrine. According to the doctrine of the hon. member for West Durham, the moment a Commissioner examining the conduct of an offending official experienced the slightest suspicion of criminality on his part, he must stop, must not venture

to ask him such a question as "Have you taken public money, or committed any other crime calculated to bring you before a magistrate?" It was just at that moment the enquiry ought to begin. If it ought to begin it was important it should proceed. The investigation could pass no sentence, could inflict no penalty, but must report to the head of the Department the information required, and submit the question: whether it was desirable to proceed to the punishment of the accused? Suppose the Act did not pass, and that the head of a Department ordered an investigation, not under oath, into the conduct of any clerk, under a charge of the gravest character, he (Mr. McDonald) would ask whether the enquirer would have to stop or should go on and complete the enquiry, and report the result, and thus lead to the detection and punishment of the offender? He did not see the sense of stopping if the enquiry could discover guilt. All that could be effected by the Commissioner was a report.

MR. BLAKE said there was no reason why a Government officer should be exposed to peculiar disabilities and particular modes of trial in respect of crime which other subjects were not exposed to.

MR. McDONALD: They were not.

MR. BLAKE said those accused officers were exposed to exceptional treatment. The hon. the Minister of Justice thought he answered the whole argument by saying the Commissioner could not inflict punishment. But a preliminary enquiry, the examination of witnesses before a private Court—perhaps before persons not learned in the law, without counsel for the accused, might result in the conclusion of the question, and a decision by the Department that the charge was proved, leading to the discharge of the officer, because supposed to be proved guilty of larceny, embezzlement, or some other offence.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): He has his remedy.

MR. BLAKE: What is it?

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): An action at law.

MR. BLAKE: When he only holds office during pleasure.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): That is a point for discussion.

MR. McDONALD.

MR. BLAKE said the offender or accused might be dismissed for contumely in consequence of this action. The enquiry should pause when there appears to be an entry upon a personal crime. The hon. the First Minister mentioned the powers of Committees of the House; but they had power to investigate everything or anything they pleased, from which it did not follow that Parliament ought to authorise such persons as Ministers might appoint to hold preliminary enquiries into crimes. Those are things that ought to be done decently, and in order, and in accordance with general law applicable to all classes of subjects. As to the second Section, the hon. the Minister declared it was the intention of the Bill that there should be an examination before the Commissioner, who should not pass to evidence of crime, but proceed to complete the evidence, so far as necessary—not with a view to punishment, but to the completion of the evidence. Under those circumstances, it was a most extraordinary step to take power to examine any person, including the accused. The second clause ought not to contain power to extract from the accused the evidence of his own guilt—not merely of his misconduct as an officer, but of acts rendering him liable criminally.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that complaints had been made, for example, that, on the frontier, officers of the Customs had been conspiring with smugglers, and allowing goods to enter without duty, or at a nominal duty. They wanted enquiries in such cases, in the protection of the public Revenue, and particularly where public officers were in collusion with outside offenders. The smuggler would not give evidence, and therefore, an officer could be appointed under this Act, with the sanction of the whole Government, to call upon the suspected officials and examine all parties offending, by which means the offenders might be traced and the practice stopped. If an officer was shown to be guilty of such an offence, he could not be convicted before the Commissioner, because it was like all other enquiries under the Great Seal. It might result in tracing guilt home to a private individual, when all that could be done was to recommend his trial. But if

the object was not to bring home a particular crime to a particular individual, but in the public interest, to secure regularity throughout the Department, he could not conceive any real reason why it should not be adopted. The very fact that two other Bills, had been passed on the same subject, without any inconvenience arising from them, showed that there was no force in the objection of the hon. gentleman.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I do not think there is any difficulty whatever in this clause. It gives authority to the Commissioner to summon before him any person to give evidence. A witness is summoned to give evidence in relation to any matter which, at first, may not point him out, but which, in the result, may indicate him. The moment he goes before the Commissioner and is asked to give his evidence, he has only to say: I will not give evidence, because I am afraid my evidence will convict myself. He has the permission everyone has under the English law, of refusing to give evidence which may convict himself. Therefore, I think the objection of my hon. friend falls to the ground.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Bill reported.

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN DISPUTED TERRITORY (ONTARIO) BILL—[BILL 119.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): As I explained in introducing this Bill, its object is, during the pendency of the suit between the Province of Ontario and the Dominion Government, with reference to the jurisdiction of the disputed territory, to secure the punishment of any crime committed in the disputed territory, by authorising the trial of any one charged with crime either in Ontario or Manitoba. That will enable criminals to be tried irrespective of any question that might arise as to the jurisdiction of the Courts over the territory where the crime was committed. The Bill is on the same principle as the Act of 1813, referred to in the discussion with

reference to the boundary line. The Bill was drafted by the Attorney-General of Ontario and myself. I propose, if the House will permit the Bill to go into Committee, to engraft upon it the provisions of a Bill introduced by myself early in the Session. One amendment I propose to introduce will secure a more economical and speedy conviction and punishment of offenders against the law relating to the sale of spirituous liquors in our North-West Territory. Such criminals may be confined in jails in Manitoba or Ontario, if the magistrates think it advisable or more convenient. The fact, I believe, is, that along the line of Railway, in the Territory of Keewatin, there is only one jail, which was erected the other day, and magistrates had got into the habit of sending prisoners to Winnipeg. When the question arose, as it did the other day, they had no authority to do so, and several of these prisoners were discharged. The Bill is meant to overcome this difficulty. Instead of defining the disputed territory by metes and bounds, as it was in the schedule, I propose merely to state in the preamble: "Whereas, certain territory on the western and northern boundary of Ontario is claimed by the Government of Ontario as being within the said Province, etc." I think that is safer than to define the territory, because it might avoid difficulties in the future. For instance, suppose that the line running due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi should not be adopted either one way or the other, a difficulty might arise.

MR. BLAKE: I do not see how the hon. gentleman is going to obtain any jurisdiction by this Bill. Suppose Ontario claimed that the Province has these boundaries awarded by the arbitrators, and, apart from that altogether, suppose these may be the boundaries of the Province, then would this Bill have any force? Would this House have any right to legislate in this way? Could we legislate in any other part of Ontario as we propose to legislate here?

MR. McDONALD: I fancy the House has power to declare by Act that an offence committed in Ontario shall be tried in Quebec. There can be no difficulty about that. Then, as a matter of course, if an offence is committed in an

unorganised territory, we have the power to say where it shall be tried.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES LAW AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 120.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD: This Bill is for the purpose of enabling evidence in criminal matters to be taken as provided in the first clause. It is, to a large extent, a copy of the English law on the subject, and is for the purpose of obtaining the testimony in criminal matters of persons who are ill and likely to die.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. GUTHRIE: I desire to add the following clause:—

“Any Judge of Superior Courts of Law, and Judges of the County Courts exercising criminal jurisdiction, shall have the power to make any order in the foregoing sections of the Act.”

A doubt might arise as to whether a Judge of the Queen's Bench, sitting at Nisi Prius, is a Judge of criminal authority. I would, therefore, add a clause extending it to any of the Superior Courts.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I think if the amendment is confined to Judges of the Superior Courts, we shall have time to consider, before the next meeting of the Legislature, if we desire to extend it further. The amendment will be to the effect that any Judge of the Superior Courts of Law and Judges of the County Courts exercising criminal jurisdiction, shall have the power to make any order under the foregoing sections of this Act.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he wished to add an amendment which would specially provide for the legality of some evidence, which was now being taken, in a special case involving life. The evidence was being taken, in anticipation of the passage of this Act, in one of the Courts in Ontario—a case in which a person might die before the trial, and before, in fact, the passing of this Act. It was desirable, under the special circumstances of the case, that the evidence should be taken in accordance

with the law in force in England, namely, that a deposition taken before the trial may be read at the trial, in case of the death of the witness before the trial comes on. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) knew it was not desirable to make any law retroactive, but under the special circumstances of the case, he proposed the amendment he had referred to. The prosecution would have notice to attend the examination, and, therefore, no wrong could be done.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I hope no such provision will be passed. It would be against the principles of justice; it would be dangerous to adopt such a course. It would make evidence at the trial of that which, when taken, was not evidence according to law. The hon. gentleman says no wrong could be done, because the prosecution would have notice. But as the law does make such using of evidence legal, then it would not be incumbent on the prosecutor to attend an examination which may be worthless. I shall certainly ask the Committee not to adopt the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Kirkpatrick) negatived.

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported. House resumed.

(In the House.)

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply further considered.

On Resolution 166 (April 23), Indians of British Columbia, \$50,928.

MR. MILLS said he understood nothing had been done to give the Indians legal possession of their reservation. The Indians should be satisfied with reference to their claims on the reservation made to them, and he thought the appointment of Mr. Trutch was not a desirable one, if it was intended to allay feelings of distrust that had been created in the minds of Indians.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said a suitable man would be appointed as Superintendent of the Interior, and that the hon. gentleman might dismiss any fears about the Indians as they would be properly attended to.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

MR. McDONALD.

Resolutions 169 to 172 read the second time and agreed to.

Resolution 167 (April 27) read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 168, Agricultural Implements, etc., furnished under Treaties to Indians of Manitoba and the North-West, \$67,460,

MR. MILLS asked how the instructors had been received by the Indians; how many were farmers and agriculturists? He understood that a number of Indian tribes had refused to receive farmers sent to them. Had reservations been given to these parties within the Indian reservation, or were they given distinct tracts of land? He (Mr. Mills) heard that some of the gentlemen appointed were never engaged in agriculture before, and were not, therefore, likely to be successful in cultivating the soil. To take two or three Indians upon a farm, with the expectation that they would be taught agriculture, was, in his opinion, a mistake. He was of opinion there was only one way to make a success of this—that was for the instructors to go upon the reservations and have the Indians join with them in farming operations. The Indians, he might observe, had received pretty much all the agricultural implements, cattle, etc., that were promised them under the Treaties. We had been engaged feeding them a number of years, but now that many of them were upon the reservations, that would not longer be absolutely necessary. He had been told by one of the agents, that, very often, when the cattle were driven along for supplies, the Indians expressed regret that such animals were slaughtered, and said they would forego being fed if they were allowed to keep those cattle for agricultural purposes. He thought if the Government were to be at all successful in this experiment, the Indians would require to be aided to some further extent by grants of agricultural implements and cattle. This could be done and at the same time the annual appropriations could be diminished.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: As regards complaints being made by the Indians about the farm instructors, I can only say that, upon enquiry from the gentlemen chiefly responsible for that branch of the subject, I learn that not one single complaint or representation of that kind

has reached the Department. I think, therefore, my hon. friend has been misinformed. With regard to the statement that many of the instructors are not farmers, I can state that fifteen out of the nineteen were selected after a very strict enquiry as to their ability as farmers. I saw most of them—at all events the Deputy Minister saw them all—and discussed with them the whole subject of their duties before they started for the North-West. The others were appointed in my absence, but I have no reason to doubt that they were also good men. My hon. friend asks whether they live on the reservations. A small lot is set apart for the farmer contiguous to the reserve, so that it shall be the property of the Government, and the instructors should not intrude upon the property of the Indians. The instructor is there to teach them how to break up the soil, how to sow, reap and to plant. A man who merely walked among the Indians and directed them to do so and so, would not effect much. The whole thing is an experiment, however, and if it does not succeed, we can alter the mode of operations. I am told that the Indians have taken to the work in a remarkable degree, but, of course, there has not been time to learn much about the probable results of the experiment. I hope that, by 1881, whoever holds my place, will be able to give a favourable account. It is quite clear the experiment must be made. It is quite clear the ordinary supply of game is disappearing altogether, and the soil and the rivers and lakes for fishing are the only means of support left. Unless we want to sustain a nation of paupers, we must induce the Indians to cultivate the soil. An expensive effort is being made for the purpose, but it is better to feed them than fight them, and I know of no other way of doing this than the plan we have adopted. The complete disappearance of the buffalo has caused enormous destitution among the Indians. The hostile tribes have come into the country and are closely watched by the American troops on the south side of the border, who have driven back the buffalo in order to starve them out. Consequently, the buffalo has not been able to make their annual march to the north and supply our own Indians. The hostile Indians have suffered greatly, and if it had

not been that they are not masters of International Law, and have crossed the boundary wherever buffalo could be found, they would have been reduced to utter starvation. I am glad to say there is no evidence before me that would warrant me to state to the House that any actual deaths have taken place, but there has been great suffering from the famine that has spread over the whole western portion of that country. Public sentiment would not allow it, and no Government would be worthy of their position, if they allowed the Indians to starve as long as we have the means to feed them. The Government adopted the best means for relieving them. We were obliged to find food for them. In some instances, perhaps, the Indians have been fed when they might not have been in an extreme position of hunger or starvation, and I dare say there have been instances of imposition; but as far as I can learn the officers have exercised due supervision over the food supply. I must say, however, that it was a dangerous thing to commence the system of feeding the Indians. So long as they know they can rely, or believe they can rely, on any source whatever for their food, they make no efforts to support themselves. We have to guard against that, and the only way to guard against it is by being rigid, even stingy, in the distribution of food and require absolute proof of starvation before distributing it. I have no distinct information to give to the House, but I understand that a very considerable number of those Indians, who retreated into our country before the American forces, have surrendered and are now surrendering by degrees, and betaking themselves to the reserves provided for them in the United States. I hope it may be so, because those Indians are not only the cause of irritation—which we need not allude to particularly just now—but they interfere very much with our own Indians. They kill the game and occupy the country which belongs to our own Indians. I hope, in another year, we will be able to give a prosperous account of the progress of the Indians, but if not we must meet the case as best we may. We cannot allow those people to starve, and we must continue our efforts to save the Indian from himself.

MR. MILLS: The hon. Minister says

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that fifteen, at least, of the farm instructors are persons trained to farming operations. I have a list of those instructors, in which I find the name of F. L. Hunt, Winnipeg. This gentleman was formerly a resident of Michigan. He went to the North-West some years ago, and up to the time of his appointment was engaged upon some newspaper.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Perhaps it was an agricultural newspaper.

MR. MILLS: No, it was not an agricultural newspaper. Then, there is Mr. George Scott, of Georgetown, who, I am informed, was engaged in mercantile pursuits before he went to the North-West. He was a friend of the supporter of the right hon. gentleman, and I suppose he was recommended for this position. Then there is Mr. B. Sharon, of Brantford, whom I think was in a similar position. I am informed that neither of those gentlemen were ever engaged in agricultural pursuits.

MR. ROYAL: I happen to know Mr. Hunt, and the hon. member for Bothwell is rather mistaken when he criticises one of the few appointments, perhaps, that can be well defended, of the farm instructors. Mr. Hunt is a man of intelligence, understands farming, has been a resident of Manitoba for a number of years, is married to an Indian woman, and is familiar with the customs and the language of the tribes as well. I dare say that if there were more appointments like this, the experiment we are making in this direction would probably succeed to a larger extent. The farm instructor who cannot speak to the Indians in their own language, labours under the most serious difficulty; how can the teaching of husbandry, in its numerous and complicated details, be done with proficiency if it has to be done through the slow and incomplete agency of an ignorant interpreter? It is a matter of regret that farm instructors have not been chosen, for the greater part, from amongst the half-breed population in Manitoba and in the North-West Territory. Not that the knowledge of the Indian language is to be the only requirement of a farm instructor, for without strict principles of morality, without liberality and good-will, without the perfect understanding of his duties without the knowledge of intelligent farming, a farm instructor may do

great deal of harm if his only qualification is the possession of the Indian language. But I say that successful and clever farmers might have been selected from amongst the half-breed population, at a lesser cost and with a greater chance of success, than sending out indifferent Ontario farmers. While upon this very important subject, I will repeat what I have already stated, namely, that the Government cannot be too watchful of the experiment they are making just now. I believe the only way to civilise the Indians is through the good work of Christian missionaries. Religion can alone work this wonderful transformation. Let us not lose sight of the teachings of history in this respect. We must interfere in no way whatsoever with the labours of the missionary, but rather facilitate his sublime mission by all means in our power. And, Sir, experience shows on the other hand that to improve the Indian, to train him in habits of civilisation, we must begin when he is a child. So long as we do not take possession of the Indian child by our schools, by our various institutions, we shall work and spend money without any result. It is sheer folly to attempt to make farmers of the roaming bands of the plains. Necessity may force them, for the time being, to extract something from the soil, but they would rather eat their cows and oxen; and the day the buffalo will reappear, the plow will be at once left in the field, and you will see the baulky pupil of the farm instructor rush back to the wild pleasure of hunting. What is now needed in the North-West, is the teaching and the training up of the Indian children. Such an admirable work is being done already with success at St. Albert by devoted sisters of charity and missionaries. Why not take the means to extend and consolidate such an enterprise? I earnestly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will take such an important matter under their very serious and earliest consideration, and that in the solution of the grave problem of civilising the Indians, experience of what has been and is still being successfully done, will guide our experiments and direct our policy.

MR. BUNSTER said that the Indians of British Columbia were generally of a superior class to those from the interior part of the continent. They were intelli-

gent, and made good farmers. Many of them were educated in the Roman Catholic religion, members of which church had taken great pains in civilising them. Those Indians make a good class of settlers, but Chinese emigration was very obnoxious to British Columbia. He wished to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that the Chinese question was the great trouble, and Chinese emigration a great curse. It was the bounden duty of the Government and the people to put the Chinese out of the country.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I can understand the strong opinion the gentleman has respecting the Chinese, but we are now dealing with a horse of a different colour. We are discussing the question of red men, not yellow men. The Chinese question might come up next Session.

MR. BUNSTER: I accept the explanation of the right hon. gentleman.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said the hon. the Minister of the Interior promised information with reference to the number of tenders received for furnishing supplies under consideration, how many were received and considered for the delivery of the supplies at Winnipeg. He would like information with regard to the supplies required under Treaties Nos. 6, and 1 and 2. He understood that American breaking ploughs had been procured under this Treaty. This—the standard plough required—was an American plough or standard. Was it absolutely necessary that an American standard should be selected, or could they not make ploughs in Canada suitable to the purpose?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the motion made for the Return of all these tenders had not yet produced what was wanted. He imagined that it covered a great quantity of ground. The information which had been obtained would be submitted to-morrow. With respect to the American breaking ploughs, the advertisement was not at all for American made ploughs; he had called upon tenderers to give the lowest tender for ploughs of that pattern. Those who understood the matter declared that the experience of the Americans in breaking up the prairie soil, had made them adopt a certain kind of plough, which was far more

useful than any other, but they hoped that, under the fostering influence of the National Policy, Canadians would ere long make these ploughs themselves.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said that the attention of the Ministry ought to be specially directed towards securing suitable employment for the Indians. Mr. Dewdney, in one page of his Report, speaks of certain articles as of inferior quality. It would be outrageous to furnish these poor Indians with inferior tools. However, in this case, it does not appear that that was the fault of the contractor, yet he thought that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the late Government were very much impressed with the necessity of looking after the agents in matters of this kind.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the hon. member was quite right. There had been articles sent to the Indians of which the Indians had a right to complain, in regard to implements and other supplies. That happened for some years back as well as last year. They were trying, in every possible way, to put an end to that wrong to the Indians, and prevent inferior articles being foisted upon them. He admitted that he stood in a more favourable position, in regard to the Indians, than his predecessor, or his predecessor, because the country was better known lately, and all matters affecting it could be more intelligibly dealt with. He had no doubt his predecessors were actuated by a desire to carry out the Treaties in a proper spirit. The present Government were trying to carry out the same system, and that, as the country opened up, they involved greater advantages in getting better and cheaper articles, which could be more easily furnished the Indians as they become more accessible.

MR. MILLS said that no doubt the Premier did not stand in a better position, in this respect, than his predecessors. Serious frauds had been practiced on the Indians, but the late Government succeeded in putting an end to them. The great difficulty was not in the want of specifications of the articles required, but in the absence of strict uprightness and integrity on the part of those carrying out the instructions of the Government. He believed that the success of the hon. gentleman, in the administration of the affairs

of the Department, would depend very much upon the system of strict inspection of all the agencies so as to ascertain how the former instructors were discharging their duties, the character of their supplies, and so forth. He would like to ascertain how the Government proposed to distribute \$50,000 or \$60,000 between the Indians under the different Treaties, and for what purpose the money had been applied.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it would be applied under the Treaties with the different bands.

MR. MILLS said in some places the Indians had received all they were entitled to. Under Treaty 7 a very large number of cattle were supplied in the first instance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the bands supplied already could not expect a second supply. It was the intention of the Department to replace some unsuitable cattle that were given to the Indians. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the necessity for rigid inspection. Mr. Dewdney will see that all the reports will be collected under him. He is a man whom we all know, and I believe he is a good selection. He understands the Indian character at all events. He is accustomed to rough it, and has gone over immense tracts of country. He is a most active person, and I have every confidence he will do his whole duty in visiting the different Indian instructors and seeing that they are kept up to their duty. I quite agree with the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) who says he thinks we would have done better to have employed as instructors some of the men up there. That is quite true. It does not need a scientific farmer to teach the Indians to break up ground, and learn the various operations of farming, but it needs a rough man who knows himself how to handle the plough. As to the assistance we had to render the Indians last year, it had to be done in a hurry. The Government received sudden information that the food supply was lacking. There was no time to theorise about it, and we had to send up the men at once. In the future we shall adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Provencher, and as vacancies occur in the Department they will be filled up with men on the spot, men who understand the Indian character and who know how to guide

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

them better than strangers. That is the policy of the present Government, and Mr. Dewdney will carry it out. Now, it is quite true, as my hon. friend says, that you can never make an Indian an agriculturist. It is quite true that to civilise an Indian you must commence with the child. I hope that we shall have a system by which the children may be, as it were, withdrawn from the parents as much as possible, and brought under the influence of civilised Indians. But that cannot be done in a day. The adults are there; they must be fed and they must have grain to put in a crop for next season. I hope that hereafter, when we have more leisure, we may be able to devise a more scientific mode of Government for our Indian wards in the North-West.

MR. MILLS: Does the hon. gentleman expect to have one inspector for the whole of that country?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have one inspector to visit them all, but, perhaps, not all in one season. Mr. Dewdney himself will visit one portion of the country, and the next season visit the other portion. Then there is the Indian Agent who has supervision over the farm instructors, and who will act with Mr. Dewdney.

MR. SCHULTZ: I know that one of the farm instructors, Mr. Scott, is a practical farmer, and has resided for over twenty years in that country. In addition to that he is a middle-aged man, a strict teetotaler and speaks the Indian language almost as fluently as English. I regard his appointment as one of the best that has been made. I agree with the hon. member for Provencher in the advisability of taking, as far as they can be got, people up there to act as farm instructors. I am glad of the assurance that this will be done, because it will go a long way towards preserving the state of peace and good feeling which now prevails among the Indians.

MR. ELLIOTT: I wish to make an observation regarding the criticisms of the hon. member for Bothwell on the subject of the appointment of Mr. Scott as Indian Farm Instructor. I know Mr. Scott well; and am personally aware of the fact that that gentleman was reared on a farm, that he was a thoroughly competent man, and that he was in every

sense of the word, an agriculturist. My high opinion of Mr. Scott's abilities has been borne out completely by the evidence already given by the Department, that one of the best and most practical farm instructors in the North-West was Mr. Scott himself. Mr. Sharon has also come in for a share of the adverse criticism of the hon. member for Bothwell, though—the hon. member for Bothwell stated the contrary—an agriculturist. He was brought up on a farm; he is, in every respect, a competent instructor; and, as report stated, he was getting along well with the Indians whom he is instructing in farming in the vicinity of Battleford. In my opinion, the Government acted wisely and judiciously in appointing officers to proceed to the North-West and teach the Indians how to raise food for their maintenance and support. In view of the disappearance of the buffalo, and the rapid strides which civilisation is making in that country, there can be no doubt whatever that, in a few years, the Indians, unless induced to follow the avocation of farming, will be left without the means of subsistence. The endeavour to teach them agriculture is, therefore, laudable; while the appointment of instructors, who, I understand, had no less than 640 acres fenced and ready for crop, is highly commendable.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 173 to 177 read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 265 to 269 (April 30) read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 270, Post Office, additional amount required, \$60,000,

MR. BLAKE: There is a Supplementary Estimate of \$60,000, and it turned out, after a good deal of discussion the other evening, that it was supposed to be composed of three items, one being merely a cross entry which is supposed to represent \$12,000. That leaves a balance of \$48,000. The hon. the Finance Minister said that was partly due to the Government having been disappointed in their expectations of making cheaper contracts than before; and as to the residue, that it was due to an increase in the railway mileage. We were promised information as to how much of this increase vote was due to

increased mileage, and how much to disappointment in making cheap contracts.

MR. O'CONNOR: I think that is to be found in the Annual Report of the Post Office Department.

MR. BLAKE: We may find it in the Report next Session.

MR. O'CONNOR: When this matter was first mentioned, I applied to the Deputy, and he was to let me have a Memorandum, which he has not yet sent in. I think there is an increase in the Railway mileage, and in other ways, as I mentioned two evenings ago.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 271 to 274 read the second time and agreed to.

DOMINION NOTES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 114.]

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time on a division, and passed.

SUPPLY.

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

230 Public Buildings, Ottawa, Terrace Walls—To pay Harrow & Sinclair, contractors, balance due on final estimate..... \$2,592 67

INDIANS.

252 To provide for the payment of further Annuities under Treaties Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6.... 30,462 00

253 To provide for the purchase of seed grain and cattle. 13,050 00

254 Further amount required for provisions for Indians assembled to receive annuities, and also for relief afforded under Treaties 68,000 00

255 To provide for the purchase of 1,000 sacks of flour..... 6,500 00

256 To provide against the possibility of famine amongst the Indians of the North-West during the coming spring.... 9,952 00

257 Further amount required in connection with the establishment of Government and Indian farms and surveys..... 47,498 00

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said

MR. BLAKE.

the vote last year was only \$17,000. Nineteen farmers were sent out, and the cost of transport, and the purchase of cattle, horses, etc., covered this amount.

Vote agreed to.

258 Additional amount required for the payment of Instructors in Agriculture and Farm Labourers in the North-West..... \$10,000

259 Additional amount required for Contingencies..... 1,000

261 To pay Mr. J. G. Moylan balance of account for removal expenses from Toronto to Ottawa..... 300

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

276 Amount required to provide for Contingent Expenses of the High Commissioner of Canada in London..... 4,000

MR. BLAKE: I have a particular suggestion with reference to the Supplementary Estimates. We have various headings, as, for instance, "Harbours and Rivers, Quebec," "Nova Scotia," etc. I propose we should have a separate heading, "Galt," with different sub-headings.

In reply, to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY said this item was to pay the rent of his house and other contingencies. If there be travelling expenses, they would fall under that item.

MR. BLAKE: So the office is to cost \$14,000?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes.

Vote agreed to.

277 Department of the Interior—Indian Branch: To provide for the salaries of two Junior Second Class Clerks \$1,400

278 Department of Agriculture—For the salaries of two Model Keepers, heretofore paid out of Contingencies..... 900

279 Civil Service Board—Amount required to cover salaries of..... 600

MR. MACKENZIE: Who is the \$600 for?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Mr. Griffin is the Chairman and Mr. Powell the Secretary of the Board. The item has been paid since 1867—out of Contingencies. We thought it should be voted by Parliament instead.

MR. CASEY said this Board really had nothing to do unless some Department insisted on the examination of some candidate for the service. It hardly seemed worth while to continue it.

MR. BLAKE said the item seemed more intended to remunerate certain gentlemen who had little or nothing to do for it than to accomplish any other object. The House was now called on to make it a regular vote.

Vote agreed to.

POLICE.

230 Additional amount required for special service..... \$638 75

LEGISLATION.

281 House of Commons—Contingencies. Additional amount required for Stationery and Postage..... 2,200 00

282 Library—Amount required for the readjustment of the salaries of five Library Clerks and Chief Messenger, vide Report of Library Committee. 500 00

283 For purchase of books (this amount to be considered as an advance on account of the usual Grant for 1881-2) vide Report of Library Committee. 3,500 00

MR. MOUSSEAU: This appears a wonderful item. We are asked to vote \$3,500 on account of 1881-2. We should know exactly the kind of Librarian, Administrator and Manager we have got for our books and moneys. A Report published in the proceedings of the Senate will uncover interesting matters on this subject. I think the Librarian does not know how to keep accounts, as he has concealed the figures every year since Confederation. If I am correctly informed, his administration extends to only \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year, although one year he had \$10,000 under his control. It was purposely to purchase books. Now, one thing we do know—that, however audited, his accounts were never well kept; all the figures were concealed; and as a great Constitutional writer and a great Librarian, the Auditors thought he was great at managing \$7,000 a year without verifying the accounts. They always took his dates, etc., as good. Now, it is our duty who vote the money, to enquire whether it is the intention of the Government to continue Mr. Todd as Librarian, or, at least, as manager of the moneys he receives. He has been forced to admit that, during six or seven years, he either purposely concealed figures, or else was incompetent for the position he held. I understand, from many sources, that his capacity as Librarian is not greater than

his capacity as financier. His failure in this respect is explained by the fact that, being unable himself to make a good choice of books, he trusted the matter to his bookseller in England. Most of those books are worth very little, and an English scholar, living not far from here, told me that at least ten thousand of those English books might be advantageously sold by the Government for waste paper. Mr. Todd is said to be very clever, at least by many hon. members of this House, and I am sure many young members regard Mr. Todd as a great man. He writes splendid books, and we see a specimen in a volume which has been published during the Session. This book is of a most outrageous partisan character; it was printed in Boston, but the money therefor is paid by us. I see another item, in the Supplementary Estimates, of \$1,600, for 400 copies of Mr. Todd's bad book, and when this item comes up I may speak of the book itself. I am curious to know how Mr. Todd could attend to his duties as Parliamentary Librarian and find time to write a book in favour of Mr. Letellier.

Vote agreed to.

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS.

284 To provide grant to assist in giving to the forthcoming Quebec Exhibition (to be held at Montreal) a Dominion character; the distribution of the grant, or any part thereof, to be applied and apportioned in such way as to satisfy the Minister of Agriculture..... \$5,000

MR. ANGLIN: Is it the intention of the Government to vote a sum every year for giving the various Provincial Exhibitions a Dominion character? We are anxious in New Brunswick, under adverse circumstances, to get up a Provincial Exhibition. The city of St. John this year has largely contributed towards erecting a building. The Provincial Government is also giving a considerable amount, and the people of St. John desire very much that this effort of theirs should be seconded by the Dominion Government, and that a Dominion character should be given to the exhibition.

MR. BLAKE: I think the suggestion is perfectly reasonable. Last year the House adopted the policy of giving a Dominion character to the Provincial

Exhibition in Ontario, and this year it is proposed to give a Dominion character to the Provincial Exhibition of the Province of Quebec. I think, therefore, that if this is to go on, similar assistance should be given to Provincial Exhibitions in the other Provinces.

MR. POPE (Compton): We have thought that as large sums of money have been expended hitherto in competing with other countries in the Paris and Philadelphia Exhibitions, it would be just as well for a time to dispense with those large exhibitions, and give some aid to Provincial Exhibitions, and give our farmers and mechanics an opportunity of coming together and comparing the productions of the different Provinces. In this view this grant was made to Ontario last year and to Quebec this year. As for Manitoba, a considerable sum was given last year out of this vote to bring productions of that Province down here.

MR. MACKENZIE: What was done with the \$5,000 last year.

MR. POPE: About \$2,500 was expended in cooperation with the Boards of Agriculture of Ontario and Quebec. They met here and consulted upon this matter, and, as far as I could, I acceded to their request; \$2,500 was expended in gold, silver and bronze medals, that were given as prizes; \$1,000 of the balance was spent in assisting Manitoba towards getting their productions here for competition.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am informed that such was the peculiar manner of expending this money; that the hon. gentleman gave some gold medals to competitors who did not receive a first or second prize, and some other parties who had received medals from the Association, got medals from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to know whether these statements are correct or not.

MR. POPE: I suppose the hon. gentleman believes it; he would believe any story that was circulated respecting any member on this side of the House. I can say that not one single medal was given by the Government. The whole thing was arranged, mostly by the Board of Agriculture of Ontario. I had nothing to do with the matter. I gave two prizes, but paid my own money for them. Except the \$1,000 given to Manitoba,

every dollar of the \$5,000 was distributed by the board itself.

MR. JONES: We should be careful how we inaugurate a system of giving large sums for Provincial Exhibitions. I think the Government have begun at the wrong end. I believe Ontario and Quebec should be able to take care of themselves, and a few thousand dollars might be well expended towards assisting the smaller Province to bring their produce to a focus.

MR. RYMAL said that the experiment of giving the exhibitions a Dominion character, well nigh beggared the Association of the Province of Ontario last year, notwithstanding that we gave them \$5,000; and if it well nigh beggared them in Ontario, our friends in the Lower Provinces could imagine the fate that awaits them. It was utterly impossible to expect that any great amount of contributors would come from distant Provinces to any particular point.

MR. RYKERT said that by attempting the experiment of giving the exhibitions a Dominion character, large sums of money had been lost; \$7,000 was lost in that way on the Ottawa Exhibition. But it was not due to the money in aid being voted by this House. He could not understand why the Governor should retain the money in his own hands. They all approved of that, but they did not expect that \$1,000 would be taken from the \$5,000 voted. He thought it would be better to place the money in the hands of the Board of Lower Canada, who know how the money is to be expended.

Vote agreed to.

IMMIGRATION AND QUARANTINE.

285 Immigration—Towards settling accounts for Immigration Commission, outstanding since 1876. \$8,000

MR. POPE (Compton) explained that this was to settle commissions to steamship agents for services during 1877 and 1878. From the vouchers that had been sent in, he did not think that many of the claims could be established, but no more money would be paid than the vouchers showed as correct.

286 Quarantine—Towards assisting in the maintenance of the Tracadie Lazarette..... \$3,000

In reply to Mr. ANGLIN,

MR. POPE (Compton): It is a question whether this can fairly be said to be a quarantine, and whether those people should be kept quarantined there. I am not prepared to say what the policy of the Government will be in future; but we feel that this is an exceptional case, and that the Dominion ought to contribute to the support of those people. Before another year comes round, we will be able to tell the House what we purpose doing. We have not decided how the money is to be expended. The matter will be carefully enquired into before a dollar is expended. The money, however, will be expended by this Government, and not by the Local Government.

MR. ANGLIN said the Provincial Government, owing, no doubt, to its poverty, did not make proper provision for the care of those poor people. It would take very little more, however, to make them comfortable. He thought the ladies of the Hotel Dieu, who went down from Montreal to attend to those people, would be prudent, careful managers of any moneys the Government chose to place at their disposal. They would be accountable to the Government, and their accounts would be found satisfactory. They had but one object in view—that of making those poor unfortunates comfortable and happy, an object to which they devoted themselves day and night.

MR. MACKENZIE: In 1878, when I was at the head of the Government, and when the first grant by Order in Council was made to this Institution, I made special enquiry as to the method of conducting it, and found that the money would undoubtedly be better spent by those ladies than by any other persons. We then ordered its expenditure in that way. It is a terrible business to undertake, and any humane ladies, like those who undertake such a work, are worthy of all encouragement.

Vote agreed to.

PENSIONS.

287 Amount required to provide for the retiring allowances of five County Court Judges, British Columbia.....\$8,866 66

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

Intercolonial Railway, Halifax Extension.

288 Land taken for station purposes.. 1,092 00

289 Fees of Arbitrators in Milner land case..... 650 00

In reply to Mr. MACKENZIE, MR. LANGEVIN said the Chief Architect recommended this payment.

MR. MACKENZIE said he reported against it before.

MR. LANGEVIN said the claim was \$2,555, but the Chief Architect concluded to recommend \$650.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER said the arbitrators were appointed by the late Government under the ruling of a Judge. Mr. Milner claimed, in fact, the whole of the land of the town of Dorchester. He sued everybody. I found when I came into office that there had been almost as much paid in fees to counsel as the land was worth. He claimed \$15,000 or \$20,000, and as the Judges' were of opinion that he had some claim, I made up my mind the cheapest way out of it was to settle it. We agreed to leave it to arbitration, and Mr. Milner was so disappointed with the result that he refused to accept the sum awarded.

Vote agreed to.

290 To pay James Wilson for lands taken for ballast-pit at Miramichi Bridge..... \$1,500 00

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Ontario.

291 Kingston Military Buildings—Repairs, etc..... 4,000 00

292 Windsor Post Office and Custom House..... 6,000 00

Quebec.

293 Citadel—Repairs to roof..... 4,000 00

Nova Scotia.

294 Halifax Custom House—Repairs to roof..... 2,000 00

295 To pay Mr. H. G. Hill balance due for professional services as Superintending Architect, N. S..... 691 07

New Brunswick.

296 Dorchester Penitentiary—To pay Mr. Alexander Mackenzie the extra cost of stone..... 22,480 00

Manitoba.

297 Penitentiary — Outbuildings, Guards' Cottages, etc..... 1,500 00

298 Heating Apparatus..... 3,000 00

299 Winnipeg Immigrant Reception House—Additional amount required..... 4,000 00

300 Parliament Buildings, Winnipeg—Amount required..... 12,000 00

301 Lieutenant-Governor's Residence—Amount required.... \$10,000

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. LANGEVIN: All the other Provinces when they came in had Parliamentary buildings and residences for Lieutenant-Governors, but Manitoba being a new Province was not provided with those buildings. It was understood when Manitoba entered Confederation, that these buildings would be provided at a future time. The Chief Architect prepared the plans and specifications for the buildings, and told me that \$300,000 would be the probable cost. Of course that sum was out of the question. I told him we could not afford more than \$80,000 altogether. He has, therefore, prepared plans for buildings that will cost about the latter sum. For this year we will not expend more than \$12,000.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I was not aware there were any promises or pledges given in the Terms of Union with Manitoba. There are other Provinces in the Dominion that are asking for Parliament Buildings. Suppose New Brunswick makes a similar claim to Manitoba.

MR. LANGEVIN: All the other Provinces had buildings except Manitoba, and it is only fair that she should be equally well treated.

MR. ANGLIN: Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia had all erected those buildings at their own cost. It is true that, under the Terms of Union, all property belonging to the Provinces came, for a time, into the possession of the Dominion Government, who handed them back to the Provinces. But because that transfer, by Act of Parliament, took place, we are not to assume that the Dominion made a present to these Provinces of the buildings which they then possessed.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): The case of Manitoba is different from that of the other Provinces. Manitoba has no land, and it is only fair the General Government should forward in her aid. I would ask the hon. Minister if he would say when he expects these buildings will be completed.

MR. LANGEVIN: It will depend on the extent of the votes which this Parlia-

ment may be disposed to give for that purpose.

Vote agreed to.

North-West Territories.

302 Dominion Lunatic Asylum or Hospital 10,000

HARBOURS AND RIVERS.

Ontario.

303 Toronto Harbour—To continue improvements..... 12,500

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

MR. LANGEVIN said that large amounts, nearly \$50,000, had been expended on this harbour, and it was intended now to have a thorough examination made by two or three eminent engineers, so that whatever was done in the way of improvement should be permanent.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman is correct in deciding to have an exhaustive survey made of the whole harbour; and he will do well to get evidence of what changes are taking place in the interior part of the harbour. It seems to me that the gap is increasing very largely, and I think it must be apparent to any one familiar with the harbour for the last fifteen years, that there is a very great change at the western end of the spit or bar. It seems to me to have enlarged, and to be forming a new island or projection to the west; and I think the engineers should learn from reliable information what the formation is. Unless the survey be a perfect survey, it will not be of much importance.

MR. OUMET: Does the Government draw any revenue from the harbour improvements in Ontario?

MR. LANGEVIN: No; but the improvements encourage a large trade. The harbour of Toronto is considered, not only a commercial harbour, but a harbour of refuge, and it is on that ground the Government give an annual vote for this purpose.

MR. OUMET: There are a great many harbours of that sort in Ontario, and I would like to know if we cannot convert our Quebec harbours into harbours of refuge. It would save us a great deal of money if the Government would undertake the improvements.

MR. McCALLUM: If we had no harbours of refuge in Ontario, the cargoes

would never reach Montreal. This expenditure is a very necessary one.

MR. OUMET: Of course, if Ontario did not exist, Quebec would soon starve.

Vote agreed to.

304 Port Albert, Lake Huron—Repairs and dredging.....	\$1,500 00
305 Big Bay, Lake Huron.....	500 00
306 Collingwood Harbour—Additional amount required.....	2,000 00
307 Bridge at Des Joachims Rapids, Ottawa River—Ontario and Quebec, each paying \$4,000..	8,000 00
<i>Quebec.</i>	
308 Etang du Nord—Magdalen Islands.....	5,000 00
309 Escoumains—Removal of boulders.....	1,000 00
310 Isle aux Grues—Repairs to pier.....	500 00
311 Rivière Ouëlle—Repairs to pier.....	1,500 00
312 Ste. Famille—Island of Orleans, Breakwater.....	2,500 00
313 Rivière du Loup en haut—Deepening entrance.....	1,000 00
<i>Nova Scotia.</i>	
314 Main à Dieu—Breakwater.....	4,000 00
315 Partridge Island—River.....	2,000 00
316 Merigomish—Pier.....	1,000 00
317 Metaghan—Breakwater.....	2,250 00
318 Cow Bay—To pay Messrs. Archibald and Company for work executed in 1876.....	5,974 30
319 Port Hood—Repairs to Breakwater.....	3,000 00
320 Arisaig—Repairs to pier.....	200 00
<i>New Brunswick.</i>	
31 Sackville Harbour—Protection works.....	750 00
322 Shippegan—Repairs to East Gully Dam.....	2,000 00

MR. ANGLIN: I must express regret that the hon. the Minister of Public Works has not seen fit to give a sum equal to the unexpended balance of the appropriation to carry this work to completion. I am also sorry he has not seen fit to make repairs at the breakwater. There is danger of its being carried away by another storm.

MR. LANGEVIN said he thought the item would suffice to secure the repairs, and prevent the pier being damaged. It was, at all events, a beginning.

Vote agreed to.

323 River St. John—Improvements above and below Grand Falls..	\$2,000
324 Richibucto—Pier.....	1,200
<i>Prince Edward Island.</i>	
325 St. Peter's Bay—Repairing Breakwater.....	2,500
326 Wood Island—Breakwater.....	2,000
327 Miminegash do.....	1,000
328 Tignish do.....	3,000

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) asked if it was the intention of the Government to dredge the bar at the mouth of the Red River this season. That improvement would greatly assist the navigation.

MR. LANGEVIN replied that it was not thought proper to ask a special vote for it. But should the bar require to be dredged, they might be able to take the cost out of the general vote.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) enquired if it was intended to improve the Saskatchewan this season, by removing boulders and other obstructions at Cole's Falls. Captain Moore offered to effect this improvement for \$4,000, which would be well spent in such a useful work.

MR. LANGEVIN said they could not ask for a vote for the purpose this year. The locality would be examined, this season, to see what improvements were required.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE.

329 Dominion Steamers—Amount required for the purchase and maintenance of a steamer to replace the *Lady Head*..... \$55,000

MR. ANGLIN said that was a large amount. They should dispense with the services of some of those vessels, which cost a great deal, unless they were found absolutely necessary. Their principle or only work was visiting the lighthouses.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. the Minister of Marine should give explanations as to this item, and explain the reasons for it.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said the Government required steamers, not only to visit the lighthouses, but do police duty round the coasts, and so forth. The Americans had vessels watching the interests of their fishermen, and the Dominion Government had to protect theirs also. They should be prepared for any difficulty that might happen in future. The value of a great many steamers might be lost by the want of such services as those steamers rendered.

MR. ANGERS: I do not think the amount of \$55,000 is too large, perhaps not enough, to procure a first class vessel of a small draft, so as to be able to come to the assistance of vessels wrecked in the Gulf, and which would also be able to lay a submarine cable from the Magdalen Islands and Anticosti to the main shore. I was surprised to hear the hon.

member from Gloucester complaining of this amount, when he must know that it is to be expended for the benefit of the Fisheries. We have from that source a capital of four and a-half million dollars, which represents an income of \$225,000 a year, and \$50,000 is not too large a sum to take out of this amount for the purpose of protecting the Fisheries, and perhaps laying the cable.

Vote agreed to.

FISHERIES.

330 For legal expenses in connection with suits before Supreme Court for infraction of Fishery laws... \$600

INDIANS.

331 Amount required for transfer of Indian burying ground at Chicoutimi..... 250

MISCELLANEOUS.

332 Probable amount required to compensate members of North-West Mounted Police for injuries received in discharge of duty..... 2,000

MR. BLAKE: What is the principle on which it is proposed to compensate these officers of the Mounted Police for injuries received in the discharge of duties?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is no rule laid down as yet. I desire to have some rule laid down, and I propose, during Recess, to devise some rule with regard to the Mounted Police and the Militia generally. All kinds of claims are being set up. For instance, one young man in the Mounted Police, the son of a gentleman and educated, got his feet frozen, and his father is asking \$10,000 as compensation.

MR. BLAKE: I quite agree with the view as to the necessity of some comprehensive scheme, but it is certain that this matter will have to be regulated with great particularity and upon a very moderate scale of compensation. It will have to be made particularly clear in reference to injuries received from carelessness, excesses, etc. I have heard of injuries from frost which were rather due to the negligence of the party than anything else. If we are to introduce a system of compensation for injuries in the Mounted Police, it is difficult to see why we should not extend it to all branches of the Civil Service.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is the trouble.

Vote agreed to.

MR. ANGERS.

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

Excise.

333 Additional amount required to enable the Department to suppress the illicit manufacture of Excisable articles..... \$4,500

MR. BLAKE: Does the hon. gentleman find the amount of illicit distillation increasing?

MR. BABY: Illicit distillation has gone on for a number of years, and as population increases it becomes more necessary to provide against illicit distillation. I cannot say exactly that the business is increasing, but I find the stills are larger than they used to be.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I am afraid the case is so. I am afraid the hon. gentleman's returns for this year will show a considerable falling off, more particularly in the article of spirits. I do not know what his estimates may be, but I doubt if they will exceed 4,200,000 gallons for this year.

Vote agreed to.

Railways and Canals.

334 Intercolonial Railway—Windsor Branch Maintenance.... \$20,000 00

335 Amount of verdict and costs in case King vs. Brydges.... 612 00

336 Welland Canal—Amount required for repairs at Port Maitland..... 25,000 00

Dominion Lands.

337 Manitoba—Amount required for pay of Land Guides, etc.. 6,621 60

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It has been found that emigrants arriving either at Emerson or at Winnipeg find themselves very much at a loss as to where to go. They may be directed to go where they will find certain sections open; but they do not know where to go. We have adopted the American system and have stationed at Winnipeg a chief guide, who is instructed to employ a number of men to guide the emigrants to their destinations. We have sent out a gentleman, a Mr. Peter Reid, who knows the country well. He will be stationed at Winnipeg, and as emigrants come up from Pembina he will arrange them in parties and send them in the different directions leading to their locations. That is the object of having land guides.

Vote agreed to.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

338 To provide for the salary of the High Commissioner of Canada, in London, from 1st March to 30th June, 1880.....	\$3,333 33
339 Contingencies of the High Commissioner of Canada, in London, from 1st March to 30th June, 1880.....	3,000 00
340 Privy Council Office—Additional amount required for Contingencies.....	500 00
341 Department of the Interior, Indian Branch—To provide for the salaries of two junior second-class clerks, for 4 and 3 months, respectively, at \$700 per annum.....	408 33

POLICE.

342 Additional amount required for Special Service.....	747 25
---	--------

PENITENTIARIES.

343 Manitoba Penitentiary—Additional amount required to complete this service.....	3,101 00
--	----------

LEGISLATION.

344 House of Commons—Additional amount required for witnesses, short-hand writers and postage.....	2,455 00
345 To refund the amount expended out of the appropriation for the current year, to finish the publication of the Debates of the last Session.....	4,425 00
346 Parliamentary Library—Amount required to defray expenses of making new catalogues (<i>vide</i> Report of Library Committee).....	500 00

RAILWAYS AND CANALS—CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

347 Intercolonial Railway, Rivière du Loup Branch—Box and flat cars.....	94,400 00
348 Prince Edward Island Railway—Additional amount required for Souris Extension.....	18,000 00
349 Lachine Canal—To pay D. McLanaghan, amount due to him for board and lodging of workmen on Section 9.....	697 00

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: This is an item which requires an explanation. The sub-contractors on the Lachine Canal ran away with a considerable amount of money. The Government took the work into their own hands, and found an amount of \$20,000 due to the labourers, and an Order in Council was passed authorising the payment of this money. The men to whom the money was due had given due bills for their board, which

were accepted by this party to the amount in the vote. The claim was made, and was entitled to consideration. The money was due, for labour, to the men, and it seemed necessary to put the item in the Supplementary Estimates.

Vote agreed to.

350 Culbute Canal—Land damages. \$7,000 00

PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—CHARGEABLE TO INCOME.

Harbours and Rivers.

352 Petitdegrat, N.S., Isle Madame—Opening passage from head of Petitdegrat Inlet into Rocky Bay.....	2,000 00
---	----------

Miscellaneous.

353 Amount required for relief of fishermen on the east coast of Labrador.....	437 24
--	--------

In reply to Mr. SMITH (Selkirk),

MR. LANGEVIN said the amount was to cover relief given those fishermen in the autumn of 1878. The Local Government had given aid the two previous years; but Mr. Joly, Premier in 1878, declared they could not spare anything at that time. There being insufficient relief at hand, he (Mr. Langevin), in the absence of his colleagues, ordered assistance to be forwarded to prevent the people from starving.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said he had no doubt this assistance was very much required. The people on that coast was very often on the verge of starvation, and it would be a great saving to both the Dominion and Quebec Governments if they were removed from that inhospitable coast to the North-West where they might always be sure of a living.

Vote agreed to.

354 To pay interest on purchase money of Bunker's Island, N.S.....	106 52
--	--------

FISHERIES.

355 Amount required to cover legal expenses in case of <i>McFee vs. Mowat</i>	315 52
---	--------

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

356 Additional sum required to complete this service.....	25,000 00
---	-----------

MISCELLANEOUS.

357 To repay the Government of Prince Edward Island the cost of maintenance of prisoners whose sentences were two years and upwards.....	16,589 25
--	-----------

358 To pay for 400 copies Todd's
 "Parliamentary Government
 in the British Colonies" (vide
 Report of Library Committee) 1,600 00

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to know if, when the Government subscribed for 400 copies of Mr. Todd's work, they were acquainted with its character and its tendency, and if they were aware of Mr. Todd's object in publishing a book which is not only insulting to a large number of the members of this House, but contains very grave insinuations against the religion of one-half of the population of this Dominion.

MR. BABY: I may say, in answer to my hon. friend, that the Government did not subscribe to the number of copies mentioned in this item, but they were purchased upon a Report of the Joint Committee on the Library. I am bound to say, moreover, that when this item was placed in the Estimates, the Government were not aware of the character of the work, and the subscription was made on the strength of Mr. Todd's great reputation, and under the supposition that the book was but a continuation of a celebrated historical work of his, known both in this country and Europe. As to the character of the present work, I believe the opinion of my hon. friend is shared by many others.

MR. ROYAL: It may be inopportune at this late hour to act the part of an iconoclast, and break the idol of a fine reputation, yet this is what I feel myself compelled to do in the case of Mr. Todd. That gentleman has enjoyed the confidence of this Parliament for over twenty years. No doubt he has written a very valuable work on constitutional practice, but in this instance he has drawn upon his credit in publishing the work. It was upon this reputation that the Library Committee advised the subscription to 400 volumes of a work which is certainly no credit to the man who wrote it, and it is no credit for this Parliament to vote \$1,600 for such a work. In the first place this work maintains a principle which has been condemned by this Parliament, and in the second place, Mr. Todd has, in a most unwarranted manner cast reflections upon the faith of a large portion of the Dominion of Canada, which certainly ought not to be found in a work subscribed to by this Parliament.

MR. DESJARDINS.

MR. BLAKE: I think this work has been rather hardly treated by hon. gentlemen. I can readily understand that they do not sympathise with all the views expressed in it. I do not myself. There are several opinions expressed in it which I certainly do not share. But surely hon. gentlemen do not expect that any author, whom they might think it worth while to subscribe to, would do otherwise than express his sincere opinions on those facts of which he was treating. Though Mr. Todd cannot have expected to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, I myself see no reason why we should decry the general merits of his work, which is, I consider, a useful collection of precedents and historical events occurring in the various colonies. I have read the work with a great deal of interest and instruction, and, apart altogether from the circumstances that it condemns the treatment of the Letellier case by the Government, I think the work will be referred to in many other points for information and instruction, even though it should be tabooed from our Library. With reference to the observations of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), my attention has not been attracted to that part of the work which is said to justify them. Of course, if there be any part of the work which justifies those observations, I do not in the slightest degree sympathise with them.

MR. DESJARDINS: We would not object to the expression of Mr. Todd's views on any constitutional question, but what we object to is his contemptuous treatment of principles which are accepted by a large portion of the people of this country. I think he ought, at least, to have respected our faith.

MR. OUMET: I think this work ought to be paid for by the friends of ex-Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, because Mr. Todd has taken up their cause, and has endeavoured to stultify and ridicule the vote of this House. It is certainly not very creditable to us now to vote such a large sum of money to purchase a work which justifies the course of our opponents. It would be well to print in the appendix of this work the speech of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy) as an antidote.

Vote agreed to.

- 359 Amount required to pay for the keep of a criminal lunatic in British Columbia, from 30th September, 1878, to 30th June, 1880. \$455 00
- 360 Amount required to cover cost, freight and packing of Indian curiosities purchased by Superintendent Powell. 1,235 55

In reply to Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Dr. Powell, the Superintendent of Indian affairs in British Columbia, has been making a collection for some years. He has made a tour along the coast of British Columbia to observe the peculiar habits, customs and ceremonies. Samples are rapidly disappearing with the pressure of the white man's progress. During his last visit to Queen Charlotte Island, he secured a number of antiquities, if I may use the term, of some importance. Such a collection as he has, cannot, perhaps, be secured again, and he offers it to the Government. We are going to have it sent up here to be placed in, perhaps, the Geological Museum for the present.

MR. SMITH said he thought such a course would be well extended to other parts of the country. It was now only for a short time that it would be possible to have anything to show that these Indians were, and these collections would be very valuable.

MR. BLAKE: We shall have one lasting memorial of them in our Public Accounts.

Vote agreed to.

- 361 To provide for the grant in aid of the sufferers by the Hull fire. \$7,000 00
- 362 Sum required to refund to certain Deputy Inspectors of Weights and Measures, whose service, have been dispensed with, the amount deducted from their salaries on account of superannuation. 2,877 27

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said he thought when officers were abolished, officers thus dismissed without cause of complaint against them, should allow them something more than the amount paid in by them to the Superannuation Fund.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was afraid that would subject the Government to the charge of adding enormously to the public expenditure. That

principle, however, would be taken up, but the hon. gentleman opposite must promise not to attack the Government for extravagance.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT said he would take care always to give them credit for it.

MR. BLAKE: We will charge you with the dismissals of officers, and credit you with the gratuities.

Vote agreed to.

- 363 To pay Sir Alexander Galt for services and expenses, June, July, August and September, whilst continuing Trade negotiations with Spain, France, etc. 6,500

COLLECTION OF REVENUES.

Excise.

- 364 Additional amount required for travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, etc., for outside service. 2,500

Railways and Canals.

- 365 Intercolonial Railway—Compensation to representatives of the late E. C. Ennis, injured by an accident on the Intercolonial Railway in February, 1878. 400

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: This is a case which ought to be stated. In consequence of the breaking of a rail, the first-class car in which Mr. Ennis was a passenger, was thrown off the track, and he had his collar-bone broken and sustained some internal injury from which he died. That was in February, 1878. About a year afterwards a claim was made for compensation, the amount being based at \$2,400. The claim was not allowed by the Department in consequence of the evidence going to show that there was no negligence on the part of the employes of the road, the law being that the injury or death of a passenger caused in the ordinary course of transit by railway, involves no claim against the railway, unless there is connected with it some want of due precaution by the managers of the road or those in charge of the train. After Ennis's death his representatives sent in a claim, and the Department of Justice advised us that while there was no legal claim, if we could make a compromise for \$400, it would be better than contesting the suit, because a suit might involve that expenditure on the part of the Government, and this amount has been placed in the Estimates in accordance

with the recommendation of the Department.

MR. FISET: Mr. Speaker, knowing as I do the character of the accident which befel Mr. E. C. Ennis, while he was a passenger on the Intercolonial Railway, I am of opinion that this sum of \$400 is not sufficient as a compensation for the wounds he received. Mr. Ennis, when he was in the service of the Government, earned \$100 per month, and even supposing that the wounds which he received were not the direct cause of his death, nevertheless lost a year or more of his time, for, by reason of this injury to his shoulder, he was more than a year out of work; but I will go further yet, and say that I am of opinion that these wounds, if not the direct, were the indirect cause of his death. The Government alleges that this sum of \$400 is given by way of compensation, and that it was not liable for any damages. Well! I say that if the Government is not liable for any damages it ought to give nothing; and if, on the contrary, it is liable, it ought to pay to the heirs of Mr. Ennis what is just and reasonable. The fact of voting a certain sum as a compensation is in some respects an admission that it is responsible for the injuries sustained by Mr. Ennis. My intention is not to oppose the voting of this item, but I am in a position to declare that this amount will not be accepted by the heirs of the late Mr. Ennis, and that they will demand that their claims be carried to the Supreme Court in order to obtain justice there.

Vote agreed to.

DOMINION LANDS.

366 Manitoba and North West—
For pay, &c., of Land Guides.. \$4,414 40
367 British Columbia—Additional
amount required..... 5,494 61

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL, 112.]

(Mr. Bowell.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, and reported.

MR. BOWELL moved the third reading of the Bill.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

MR. BOULTBEE moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend it, by inserting the following Clause,—“The 57th Section of the said ‘The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,’ is hereby repealed, and the following Clause substituted therefor:—If the majority of all the voters whose names are entered on the voters’ lists, used at each polling, vote for the Petition, the same shall be held to have been adopted, but not otherwise, and the Returning Officer shall make his return to the Governor-General in Council accordingly.”

MR. BLAKE moved the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to and Debate adjourned.

House adjourned at

Three o’clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 4th May, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o’clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

COMMITTEE’S REPORT PRESENTED.

MR. STEPHENSON presented the Fourth Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is one thing to which I desire to call the attention of the Committee, the practice which has prevailed all through this Session of the reporters never taking down extracts from papers or books that are read, but sending in their reports with a blank marked “extract.” This has necessitated the hunting up of papers, perhaps a week after the speech has been delivered, and it is utterly impossible to do it accurately. When one reads carefully and slowly, there is no more reason why the extracts should not be taken down as well as the speech. For myself, I would infinitely rather make my speech over again than correct the report in that way.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I quite agree with my hon. friend. It is an inexcusable piece of laziness on the part of the reporters not to take down the extracts read during the speech. When the speaker has come to extracts the re-

porters have generally dropped their pencils and not taken a note. It is much easier work for a reporter to take down such portions of a speech, because they are always read slowly and more deliberately. At present, the reporters drop their pencils and bore one afterwards to get the extracts. As far as I am concerned, I have never once given the extracts, and if my speeches have suffered thereby I cannot help it.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then the hon. gentleman had better not look at the book.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I look at the book for the speeches of my hon. friend.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): I think if the extracts were left out altogether, the speeches would be better. A great many hon. gentlemen give scarcely anything else but extracts in their speeches.

MR. BLAKE: If the extracts were left out, the best part of the speeches would be left out.

MR. STEPHENSON: The Committee have given this matter a great deal of consideration, and we expect that some good results will come from the change. As the hon. member for West Durham remarked the other day, this is an experiment. We have adopted it as such, but we think it will be advantageous to the House, because we think we will get better reports hereafter than we have had hitherto.

INVESTIGATIONS UNDER OATH BILL.

[BILL 113.]

(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

THIRD READING.

Order for third reading read.

Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment:

"That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power so to amend the same as to preclude any Commissioner appointed thereunder from enquiring into criminal matters."

Amendment *negatived* on a division.

Bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 112.]

(Mr. Bowell.)

THIRD READING.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Bowell's proposed motion for the third reading of the Bill, and Mr. Boul-

bee's proposed motion in amendment thereto.

MR. BOWELL: This Bill, which was passed by the Senate, without division, is simply intended to make some slight amendments in what is termed "The Canada Temperance Act," without affecting the principle of the Bill in the least. The amendments were found necessary in order to enable the law to be worked more effectually, not only in Ontario, but in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. I presume that most hon. members have read the Bill; consequently, it is not necessary that I should enter into full explanation of it. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) would, in my opinion, effectually destroy the whole principle of the Bill.

MR. BOULTBEE: No, no.

MR. BOWELL: My hon. friend says "no, no," but I find by it that not only must you have a majority of the whole vote in the electoral division or county, wherein a poll is held, in order to bring this Act into force, but you must have an actual majority upon the voters' list of each sub-division in each county. Now, I was not aware that that was the effect of the amendment till I read it a minute or two ago. The amendment says there must be a majority of all the voters whose names are entered on the voters' list in "each polling."

MR. BLAKE: I think there is a clerical error here. That that is not the intention of the amendment.

MR. BOULTBEE: It is not intended to have that effect.

MR. BOWELL: I took the language as printed. If that be not the intention the hon. gentleman had better say—the voters' list used in such polling place, or county. However, which ever way it is passed, the amendment will effectually defeat the intention of those who introduced, and of Parliament which passed the Act. I am decidedly opposed to the adoption of any such amendment. If the principle involved in the amendment were adopted and acted upon in every election held, I am of opinion there would be very few of us occupying seats on the floor of the House to-day. It is almost impossible, under any circumstances, unless under great political or other excitement, to get a full, clear majority of the voters on the voters' list to

record their votes on any occasion. As the general principle of elections is a decision by a majority, I think the opinion, as expressed by a majority, whenever a question is put to the people, should be accepted as sufficient, particularly when the question submitted to them, is one effecting the general welfare of the country.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) : Before the question is put, I wish to offer a few observations in regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East York. I cannot understand his motive in submitting such an amendment. The Bill, in its present form, appears to be a Government measure. It was introduced in another place by an hon. member of the Government, and into this House by the hon. the Minister of Customs. His name is attached to it, at least; and why this Bill, which has received the cordial approval of the Senate, should be subjected to such an amendment I cannot understand. I suppose my hon. friend is aware that there is no movement in the country in favour of such an amendment as he proposes; at least we have had no intimation of it. There have been no petitions presented in favour of such an amendment; but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boulton) will remember that, before the Act which is proposed to be amended in this serious way was introduced, the House was deluged with petitions in favour of some restriction on the liquor traffic. Now, it is proposed to emasculate this Bill—virtually to destroy it—and that without a single petition being presented in favour of such a course. Nor does the hon. member show that any injustice is being done by the Act as it stands. It would have been reasonable to suppose that, in regard to a Bill passed unanimously—a Bill of the character of the Temperance Act of 1878—an hon. gentleman bringing down an amendment of such an important measure, would have shown, or attempted to show, that some injustice was inflicted on some portion of the community by the Bill he proposed to amend. This, however, has not been shown. I venture to say he is afraid that his amendment would not bear investigation. He was afraid to bring it up upon a single argument or statement of facts. But in the dead hour of the night, at the last sitting of the House, it

was proposed to take a division on the amendment. I decidedly objected to this course, and I think that the hon. gentleman and those who act with him, if there are any, before they can expect this House to support such an amendment, must prove that some serious wrong is done by this Bill as it now stands. My hon. friend cannot pretend to be acting in the interests of those for whom the Bill was originally passed. It was passed in conformity with what was believed to be a well founded public opinion: that some reasonable restriction should be placed upon the liquor traffic; or, in other words, that the people of this country should be allowed to say themselves how far they wished that traffic to prevail amongst them. The Bill being carried through the House with that object, it would be natural to suppose that if any amendments were proposed it should be by those who originally sustained the measure when introduced. My hon. friend has not told us that he so acted. I do not suppose he is sustained in his course by a single representative body of the temperance party in this country; I do not suppose he is acting in consonance with a single temperance man in the Dominion; I do not suppose he is able to say to this House that the amendment is calculated to promote, by any manner of means, the purposes for which the Bill was originally intended. He proposes to introduce into our electoral institutions an entirely new principle. Hon. gentlemen, on both sides of this House, as the hon. the Minister of Customs has remarked, sit here by a majority of the votes polled in their respective counties. [I do not know that there is a single member of this House—unless he was elected by acclamation—who is able to say that he sits here by a clear majority of the registered voters of his constituency. I notice in a Return, brought down to the Ontario Legislature, a comparison between the number of votes polled for the old Dunkin Act and those polled in the Parliamentary Election. In the county of Bruce, for instance, there is a total of 11,820 votes. In the Parliamentary Election there were polled 5,032 votes, and in the vote under the Dunkin Act 6,352 votes, showing that in the contest for the suppression of the liquor traffic in that county, there was a stronger

MR. BOWELL.

sentiment manifested, and a greater number of the electorate impelled to go to the polls, than in the Parliamentary Election. Now, if the argument be good, that we have a right to sit and legislate on the strength of the majority of votes polled in any election, why should not the same argument apply in regard to an important measure of this kind? Can my hon. friend say that, in any election authorised by any Dominion or Provincial Statute—with one exception provided for in a small Bill passed by the Ontario Legislature last year—there is any such principle introduced? I venture to say he cannot. We must remember that the people of this country have so far only been appealed to, to a limited extent, to decide whether they are satisfied with the principle contained in this Act. Why propose, so early in its history and before hearing from the people, to emasculate and destroy it by incorporating an entirely new principle which will place the temperance community at a great disadvantage. If this amendment is adopted, it will be exceedingly difficult for us to fulfil the primary object of this Act. The Preamble of the Temperance Act, 1878, says: "Whereas, it is desirable to promote temperance in the Dominion, and secure uniform legislation," etc. The object being the promotion of temperance, it is clear the effect of this amendment will be to make it much more difficult to secure that object. Is this House prepared to retrace its steps? Is it prepared to see, within two short years of the passage of the Temperance Act, 1878, an amendment made to it which will render the Act practically useless? Is a principle so important in its effects upon the well-being of the community to be discarded by this House in the dying hours of the Session, undoing the work of a former House after the most careful deliberation and most serious consideration? I trust the House will more regard the object of this Bill, will more regard the public sentiment of this country, than to adopt the amendment proposed by my hon. friend. It has been hinted, in private conversation among the members of this House, that the object of the amendment was to relieve the minority from the control of a tyrannical majority. If that is the object sought to be accomplished by my hon. friend, does

he not leave the majority to govern still? Is there not a tyrannical majority in the one case as well as in the other? Perhaps he may say the power of the majority is reduced, but the principle remains there still. It is by the voice of the majority, in either case, that this Act goes into effect, or does not go into effect. Even admitting that the principle for which my hon. friend contends is sound, it is impossible to apply it. You will find in many towns and cities individuals who have a vote in several polling sub-divisions. Suppose John Brown is anxious to vote for the Temperance Act and that he has a vote in ten polling sub-divisions, he goes up and votes for the Act in polling division No. 1, but, in spite of himself, his own vote is recorded against him nine times by the amendment of my hon. friend. Is there any decency—not to say common sense—in a proposition that for every once that a man records his vote according to his convictions, he is compelled, by law, to vote against himself nine times. Is this legislation by which my hon. friend proposes to amend the Act which was unanimously adopted by this House a few years ago? It is well this should be known. Let the House distinctly understand that, instead of dealing fairly with the public opinion of the country, this amendment proposes to take an unfair advantage of it, and to render it almost impossible for public opinion to be fairly recorded. Suppose the amendment is adopted, and that a majority of the qualified voters should be required; then no election could take place without a scrutiny of every vote, in every polling sub-division in the county, in order to ascertain who are the qualified voters, who are the duplicates, who are the dead and missing, who are the absentees, and all the particulars that enter into some of the contested Elections. But, Sir, I do not propose to take up the time of the House. I feel convinced that this Bill will not receive the approval of the House. From what my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, said, I feel convinced that it will not be supported by the Government. I hope he has given expression to what he believes to be the opinion of the Government. I believe there are hon. gentlemen in this House who, two or three years ago, supported very heartily the

amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lisgar in favour of a prohibitory liquor law. I am going to appeal to those hon. gentlemen who, in 1877, were so strongly in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, and who, I hope, in 1880, will accord us the privilege of saying as counties, whether we shall pass a prohibitory liquor law. Among the hon. gentlemen then in favour of prohibition, I find still in the House Sir Charles Tupper, Hon. Mr. Baby, Mr. Plumb, Hon. Mr. Masson, Mr. Kirkpatrick, and so on. Now, if these gentlemen, in 1877, were favourable to the prohibitory law, pure and simple, they will surely oppose any attempt to make partial prohibition easy. I do not believe that any prohibitory liquor law will prove effective unless it is sustained by that public sentiment. That is what I contended for in regard to the Temperance Act of 1878, and I am going to ask the hon. gentlemen who voted for that Resolution in 1877, to assist me in voting down the amendment of the hon. member for East York. I would remark that this is an Act that, as yet, is comparatively untried. It has only been in force since the 1st of May last, and we have not had an opportunity of judging of its merits, and I would regret that hon. gentlemen would prevent us from reaping fruits which we expect this Act is calculated to produce. I can appeal with confidence to members of the Government, and to the supporters of the Government on the back benches to, under the circumstances, give the Bill a fair trial, and if it should be found to be inoperative to join in devising some remedy for the evils gentlemen on both sides of the House so much deplore.

MR. BOULTBEE: I am not sufficiently old in parliamentary practice to know whether the action of the hon. gentleman is correct, but it was not courteous of him to spring up before me when I was about to support my amendment. It seems to me to be a conduct unworthy of a member of Parliament, and of one gentleman associating with another. I shall endeavour to treat this question with the calmness and moderation with which it ought to be treated. I do not yield to any hon. gentleman in my desire to suppress the evils of intemperance, although we may differ widely as to the means to be used. Having given this matter most

careful consideration for many years, when so situated, from the position I then held, as to have special advantages for judging in this respect, I very much doubt whether the cause will be at all served by harsh restrictive legislation. My own opinion has always been that temperance is only well and safely promoted by means of proper and well considered example, and great strides have been made by this means in the last quarter of a century. I defy any man on the floor of this House, or in the broad world to show that temperance has ever been promoted by this sort of restrictive legislation. The statistics in relation to the Dunkin Act show that there are more convictions for intemperance in counties and districts when that Act was in force than there were before. The reason for this is not hard, and far more in proportion to population than in districts where the Act was not put in force, to find. To make it effective it must be sustained by a large majority, a majority so large and decisive as to make it distinctly as the result of a complete consensus of public opinion. The hon. member for West Middlesex puts in my mouth the theory that I desired, by my motion, to protest against the action of a tyrannical majority. That is not the view with which I proposed the amendment at all. I wished to avoid and protest against the action of a tyrannical minority. When we make such a law as this, however averse many of us may be to it, if it is passed by a clear majority of the people, I apprehend the minority have nothing to say against it. One of the principle objections to this measure is that the whole instincts of our race are opposed to harsh sumptuary laws such as this restrictive of personal liberty. Consequently the Act is not received with favour, and being united on the action of a small minority of the people, is rebelled against and set at defiance. If, however, the law was adopted by a large majority, a different state of things would result, for, subject to proper conditions, our people are a law abiding people. We have found, moreover, that in instances where this Act was put in force, there was a sort of feeling that a wrong was being done, an injustice being suffered, and a very natural feeling it is, because in the action that is sought to be taken

MR. ROSS.

in these matters no arrangement is ever made to compensate those whose property is ruined and destroyed in giving effect to this law. It seems to me that if we desire to deal justly in this behalf, if we desire to popularise this obnoxious law, some compensation should be given to those men whose property is to be affected, whose business is to be destroyed. Mr. Gladstone, surely one of the first of living Reformers, during the late Election, on this subject, in one of his speeches, said :

“As to the liquor traffic, he was prepared to give due consideration and support to any well considered scheme of local option. In fact the late Government did introduce a Bill with that object, but were unable to pass it. However, whatever action was taken with reference to this great question, in cases of loss of property, there must be compensation for losses sustained.”

But here, unfortunately, I think for the cause they champion, the advocates of a prohibitory law say expressly that no such compensation should be made advocate, indeed an act of deliberate spoliation, which must always be repugnant to the views of right thinking and just people. The view of Mr. Gladstone, than whom no man has, perhaps, travelled further in the cause of reform, is directly antagonistic to this, and wisely so. My belief is strong to conviction that we should endeavour, instead of seeking to impose a harsh sumptuary law on the people, to promote, as much as possible, the use of our wholesome Canadian wines and ales, and discredit, as much as possible, the use of the more severe intoxicants, whiskies, brandies and rum ; and promote a carefully considered license law, which will afford a good opportunity of making a living to the keeper of a well-conducted hotel, and to visit the most severe penalties and restrictions on grogeries, licensed and unlicensed. This will do more to promote temperance than any endeavour to stamp out intemperance by a law like this, repulsive to the instincts of a free people, and fruitful of evil in its practice. A license law, to have a good effect, must be framed in the interests of good order, and administered in all parts of the Dominion with justice and equity ; it must not be made, as it is in Ontario, the means of bitter and malignant political persecution, where men are deliberately ruined if they refuse to support the Local Government. The

amendment I have proposed does not mean, as was suggested by one of the hon. Ministers of the Government, that there should be a majority at every polling place. It simply proposes that there shall be a majority in the whole district where the law is sought to be put in force. I did not understand what the hon. member for West Middlesex meant by saying that a voter might vote at one polling place in favour of the Bill, and in eight or nine other places in the same constituency, against it, I do not understand it. It seems to me his objection was rather a puerile one ; possibly he does not understand exactly what he means himself. The Resolution simply provides that a majority of votes of the district shall be necessary to give effect to the law. It does not mean that any man that happens to have eight or nine pieces of land in eight or nine different places shall have eight or nine different votes. It is perfectly absurd to put it in that way. The hon. member for West Middlesex also seemed to regard the measure as a Government measure. I did not understand, from the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Customs, that it was regarded as a Government measure. As I understand it, the Government intend to let this measure go on its own merits, each member voting as he pleases. In reference to the Dunkin Act, there seems always to be a feeling of injustice grow up when it is enforced, and a desire engendered to break the law. I call the attention of the House, and those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to the Resolution, to the fact that, when men once come to regard the breaking of the law as a light matter, there is much less hesitancy in breaking it in other cases, nor will the distinction be nicely drawn as to which law may be broken ; and it cannot be denied that in setting at defiance and breaking the Dunkin Law, there is not attached that penalty of shame and public condemnation which attends the infraction of other laws. If then, hon. gentlemen wish to support the Temperance movement, they should join with those who wish to make it necessary that a majority of the whole vote should be pronounced in favour of the law before it is sought to be imposed on the community ; were this done, and some system of compensation settled for injury sustained, the law would become a

living force, respected and supported by the people, while, as at present, it is simply a source of constant worry and annoyance, producing no result but loss of revenue, increase of taxation, and discredit to the Temperance cause, which, in itself, is a great evil.

MR. CASEY: The hon. gentleman tells us there are more convictions for drunkenness since the operation of the Dunkin Act. That is not very extraordinary, perhaps, when we consider that where the Dunkin Act is not in operation people will be more slack in prosecuting than they will in a temperance community. The increased number of convictions only indicates a vigorous carrying out of the law. The hon. gentleman tells us there is a greater desire to drink, on the part of young men, where that Act is in force. I do not know how he knows this for a fact, unless the young men have made him their father confessor, and that is extremely unlikely. The hon. gentleman knows that many other indulgences when forbidden become sweeter when the law forbids them; but that is no reason why an enactment, which is proper, should not be enforced. With reference to a majority of the total vote being required to pass the law, it appears to me, as I understand the law, that a majority of the entire votes in counties where two parties are reasonably equal, will be almost impossible. By this proposed amendment, a majority of the whole of the names on the voters' list will be required. It is well known that there are many non-residents and many repeaters. There are many absentees who cannot vote; some may be dead at the time, and yet the hon. gentleman would require that all should vote, whether living or dead, or otherwise absent, in order to carry the Bill into effect.

MR. BOULTBEE: No, no.

MR. CASEY: That will be the effect of this amendment. Suppose a man has several votes; he might in one place vote to have the Bill put in force, and in the other places where he did not vote, he would in effect be put down as against the Bill. But the hon. gentleman, and the Licensed Victuallers' Association, of which he appears to be the champion, wish apparently to have the votes of the living and present voters

killed by the votes of the dead and the absent.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order; question; order; carried.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I must ask for order; really we must have order.

MR. CASEY: The hon. member for East York (Mr. Boultee), and the association of which he is the mouth-piece, wishes the votes of men recorded in one place killed by the same man's own name registered in another place, but not voted. I cannot think the hon. gentleman has looked at the Bill seriously, and I am sure that he has not thoroughly considered the legal and inevitable effect of his amendment, which is utterly unfair, ridiculous and unjust in its nature. What we really want, in order to carry out the law, is the majority of influence in any particular community, and not necessarily their numerical majority.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order; carried; question.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope hon. gentlemen will keep order.

MR. BLAKE: I think we ought to have some degree of decency observed. A sense of duty compels me to say that these disgraceful exhibitions are becoming intolerable.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nine-tenths of the noise is on the Opposition side of the House.

MR. CASEY: I think that the majority of those who take the trouble to vote on a Bill of this character, the Scott Act, ought to be sufficient to ensure the carrying out of the Bill efficiently and reasonably. The argument in reference to the loss to be sustained by persons having investments in the trade is of no weight, except in favour of awarding some compensation, which is not the question now before us. As this is a Government Bill, the Government will, if they do not use their influence one way or the other, renounce their functions on a most important question. I must allude briefly to the attack made by the hon. member for East York upon the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), for his alleged ungentlemanly and unparliamentary conduct in rising to speak before him. The hon. member for East York introduced the amendment at

the last moment last night. He made what remarks he had to make.

MR. BOULTBEE: No, I did not.

MR. CASEY: I think so.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No, no. He did not speak.

MR. CASEY: Well my recollection was that he had spoken.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. CASEY: Well, then, he made his motion without saying anything in support of it.

MR. BOULTBEE: I do not know whether it is parliamentary or not to have to sit here and listen to a man saying what is untrue.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. CASEY: I—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. CASEY: I speak to a point of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point raised?

MR. CASEY: I stated, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman had spoken to his motion when he introduced it, last night. I was under the impression that he had, but I have just admitted his own statement of the affair, and it is this admission and repetition of his own statement which he has characterised as entirely untrue. After the motion was made, the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Blake) had moved the adjournment, and at the opening of the House to-day, the hon. the Minister of Customs had also spoken to the motion. In fact, the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had only continued a debate begun some time before, and for so doing he had been called "ungentlemanly." As a matter of fact, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) had no right to speak at all on the motion at this stage except by the courtesy of the House—a courtesy he had grossly abused, by making such an attack on another hon. member.

MR. PLUMB: I only rise to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), who called upon hon. gentlemen who had supported the Resolution of the hon. member for Lisgar, not to go back on their record, but to vote down the motion of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton). The hon. gentleman did not however state the case,

in that connection, precisely as it appears on record. I will, therefore, read the record in order that the hon. gentlemen, appealed to by the hon. member for West Middlesex, may see how far they are bound, and in order that they may in fact understand the nature of the appeal made to them by that hon. gentleman on the 4th of April 1877 (see *Votes and Proceedings*, page 236) from which the hon. member for West Middlesex has been apparently and hesitatingly quoting. It will be found that the hon. member for Lisgar moved:

"That in the opinion of this House, a Prohibitory Liquor Law is the only effectual remedy for the evil of intemperance, and that is the duty of the Government to submit such a measure for the approval of Parliament at the earliest moment practicable."

At that time the hon. member for West Middlesex strongly opposed the Resolution and offered the following amendment:—

That all the words after "that" in the original motion be expunged and the following substituted in lieu thereof:—
"Whereas, grave doubts exist whether under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, this House has the power to deal with the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and whereas the Court of Error and Appeal in the Province of Ontario has referred a case to the Supreme Court whereby the relative jurisdiction of the Provincial and Dominion Legislatures, *in re* the Liquor Traffic, will be argued, be it therefore resolved, that this House, while not receding from any previous declaration on the importance of a Prohibitory Liquor Law, deems it inexpedient, under these circumstances, at present to express any opinion regarding the action to be taken by the Government in dealing with this question."

This amendment was carried by 104 votes to 59, and the question on the Resolution of which it was an amendment was not therefore put at all. The names of the hon. gentlemen who voted against the amendment have been cited by the hon. member for West Middlesex, and the impression given by his remarks would be that they had voted affirmatively for a prohibitory liquor law. The 104 who voted for the amendment were the political friends of the mover; the 59 who voted against it were on this side of the House, then in Opposition. The hon. gentleman did me the honour to say that my name was among them. I therefore, thought it right to explain the

matter, which clearly does not bear his interpretation. We voted in favour of temperance, but not in favour of the arbitrary measure now advocated. It is not a question in which we are bound to follow the hon. gentleman and his friends. I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for East York, and I shall not be deterred by the nonsensical and impertinent charge that, if I do so I must be an agent of the Licensed Victuallers' Association, directly made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) against every one who may support the Resolution of the hon. member for East York, and who, in the course of his ingenious remarks, has, as usual, managed to bring his argument to support conclusions exactly the reverse of what he was intending to support. He generally contrives to overshoot the mark, and score a point for his opponents. No man will go further than I in support of any measure which will fairly and squarely meet this case, and tend to assuage the fearful evils of intemperance; but I say, that any sumptuary legislation, of an arbitrary character, which may be forced upon the community by a bare majority of the voters who go the polls, representing, perhaps, a third or a fifth of the voters registered, will fail to command respect or obedience, and that it will have anything but a beneficial effect, from the fact that it has not the moral nor the numerical support of the community upon which it acts. The very fact of the hon. member for West Middlesex making such an appeal as we have just heard, shows that he has no confidence in the community, that he has no hold on the community. I certainly feel myself at a disadvantage in speaking on the temperance question of prohibition, against such an able advocate of that principle. But, Sir, I firmly believe that he has no evidence in the attitude of the people of the Dominion in respect to that question, and I say that the clearest, best possible test that can possibly be made of the sincerity of that hon. gentleman, and of those who act with him, is to insist upon this Resolution, and compel them to vote upon it. I shall vote for it without regard to any sneers about ulterior motives. It did not become the hon. member for West Elgin to lecture this House, and to say the Resolution was brought forward

by a person who was the agent of the licensed victuallers.

Mr. CASEY : I never said he was the agent. I said the hon. gentleman made himself the mouthpiece of that association.

Mr. PLUMB : The hon. gentleman not only said that, but he stated the hon. member was the agent.

Mr. CASEY : If I said that, it was a slip of the tongue.

Mr. PLUMB : I hope the Resolution will receive the calm consideration of the House. Every hon. member has a right to take his own view on a question of this kind. Wherever forced measures have been tried, they have proved a miserable failure. In the State of Maine, there is a habitual violation of the law, which demoralises the people. In the town of Bangor, where it has its strongest advocates, the police are in such a position that they dare not report the violations, because, if they did so, they would lose their places. While I am willing that this experiment should be tried, I am not willing to have it tried in a way by which the minority, a handful of voters, will be able to coerce the whole community. The Resolution being a perfectly fair one, I trust it will meet with the support of the majority of this House.

Mr. HACKETT : I think the amendment is a perfectly reasonable one. In looking at the Act of 1878, I find that the 6th Clause states that the genuine signatures of at least one-fourth of the electors shall be deposited with the Sheriff before the proclamation can issue. We all know that the Dunkin Act has proved a perfect failure in those counties in Ontario in which it has been tried, and it has deprived municipalities of a large revenue during the time the Act was in force. Indeed, wherever it has been tried, it has only lasted a few months before the electors have turned out and voted for its repeal. I believe that nothing short of a Prohibiting liquor law will stop drinking in this country and if such a law was brought forward and provided for a compensation for all those engaged in the liquor traffic, I would prefer to support it. If this measure comes into force it will last for three years, and in that way be worse than the Dunkin Act, and I, therefore, hope the House will vote for this amendment.

Mr. PLUMB.

MR. LONGLEY: This question, sprung upon the House, as I may say, in the last hours of the Session, is not, if the advocates of temperance can prevent it, to be passed in a single hour. I was not in Parliament when the Canada Temperance Act was passed, but I am familiar with the circumstances which led to the passage of that Act, and I beg to inform this House that the authors of that Act did not from the beginning contemplate the passage of a prohibitory Act, and therefore, in my estimation, my hon. friend from West Middlesex was quite consistent in opposing a motion in favour of prohibition, which he did not believe at that time, and which he does not believe now, was made in sincerity. It is a peculiarity, a marked characteristic of those gentlemen who have always stood opposed to the temperance movement, in which there is more of human happiness, and peace, and material prosperity bound up than in all the questions of the day, to work in this way against it. The temperance question is worth ten questions of National Policy, important as that may be, because if you had prohibition, pure and simple, you would challenge the exercise of the common sense of some of those who, in practice and precept, have stood opposed to the cause. Prohibition has been tried in some of the Provinces of the Dominion. I do not say it has had a fair trial, but it reached the stage in Nova Scotia that a strict prohibitory enactment was passed by the House of Assembly in 1855, by a majority of twenty-nine against nineteen, which was a pretty clear indication of the sentiment of the people of the Province at that time. Simultaneously, a prohibitory enactment was passed in New Brunswick, which, owing to a variety of combinations, unfavourable in their character, never accomplished what was expected of it by its friends. The sentiment of the temperance people of the whole Dominion had settled down to the belief that it was better to try something practicable than aim at once for prohibition, avowing, at the same time, that it was a settled conviction that, for the ultimate cure of inebriety, nothing less than prohibition would answer the purpose. Let us consider for a moment the scope and bearing of the amendment which has been pro-

posed. I do not wish to impute unworthy motives to any hon. member of this House, and I say in the beginning, that I am willing to accord to every hon. gentleman who differs from me the same liberty that I claim for myself; but when hon. gentlemen undertake to advocate a cause, we naturally expect something in the form of argument, and we expect that the reasons they assign for opposing a good measure will be cogent reasons, for the course they have adopted. I have not yet heard such an argument in favour of the amendment. I am inclined to assume that, during the last twenty years, the minds of the people have not been more deeply stirred than they were by the vote in Nova Scotia in 1878, and the feeling of interest in regard to that Election was never more all-prevalent than at that time. What was the result? Under that state of public feeling we would naturally have supposed that almost every man would have gone to the polls and voted. Yet out of a total vote of 62,042 only 49,044 polled, or 82 per cent., or thereabouts, of the whole electoral vote. I assume, in regard to a question like the one under discussion, that the interest would not be as all-absorbing as it would be in reference to a question of a broader character with regard to which everyone might be supposed to feel an interest. Again, it is only fair to assume that the men who are actuated by interested—I will not say sordid—motives, would naturally make a greater effort to defend their interests than the temperance men, many of whom, I regret to say, are lukewarm or half-hearted in the cause, and can scarcely be depended upon in an emergency. The odds, therefore, are all in favour of those interested, directly and indirectly, in the traffic, and they would be more likely to poll a larger proportionate vote than the temperance men. Each would be at least upon equal terms, and I think it is fair to assume that the rum interest would be more stirred than those who have been labouring on behalf of teetotalism. I am inclined to think that the men who have been labouring in the cause of teetotalism for thirty-five or forty years, continually sacrificing their time, their comfort and their means, and during this long interval, having acquired a very extended and intimate acquaintance with the subject with which they were called

upon to deal, are rather better prepared to form an opinion upon this question than the novices who are always ready to find fault, but who, neither by precept or practice, have lifted a hand to save the thousands of men going down to drunkards' graves, and from all the pains, penalties, sorrows, tears and woes which spring from the liquor traffic. I have heard hon. gentlemen talk about vested rights, and about the ruthlessness of men who would take away their property. What rights are there connected with a business which goes to sap the morality of the people and interferes with the industries of the country? What is the condition of the leading cities of the Mother Country—London, Liverpool, Glasgow, etc.? What unsexes fair women, embrutes and makes them shameless? It is the drink, and here, forsooth, we are asked to vote for an amendment which is not designed, as it is professed, to make the law operative, but is designed expressly to defeat the law, to strike such a blow at it that it cannot be brought into operation in one-eighth of the constituencies of the Dominion. It is not, in my judgment, with a view of backing up the law with a strong, moral sentiment and with numbers, but to prevent the law from going into operation. Hon. gentlemen tell us that this is a tyrannical law, but they have not established that allegation. What is more reasonable. I appeal to the unbiased opinion of every hon. gentleman in regard to a great moral question like this, in connection with which men's views and interests naturally clash, whether it is not safe to leave this question in the hands of the people. We are willing, when great issues come up from time to time, which divide the people, to accept the mere majority of votes polled; and such a principle as is sought to be introduced into this law is not to be found in our law, except in regard to certain local matters involving heavy taxation, where it is thought better, for the security of all, to have a two-thirds or three-fourths vote. It is an instance of the unfairness, or want of thought, or reason, of the advocates of this amendment, that they thus seek to introduce a new feature into our law. I was amused to hear the hon. gentleman who made himself so prominent respecting this

amendment, refer to a certain Bill introduced into the Committee of Railways and Canals the other day, requiring a majority of all the stock-holders to be present and becoming assenting parties to any business transacted. Why was this? Were all those stock-holders on hand so that they were comeatable in one or two or three days? They might be spread all over the continent, and in England, and in other places, and, therefore, it was only deemed fair to all that there should be a majority present, but there is nothing in connection with this law analagous to that condition of things. For centuries past, we have had legislation acknowledging the dangerous character of the liquor traffic. We have sought to restrain and trammel it, and prevent just as many men as we could from getting a license—in other words for \$20, \$30, or \$50, parties could purchase the privilege of ruining and bringing to poverty their neighbours. Who can deny it? Do we hear of a murder, or arson, or theft, or any crime in Canada? We hear of them frequently enough. The Judges of the land who should be supposed to be not only disinterested, but abundantly competent to form a fair and impartial opinion, testify that seven-eighths or nine-tenths of such crimes may be directly or indirectly traced to the liquor traffic. That is not the worst of it. If you wish to make a brute of a man, just create in him a thirst for intoxicating liquors, and he goes from one state of degradation to another, only to become an object of pity and loathsomeness to his nearest and most intimate friends. What other vice can do all that for a man. A man may be charitable and honest towards his neighbour, and be guilty of many imperfections and sins; but show me a drunkard, and he is everything that is contemptible, vile, and pitiable. What takes down to dishonour and premature death 4,000 persons in this Dominion annually? What costs us \$16,000,000, at the lowest estimate, annually? Wipe out the liquor traffic, and in five years you will save money enough to build the Pacific Railway; and you will do more, you will save the morality of the people, and the energies of the people, the industry and capacity of a very considerable portion. Talk about liberty. If you want to see a slave, bring up the man who has the bottle in his

hand half the time. It is the man who eschews the evils, and seeks by force of example to lead others away from that bad path, who can boast of his liberty. The moderate drinker will express pity for his weaker brother, and wonder that he is such a fool as to indulge to excess, and yet, in five years his own condition will be worse than that of his neighbour, whose weakness he laments and deplores. It cannot be denied that a considerable percentage of those who are not drunkards to-day, became such, in course of time, and often in a very short time, and it is incontrovertible that a certain large percentage of those who drink, after a course of years, drink deeper and deeper, until they lose all sense of shame. I have another objection to this amendment. In many of the counties during an Election at a certain season, one-third at least of the whole voters would be absent. Now, assuming there is even a measure of truth in this statement of our Free-trade friends, that thousands of our people, have gone to the States this year, what about them? The Election under this law would be lost. By the latest electoral list it would be seen that about one-tenth or one-fifth of the voters at the previous election would be out of the country so that, looking at it in any way you please, it is fruitless to put an amendment the avowed object of which is to carry the law into effect, but which would really defeat its purpose. For curiosity's sake, I would like to know how many teetotalers will vote for this amendment. They are the men who know best about the law, who are the best judges of its merits, and what would assist them. I do not want to claim too much for the temperance men, but I am assured that there is quite a large percentage of men who have been saved from drink, and the lowest depths of degradation, through our efforts. But for the efforts of the temperance men who are denounced on the right hand and on the left, we should have been a whole nation of drunkards. In 1875, the temperance men from the different sections of the Dominion met in Convention, and after days of careful discussion and consideration of the question of temperance and prohibition, it was settled that they should not ask for prohibition, pure and simple, feeling that possibly the country was not ripe for such a measure,

and that they would, therefore, ask for a permissive measure, and try the effects of that, in the hope that it would steadily lead up to prohibition. Now I am not an admirer of the Canada Temperance Act. It is not by any means so stringent as the License Law we have in Nova Scotia, which has been in force for the last ten years. Let me say a few words about it. It is by the way, I fear, swept away by the recent decision of the Supreme Court. In Nova Scotia, for the last ten years, before a man could get a license to degrade, and make unhappy, and ruin his fellow-men, he had to get the consent of two-thirds of the voters of the polling district, and then had to go to the Grand Jury and get the recommendation of two-thirds of that body, and in the third stage had to go before the Court of Sessions, which had the power after all his pains of rejecting the prayer of his petition, and refusing his license. So through the instrumentality of that law, when vigorously enforced, as it was now and then, we find it easy to close up the grogeries in any given place, in a very short period. What is the testimony in reference to this matter. It is that with three or four energetic men, we can carry out the law. It has been asserted by some hon. members that the Maine Law has been a failure. Some persons, who I fear, are too fond of drinking themselves, state that more drinking occurs where the Maine Law has been adopted than elsewhere. The testimony of Judges, District-Attorneys, and the Chiefs of Police, and all the various classes who have the best chances of obtaining information in connection with the subject, shows the beneficial working of the law. In one place where there were 100 grogeries, three months after the passage of the Maine Law there was not one selling liquor openly, and very few who were selling secretly; and with reference to the number in the state prisons and asylums, and in regard to the cost of maintaining this worthless part of the community, the testimony has been surprisingly in favour of the operation and effects of the Maine Law. I might say much more on this subject, were the Session not so advanced, but I want specially to impress on the mind of every intelligent gentleman this fact: that we are paying an immense sum of

money, directly, for the privilege of perpetuating the drink traffic which destroys the lives and happiness of the people, and blasts the prospects, in the case of many a man, both for time and eternity. \$16,000,000, at the lowest estimate, is the amount spent on this liquor traffic; some put it as high as \$20,000,000—that is, the first cost. But what is the cost when retailed by the glass? In fact it is manufactured *ad infinitum*, the quantity first imported is multiplied ten-fold. Another thing not unworthy the attention of every man who would not run the risk of his life is, that a large portion of what every person drinks, who indulges in intoxicating liquors, is little short of absolute poison. The man who drinks intoxicating liquors thus runs the hazard of his life. There was a time when men were less injured than now, when liquors were said to be good, and I believe that was true in a large measure. But it is equally true that a skilled wine merchant or liquor dealer can imitate any sort of liquor he pleases, in such a way that he may deceive the greatest connoisseur. Many incidents might be brought forward to illustrate the character of the liquors that are in use, and the dishonest and debasing devices that are resorted to with a view of perpetuating this traffic. I want to know if this business were like any other business why is it that we need to restrain it? The moment you seek to restrain it, you admit that it is an evil, that it is like an adder, or a serpent, in its dangerous character. There are awful warnings in the Bible in regard to this. We are told: "Look not upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth its colour in the cup, for at the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. Who hath woe; who hath sorrow; who hath contention; who hath redness of eyes; who hath wounds without cause." Are there any here who can testify? Mr. Speaker, there is always some consolation in adversity. When one has been engaged for thirty or forty years in arduous toil for a cause which he believes essential to man's present and future good, and sees that things are going wrong, and is apprehensive that the tide is turning against him, there are a few facts from which he may draw consolation. Who are the men who are in favour of

Mr. LONGLEY.

this reform? Who are they who have sought for years to save their fellow men from intemperance? Do they not include the best men of the country? I am glad to say that we find the clergy of all sects and denominations—perhaps I may say seven-eighths of them—in favour of total abstinence and prohibition. These men not only preach but they practice. What we complain of is that our friends opposite preach a good deal and practice precious little. Now, it may be an extreme view to take, but I hold there are cases in which a moderate drinker is worse than a drunkard.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings): Do not look at me.

Mr. LONGLEY: I refer, of course, to the force of example. If there is a poor, despised drunkard, imbecile, his clothing in rags, who tumbles about the streets, men do not point to him as a justification for their drinking. He is looked upon in the light of a warning. But if you find a very respectable man, who can drink or let it alone as he pleases, who, perhaps, only drinks once a week or once a month, that man is at once referred to as a justification for deeper drinking on the part of another; so that, in the light of example, the influence of the moderate drinker is worse than that of the drunkard. It is not denied that 4,000, at least, out of a population of 4,000,000, annually die drunkards. These were once moderate drinkers, from whose ranks the inebriates were recruited. There are professed friends of temperance on the other side, who would have us believe they are heart and hand with us. We know they are not. I am not disposed to censure unduly, I hope the Ministry, but I have felt a shade of disappointment that there was not brought to bear upon the promoters of this enterprise that sort of influence which a Government, backed by eighty majority, can always bring. I know the delicacy of the position of the Government, but still I would have preferred that they had thrown their influence in the right scale. I will make no predictions, but it seems to me that it must come to this: that, no matter how wide are the differences that separate men in regard to politics, the day is not far distant when men, who have taken an interest in the temperance re-

form and believe it transcends in importance all other schemes for the promotion of the welfare of our people, will inevitably be drawn together, and the issue will be brought before the people at the polls before we are a score of years older. If we could relieve our country from this great burden, if we could relieve it from the attendant taxes, the attendant miseries in connection with the liquor traffic, then we would be happy, virtuous, and free. I trust the amendment will be voted down, as it should be, and that a measure, designed to promote sobriety and public virtue, may not be marred by the insidious proposal which I have sought, in conjunction with others, to oppose.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell): I would certainly not intrude myself upon the attention of the House at this period of the Session, were it not that I cannot give a silent vote upon the motion. It appears to me the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley), has forgotten that the question before the House is not whether teetotalism is a good or bad principle, but whether this particular amendment will be an advantage in the working of this law or otherwise. I was glad to hear the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), who is an authority on this subject, and the hon. member for Annapolis, say they were not in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, because they do not believe the public sentiment of this country is far enough advanced to justify the enactment of such a law. I can remember when I was defeated for Parliament six years ago, for expressing precisely those views and when, in my first contest for Montreal, I had the whole Temperance Electoral Association against me because, when they called upon me, I told them frankly that, while I would do all I could to promote temperance in the use of intoxicating liquors, I did not believe public opinion in this country was ripe for a prohibitory liquor law, and consequently that I would never vote for a law which I did not believe would be for the advantage of the people at the time it was passed. Now, what is the proposition made to us to-night? We have had a local option law in this country for a great number of years. It has been adopted in almost half the counties of Ontario, and in a great many counties in Quebec. What

has been the experience in relation to the working of this law in those counties? It has not brought about those results which the hon. member for Annapolis so eloquently described as desirable. It has not stopped the use of intoxicating liquors; it has simply produced Free-trade in liquors of the worst description. So apparent has that been, that, in almost every county where the local option law has been adopted, its practical operation during a few months led the people who adopted it to reverse their decision and repeal the law within a year, or at most two years, after its adoption. No one, I think, will venture to say that, if the mere adoption of this law in any county had the effect of stopping the sale and use of intoxicating liquors, and of producing those results which were described to us by the hon. member for Annapolis, we should by all means have that law. But experience has not pointed in that direction, particularly as regards the local option law in the Province of Ontario. Why? Simply because, as it seems to me, unless you have a very strong public sentiment in favour of a law of this kind, it cannot succeed. I do not mean that kind of public sentiment which is exhibited by a mere majority of persons who are brought up to vote—I do not mean that kind of feeling which is promoted by momentary excitement, aroused by the kind of weapons which are used on those occasions, and I think properly used, by those who are sincere and earnest in their advocacy of this question, nor do I know the kind of feeling that is promoted in that way—but I mean that, unless you have a strong sentiment on the part of an actual majority of persons, and such as this amendment would render necessary, the result of the passage of such a law would be simply to stop the licensed sale of intoxicating liquors, but nevertheless would not prevent them from being sold. That being the case, I believe it is not in the interest of temperance itself that this law should come into operation in counties where there is not such a strong and overwhelming sentiment in its favour, as would justify the belief that it would be enforced. Now, I do not believe a mere majority vote—that is, a majority of those going to the polls—is an evidence of that feel-

ing. The hon. gentleman from Annapolis has told us that, in Nova Scotia, where they have a License Law which he says is much better than this, a license can only be granted upon the consent of two-thirds of all the voters upon the electoral list. That is substantially the principle sought to be enforced by the amendment proposed, except that it is carried much further; and I cannot see the distinction in principle which is sought to be drawn between requiring an arbitrary number to permit the granting of a license, and the refusal of a license. I repeat that, if I believed it possible, by the adoption of the Scott Act by a mere majority vote in any county, to stop the use of intoxicating liquors, I would heartily support it. I am a total abstainer, and to the extent of my personal influence and example, I do what I can to enforce that principle. I am as deeply impressed with the evils of intemperance as the most ardent of those who are opposing this amendment. I have always supported, as a journalist, the adoption of local option laws wherever they have been proposed, and where my influence could be felt; but a careful study of this question, a study extending over thirty years, during which I have been familiar with all the phases of the temperance movement, convinces me that the drinking habits of the people cannot be prevented by the passage of a mere incidental majority of a by-law, prohibiting the retailing of intoxicating liquors within particular localities. The failure of such laws in the past has tended to injure the temperance movement. Nothing but an overwhelming temperance sentiment will enable the law to be enforced, and it is in this conviction that I vote for the amendment now proposed.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I simply want to make one observation. It has been made before, and it appears to me it is an observation which should impress itself upon the memory of the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment. The Act is upon its trial, and I ask the hon. gentleman to let it alone for a little while. It appears to me that the passage of this amendment will be a repudiation of the law which we recently passed, at the request of a great many people in this country, before they have had time to

verify their views, as to whether that Act may be efficient or not.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The difficulty I have experienced in this matter is simply this: We know, and the country understands perfectly well, that from 1873 to 1878, the country was stirred from one end to the other as to the best measure that could be adopted for the suppression of intemperance. It culminated in the passage by this Parliament of an Act that appeared to be accepted by both sides of the House. That Act was passed in 1878, and the first election that took place under its provisions was in the city of Fredericton. It was put in force, and its constitutionality was at once questioned. The result has been that, though the Act has been in force practically since 1878, no opportunity has been given by which we have been able to test it, as has been the case with the Dunkin Act. I hope we shall have an opportunity of ascertaining whether the Act may prove effective, and with that view I should be sorry if the amendment of the hon. member for East York became law. As one who has proposed to this House a measure, which I believe is calculated to give employment to the people, and make the masses happier and place them in a better condition, I naturally desire to see followed up a proposition that, while their earnings are increased, will save them from temptation. Therefore, I, for one, will feel myself called upon to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for East York.

MR. BRECKEN: I, myself, agree with the principle of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East York, but I cannot vote for it for the reason that Prince Edward Island occupies a peculiar position. We would have no means of ascertaining, under our present system of conducting elections, whether a majority of the electors had voted yea or nay on that question. A large number of the people of the Island are in favour of the measure as it stands, and, therefore, I cannot support the amendment.

MR. GILLMOR: I am quite satisfied, from present appearances, that hon. members are not disposed to listen to a speech from any hon. member on the question now under discussion. If they will give me a hearing for five minutes, I promise not to trespass longer on their patience.

I agree with the hon. the Minister of Finance, as regards the effects of this amendment, on the Temperance Act. But it was quite unnecessary for him to introduce any reference to his famous National Policy. I am not an enthusiast on the question of prohibition; my experience in New Brunswick, on that question, has been such as to cause me to be cautious. But hon. members must know that those who agitate and labour in this cause of total abstinence are doing so for the purpose of educating public opinion up to their standard. Their efforts, after years of labour, has resulted in bringing public opinion to a point sufficient to cause this Legislature to pass the Temperance Act, now on the Statute-book. It has taken two years to establish the constitutionality of the law. After this decision, I think it unwise and unfair to attempt to destroy the Act, by attaching this amendment. Whether the law will, or will not, meet the object of its promoters, can only be decided by giving it a fair trial. If this amendment is carried, it will have the effect of rendering the Bill inoperative, and it might as well be repealed. It is better for all parties that this law should now have a fair trial, if not, there will be great dissatisfaction, and social discord is sure to follow. The law has already been adopted by six populous counties in New Brunswick, the votes polled were not numerous, but the majority in favour of its adoption was four or five to one. There is no denying the fact that, whether the law can be worked successfully or not, so far as public opinion has been expressed, both in and out of Parliament, that a large majority of the people want to try it, and the better course will be, to let it go to the country untrammelled by this amendment.

Motion made :

That the said Bill be now read the third time.—(*Mr. Bowell.*)

Motion in amendment made and question proposed :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend it by inserting the following Clause :—

“The 57th Section of the said, The Canada Temperance Act, 1878, is hereby repealed, and the following Clause substituted therefor :—If the

majority of all the voters, whose names are entered on the Voters' Lists, used at such polling, vote for the Petition, the same shall be held to have been adopted, but not otherwise, and the Returning Officer shall make his return to the Governor-General in Council accordingly.”
—(*Mr. Boulton.*)

The House divided :—Yeas, 96 ; nays, 73.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers	Kirkpatrick
Anglin	Kranz
Arnell	Lane
Baby	Langevin
Bannerman	LaRue
Barnard	Macmillan
Beauchesne	McCallum
Béchar	McCarthy
Benoit	McCuaig
Bergeron	McGreevy
Bergin	McInnes
Bolduc	McLennan
Boulton	McQuade
Brooks	Malouin
Bunster	Masson
Bunting	Massé
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Merner
Carling	Mongenais
Caron	Mousseau
Cimon	O'Connor
Cockburn (W. N'land.)	Orton
Coughlin	Patterson (Essex)
Coupal	Perrault
Coursol	Pinoaneault
Cuthbert	Platt
Daly	Plumb
Daoust	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Dawson	Rinfret
DeCosmos	Robinson
Desaulniers	Rochester
Desjardins	Routhier
Doull	Royal
Draw	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Dugas	Rykert
Dumont	Shaw
Elliott	Stephenson
Ferguson	Tassé
Fitzsimmons	Tellier
Fortin	Thompson (Cariboo)
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Vanasse
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Grandbois	Wallace (W. York)
Hesson	Weldon
Houde	White (Cardwell)
Hurteau	White (E. Hasting)
Jones	Williams
Kanbach	Wiser
Keeler	Wright.—96.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Allison	King
Bain	Lantier
Bill	Laurier
Blake	Longley
Borden	Macdonald (Victoria BC)
Bourassa	McDonald (Pictou)
Bourbeau	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.)

Bowell	Macdonald (N. Lanark)
Brecken	Mackenzie
Brown	Macdougall
Burpee (St. John)	McRory
Burpee (Sunbury)	Méthot
Cameron (South Huron)	Mills
Cartwright	Montplaisir
Casey	Oliver
Casgrain	Olivier
Chandler	Paterson (S. Brant)
Charlton	Pickard
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Poupore
Colby	Robertson (Shelburne)
CConnell	Rogers
Costigan	Ross (Dundas)
Farrow	Ross (West Middlesex)
Fiset	Rouleau
Fleming	Rymal
Flynn	Schultz
Fulton	Scriver
Gigault	Skinner
Gillmor	Smith (Selkirk)
Guthrie	Sproule
Haddow	Thompson (Haldimand)
Hilliard	Tilley
Holton	Trow
Hooper	Tupper
Huntington	Wade
Ives	White (North Renfrew)
Killam	—73.

Motion *resolved* in the affirmative.

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

After Recess.

House *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole, and *reported* the Bill as amended.

Question *proposed* on the third reading of the Bill.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): I move in amendment that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be read the third time this day three months. I think the House will, on reconsideration of the subject, deal summarily with the amendment just carried, and it is for this reason that I now propose the present amendment.

MR. BLAKE: I think the amendment of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton) destructive of the Bill, and, therefore, I shall vote for the three months' hoist.

MR. ANGLIN: The Bill is based upon the assumption that a majority of the people, in any particular district, shall be able to put the Act in operation. Those who look at this question from a reasonable and sensible point of view, will see that the Bill, as it stands, is fair and proper. I am not a prohibitionist: I am entirely opposed to prohibition; but I believe the Bill, as now amended by

MR. ROSS.

the amendment of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton), will work most beneficially and reasonably.

MR. McCUAIG: I have been nearly half a century a member of the Total Abstinence Society, and have taken an active part in the temperance movement. After a year and a-half's experience of the Dunkin Act in my own county, I have come to the conclusion that it is an absolute failure. The consumption of intoxicating drinks has been far more than before. In the town of Picton, where I reside, there are 40 places where whiskey is sold. I am sorry to find this as a result of legislation; but it is true, and I shall vote for the amendment of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Boulton). We cannot legislate so as to make men sober, so long as adjoining counties sell liquors, and so long as we derive very large revenues from that source. I feel bound to say that I look upon all legislation in the way of restraining the sale and consumption of alcoholic liquors as a failure.

Motion *made* :

That the said Bill be now read the third time.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Motion in amendment *made* and question *proposed* :

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be read the third time this day three months.—(Mr. Ross, West Middlesex.)

The House *divided*.—Yeas, 54; nays, 85.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Allison	Hooper
Bain	Huntington
Blake	Ives
Borden	King
Bourassa	Lantier
Bourbeau	Laurier
Bowell	Longley
Brown	McDonald (Vict., N. S.)
Burpee (St. John)	McRory
Burpee (Sunbury)	Oliver
Cameron (South Huron)	Olivier
Cartwright	Paterson (South Brant)
Casgrain	Pickard
Charlton	Robertson (Shelburne)
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Rogers
Colby	Ross (Dundas)
CConnell	Ross (West Middlesex)
Fiset	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Fleming	Rymal
Fulton	Schultz
Geoffrion	Scriver
Gigault	Skinner
Gunn	Sproule

Guthrie	Thompson (Haldimand)
Haddow	Tilley
Hilliard	Trow
Holton	Tupper.—54

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott	Kranz
Anglin	Langevin
Arkell	LaRue
Baby	Little
Baker	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Bannerman	McDonald (Pictou)
Barnard	Macmillan
Beauchesne	McCallum
Benoit	McCarthy
Bergin	McCuaig
Bolduc	Macdougall
Boultsbee	McGreevy
Brooks	McLennan
Bunting	McQuade
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Malouin
Carling	Masson
Caron	Merner
Cimon	Méthot
Coughlin	Mongenais
Coursol	Montplaisir
Currier	Orton
Cuthbert	Patterson (Essex)
Daly	Perrault
Daoust	Pinsonneault
Dawson	Platt
DeCosmos	Plumb
Desaulniers	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Desjardins	Richey
Doull	Rinfret
Drew	Robinson
Dugas	Rouleau
Dumont	Routhier
Elliott	Rykert
Ferguson	Shaw
Fitzsimmons	Stephenson
Fortin	Thompson (Cariboo)
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Grandbois	Wallace (West York)
Hesson	Weldon
Houde	White (Cardwell)
Jones	Williams
Keeler	Wiser.—85
Kirkpatrick	

Motion resolved in the negative.

Bill read the third time and passed.

PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 123.]

(Mr. Baby.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

MR. BLAKE: Are there any other material changes in the Bill, beyond those discussed, with regard to the alteration of tests?

MR. BABY: No; the only changes are those I have indicated as to the fire test. In order to make the Canadian oil of better quality, the fire test is raised from 105° to 115°. Then the responsibility

of the inspection of petroleum is transferred from the officer to the trader and the retailer, in order to ascertain if it is actually what it is represented to be in the packages. Then, instead of gauging the packages, as under the old law, which was very inconvenient both to importers and retailers, their weight is to be taken. I think it is a step in the right direction. It is well-known there is a difference between American and Canadian oils of between five and seven degrees. The reason we have established such a high fire test is to prevent explosions; to secure that a proper quality of oil is brought into the market. In every country where petroleum is in use, a fire test is applied to see that the oil does not contain those explosive matters which endanger life and property. Under this law the same instruments will be used by all the officers, so that the inspection will be uniform. Should any misunderstanding arise between the officer, the importer, the refiner, or the retailer, the matter will be settled at the central office.

MR. SCRIVER: I understood the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to say that it was admitted on all hands that there was ground for discrimination against the American oil in the fire test. I believe the hon. member for Stanstead assumed that there was no ground for discrimination between American and Canadian oil, and in that I fully agree with him. The result of all the experiments I saw, and I believe they were quite fair, were not such as to lead me to believe that any ground for this discrimination exists. I regret that the hon. Minister, for reasons which are, no doubt, sufficient to himself, has been induced to raise the test on American oil from the degree proposed by the hon. member for Stanstead, 115°, to 120°. If the hon. Minister had been willing to accept the former as a proper fire test for American oil, it would have permitted many of us living on the frontier to import and make use of a grade of American oil, which we have been in the habit of using for some time past, and which has been productive of no accident. A difference of five degrees will shut us out from the use of that particular grade of oil, and will inflict an injury upon those of us who prefer to use American oil. I believe this action will

have the result of affording, in an indirect way, to Canadian refiners and producers, an addition to the Protection they already enjoy, and which, I think, was already sufficient to satisfy all reasonable people.

MR. BABY: According to the tests we have made, there is certainly reason for making a difference in the fire tests of American and Canadian oils. We took very great care to have reliable experiments. We engaged for that purpose very good men from the other side of the line, who were themselves inspectors. The test, as it stands now, does not exclude American oil. The oil the hon. gentleman alludes to is much above 115°, it is 125°. That is Downer's oil, in Boston, and is the one which the Eastern Townships people use. The Department have been in close relations with that house in Boston, and the latter are perfectly satisfied with the test as it appears in the Bill. This test will not exclude that oil, nor will it exclude any good American oil. It may exclude those oils which contain dangerous explosive materials. In raising the gravity and the fire test of Canadian oil, we hope to secure a better quality of oil for our market, and one which will not explode.

MR. WRIGHT: I have been in the habit of getting from New York an oil called the astral oil, which gives an exceedingly agreeable light. Last fall I ordered this oil as usual, and found that it did not meet the test laid down by the regulations. I went to the Customs house to enquire why this fine oil, that I had used for ten years without accident, had been, all at once, found to be so very dangerous, and if it was so to send it back to New York. I wished to know who this special chemist was that had pronounced this oil dangerous. I was ushered into a room in which there were many retorts, and I found there a gentleman, who had been previously connected with the Post Office Department, who applied the test. I found it rather strange that a man who, to my certain knowledge, possessed no special skill in chemistry, should be engaged in that class of operations. I said to that gentleman: "What special knowledge have you in this matter?" "O," said he, "we are furnished with a book, and we are furnished with these retorts." I said:

"Given the books and the retorts, where is the chemist who is to apply this knowledge?" He looked at me carefully, and silently pointed to the retorts. The whole was like a scene in the famous play of the Alchemist. I retired a sadder and wiser man. My oil had to be sent back to New York, as not having stood the requirements of the law in the judgment of the chemist, and after a certain time a different kind of oil came in return, more expensive than that which had been sent back.

MR. COLBY: The remarks of the hon. gentleman are quite in point. Under the law, as it stood last year, under the 130° fire test, Pratt's astral oil, which diffuses such a beautiful radiance, was excluded. As a matter of necessity, a higher grade of oil, a special oil by the same manufacturer, had to be imported, in order to meet the requirements of the law. The oil which my hon. friend had previously used, stood the burning test at 150° or the flash test of 130°. The oil which he subsequently purchased from the same manufacturer, cost him three or four cents a gallon more than the other, and was an inferior illuminating oil. I am assured, by a gentleman from New York, an oil inspector of fifteen years experience, that the 150° burning test oil, the standard white oil, will still come in under the 120° test, so that my hon. friend will not be subjected, in the future, to the annoyance he has experienced. The oils in the United States, I believe, are classified into three or four grades. There is an ordinary export oil standing a burning test of 110°, which is used in England and other foreign countries. I think it is an inflammable and dangerous oil, and never could be admitted into Canada under the old fire test of 105°. There is another test of superior oil standing the burning test of 150°, and comparing in its quality with Pratt's astral oil. The superior classes of illuminating oils, and perhaps the most profitable in the interest of the consumer, are not excluded by the proposed flash test of 120°. Now, I have not, in the slightest degree, changed my view with regard to the comparative safety of the two oils. I believe the American oil and the Canadian oil, standing the same fire test, are, intrinsically, equally safe. The use of the pyrometer

is to detect the presence of gasoline, benzine, naphtha and several other inflammable substances. If, at a test of 110° the flash is not discovered, then these substances are not present in dangerous quantities; consequently, I believe the one oil is as safe the other. There may be a very slight difference between them, as many practical men insist that a portion of gasoline may be held in suspense, mechanically associated with paraffine. But as the hon. Minister has carefully investigated this question, and shows a disposition to meet the reasonable views of hon. members, I am not disposed to press the matter upon a theoretical point. But, as I stated to the House last evening, should I find myself mistaken in this matter, that practical inconvenience is resulting, that we are in any way compelled to purchase a class of special oils, I shall return to this subject next Session with more earnestness and determination to get justice done, than I have this Session. Upon the whole, observing that the hon. Minister has incorporated many excellent features in this Bill, particularly that with reference to the inspection of petroleum, I shall give it my support. One, at first, can hardly understand why the cost of inspection of Canadian oil should be 10c. a barrel, and the cost of inspection of American oil 30c. a barrel. The discrimination is, perhaps, too large, but the reason of it is that Canadian oil is inspected in large quantities. I understand that the hon. Minister desires to make this branch of the service self-sustaining. He desires to derive a sufficient amount of revenue from this source to cover the cost to which the Department is subjected, and he believes the additional cost will provide for a more thorough inspection in the future. Under these circumstances, while the matter might have been more satisfactorily adjusted, I am not disposed to object to that provision, being satisfied that the disposition of the hon. member is to meet the wishes of the House and the country, and being satisfied with the general excellence of the Bill as a whole.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply further considered.

Resolutions 230, 252 to 259, and 261 (May 3rd) read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 276, amount required to provide for contingent expenses of the High Commissioner of Canada in London, \$4,000,

MR. BLAKE: I think the proposal to pay \$14,000 in all to the High Commissioner of Canada is excessive. I do not think that expenditure is commensurate with the resources of the country. The American Minister, at the Court of St. James, only receives \$17,500, and the proposal to pay our London Agent \$14,000 seems to me to be entirely disproportionate. I move in amendment:

That the said Resolution be not concurred in, but that it be resolved, That the proposal to pay the London Agent \$10,000 a year for salary, and in addition \$4,000 a year for rent for a dwelling house and allowances, in all, \$14,000, is excessive.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It was stated very clearly and distinctly, I think, that this arrangement is calculated to save a very large sum of money to the Dominion. With regard to this vote I would say the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario has a salary of \$10,000 a year, and he has his house-rent, fuel and various other contingencies, amounting to far in excess of \$4,000 allowed him. I think it could scarcely be expected that the representative of the people of Canada, living in London, should not receive something like an equivalent to the sum appropriated for the expenses and salary of the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario.

MR. BLAKE: I am not disposed to admit that he is worth twice as much as you are.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That is no test at all, because we are supposed to be here on patriotic principles, and not from mercenary considerations. When I state what is a fact, that some managers of banking institutions receive \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year, I think the amount proposed to be voted is comparatively small. I think the House will not sustain my hon. friends proposition.

Motion made;

“That the said Resolution be now read the second time and agreed to.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

Motion in amendment (Mr. Blake) made and question proposed. [See above.]

The House divided:—Yeas, 48; nays, 14.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Anglin	Haïdow
Bain	Holtou
Blake	Huntington
Borden	Killam
Bourassa	King
Brown	LaRue
Burpee (St John)	Laurier
Burpee (Sunbury)	Mackenzie
Cameron (South Huron)	Malouin
Cartwright	Mills
Casey	Oliver
Casgrain	Olivier
Chandler	Paterson (South Brant)
Cockburn (Muskoka)	Pickard
Coupal	Rinfret
Dumont	Robertson (Shelburne)
Fiset	Rogers
Fleming	Rymal
Fulton	Scrivier
Geoffrion	Skinner
Gillies	Thompson (Haldimand)
Gillmor	Trow
Gunn	Weldon
Guthrie	Wiser—48.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott	Longley
Allison	Macdonald (Vict., B.C)
Angers	McDonald (Cape Breton)
Arkell	McDonald (Pictou)
Baby	McDonald (Victoria, NS)
Baker	Macmillan
Bannerman	McCallum
Barnard	McCarthy
Beauchesne	McCuig
Benoit	Macdougall
Bergeron	McGreevy
Bergin	McInnes
Bill	McKay
Bolduc	McLennan
Boultebe	McLeod
Bourbeau	McQuade
Bowell	McRory
Brooks	Masson
Bunting	Massue
Cameron (N. Victoria)	Merner
Carling	Méthot
Caron	Mongenais
Cimon	Montplaisir
Colby	Mousseau
Connell	O'Connor
Coursol	Orton
Currier	Quimet
Cuthbert	Patterson (Essex)
Daly	Perrault
Daoust	Pinsonneault
Dawson	Platt
Desaulniers	Plumb
Desjardins	Pope (Compton)
Drew	Pope (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Dugas	Richey
Elliott	Robertson (Hamilton)
Ferguson	Robinson
Fitzsimmons	Kouleau
Gigault	Routhier
Girouard (Jacq. Cartier)	Royal
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Ryan (Marquette)
Granbois	Rykert

Hesson	Schultz
Hilliard	Shaw
Hooper	Sproule
Houde	Stephenson
Hurteau	Tasse
Ives	Tellier
Jones	Thompson (Cariboo)
Keeler	Tilley
Kilvert	Tupper
Kirkpatrick	Wade
Kranz	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Lane	Wallace (West York)
Langevin	White (Cardwell)
Lantier	Williams
Little	Wright.—114

Motion resolved in the negative.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 277 to 317 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 318, Cow bay—To pay Messrs. Archibald and Company, for work executed in 1876, \$5,974.30.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I should like to know on what principle this is now brought forward after the expiration of four years. To the best of my recollection, this work was purchased from these gentlemen at a large price three or four years ago, and, unless I am greatly mistaken, this is an old claim which was presented and adjudicated upon by the late Government, and found to be unreasonable.

MR. LANGEVIN: This claim was under the consideration of the Government three years ago. The work was purchased by the hon. gentlemen opposite in 1875, and in 1876 a storm damaged the works, and Mr. Archibald, fearing that they would be carried away, and in order to protect the Government property, and his own property, expended \$5,974. Reports were made at different times by the engineer, Mr. Perley, who stated that the work was necessary, and that if it had not been done, the Government property would have been in danger of destruction. Mr. Tomlinson, the engineer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, also reported in August last year, that the work done by Mr. Archibald, though prompted by anxiety to preserve his own works from injury, was of the utmost service in preventing serious damage to the Government property, and that he considered the items correct, and the charges proper. On the strength of those reports, the Government decided to ask Parliament for this vote.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY.

MR. MACKENZIE: Wherever any claim has been adjudicated upon by the late Government, and disposed of against the interests of the claimants, the present Government appear always prepared to take it up and pay it. If I recollect right, this is the twentieth instance of that character, and I think it would be interesting to make up a list of those claims and the reasons for their payment. Mr. Archibald believed he had a right to enter upon our works and make additions to consult his own views of its strength without consulting the Government. That those additions made the work better there is no doubt, but Mr. Tomlinson is not warranted in saying that our pier would have given way if that work had not been done. They went to work and expended money where we did not intend to spend any, and I refused to entertain the claim. The reasons why the hon. gentleman has entertained it are not to my mind sufficient. True hon. gentlemen opposite have gained a supporter and I have lost one, for Mr. Archibald avowed his intention to oppose the Government at the last General Election because we refused to pay his claim for those repairs. It is rather hard that the late Government should have lost this very independent supporter because of their adherence to the public interests, and that hon. gentlemen opposite should pay him \$6,000 in order to gain his support. There is no ground whatever for the claim.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 319 to 335 read the second time and agreed to.

On Resolution 336, Welland Canal—amount required for repairs at Port Maitland, \$25,000,

MR. McLENNAN said: Before this item is passed, I wish to say a word on the subject of the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence route. With respect to the canal, my own impression is, that more can be said than that the present works should be completed. I believe they are all under contract, and, when they are completed, the country can afford to wait for results. I believe, however, that no reliable estimate is yet before the country, upon which the cost of getting 12 ft. of water, from Kingston to Montreal can be judged; and I believe further, that no expenditure in that direction would bring

a commensurate return. In my opinion, no measurable expenditure upon the St. Lawrence Canals will make the transport of the great staple produce of the country appreciably cheaper.

MR. CASEY: Is it in order, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the general canal policy at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not wish to stop the hon. gentleman, but I think it is not quite in order to discuss the general policy relating to canals now. Port Maitland pier is now under consideration.

MR. McLENNAN: Then I bow to the ruling of the Chair.

Resolution read the second time and agreed to.

Resolution 337 read the second time and agreed to.

Resolutions 338 and 339 read the second time and agreed to, on a division.

Resolutions 340 to 350, and 352 to 367, read the second time and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

1. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1880, the sum of \$1,712,346.55 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the financial year ending 30th June, 1881, the sum of \$23,301,208.76 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

MR. BLAKE: This vote, I presume, will include the Canada Central subsidy?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: Yes.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman knows that there has been an error in this matter; that he has taken something like \$800,000 or \$900,000, when all he will really want is the interest for the next financial year for that amount.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: That is probable. It is just possible that, instead of taking the vote for the larger amount, \$35,000 for the year may be appropriated.

MR. BLAKE: It is just certain.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It would not be right, when it appears an error has been committed, to propose a vote which is not intended to be taken, and embrace it

in the Ways and Means in Supply. The amount ought to be reduced in Ways and Means accordingly. But it is like other appropriations, though taken, not necessarily expended.

MR. BLAKE: Is it understood, then, that the Finance Minister will make it plain that only the small amount is to be voted?

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: We will arrange that.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: It is desirable that the Minister of Railways should understand, distinctly, that this vote is not the same vote as the Estimates.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: I think the hon. gentleman had better explain why he, when Finance Minister, for the first time, introduced a statement in the Estimates, such as had never appeared before.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: What statement?

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: A statement to which I drew before the hon. gentleman's attention, in which he gave no column, though one had always been given before, and has been since, showing the amount of appropriations in that Estimate chargeable to the Consolidated Fund. In the Estimates for 1874-5, he mixed up Capital Expenditure and Expenditure chargeable to Income. From his Supply Bill, in that and other years, I can prove that he took Estimates for Expenditure, chargeable to Revenue, apart from Capital Expenditure, of over \$26,000,000 and \$27,000,000. Over \$27,000,000 was taken for 1874-5. I can establish that point from the Supply Bill of the hon. gentleman, just as easily as from his Estimates. The reason for producing his Estimates in a form never before or since submitted to the House, which I have given, he has never been able to meet; he took out of the Appropriations, chargeable to Capital, \$500,000, and put it in the Public Accounts, chargeable, to Revenue, for the purpose of swelling abnormally, the ordinary expenditure of 1873-4, which he hoped to be able, for all time, to charge against the expenditure of his predecessors.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I confess I am very much puzzled to know what the hon. gentleman means. The total amount of the Estimates for 1874-5,

brought down by me, amounted to \$24,803,285.10. Now, \$26,168,000 was the exact amount brought down in the Supply Bill for 1874, in the Statutes. The member for Cardwell (Mr. White) had the honesty, when his mistake on the subject was exposed by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Anglin), to say candidly and frankly that he did not know the difference. He withdrew the statement in the report in the *Montreal Gazette*, although, undoubtedly, he allowed the mistake to appear in the *Hansard*, for reasons he stated in the House. But the hon. member for Cumberland had not the honesty and the frankness to admit he was ignorant of the difference between the Supply Bill and the Estimates. So the financial critic of the late Opposition, who had criticised the financial policy of the late Government for five years, in every form and shape, had not mastered the very *pons asinorum* of the financial discussions carried on in the House; he did not understand the very simplest elements of the mode in which Supply and Estimates are brought down in the House, and had not the honesty to admit he was grossly mistaken. He ought to have known that, in 1874, I brought down two Estimates, the original and the supplemental, the total amount being precisely \$24,803,285. I hope the hon. the Minister of Finance will explain to his colleague in the future, and for all time to come, that the Supply Bill and the Estimates are two totally distinct things—that in the Supply Bill is not included a single item authorised by Statute, while it includes all the items chargeable ordinarily to Capital. It was not creditable to the hon. the Minister of Railways that he should have attempted to get out of the plain and obvious meaning of his own words, and which admit of no possible construction, except what I have placed upon them, by attempting to bring in the Estimates brought down in the Session of 1875, and which had nothing whatever to do with the first Estimates, to which the hon. gentleman in the very page from which I have read distinctly alluded.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard J. Cartwright) finds it convenient to go off upon a side issue, leaving the main question in

controversy untouched. I quite admit that I have recently paid no attention to those discussions with regard to finance knowing this matter could be very safely left to the hon. the Minister of Finance, and being entirely occupied with other matters, myself. When rising on the spot at the moment to answer the hon. gentleman, I took the figures \$26,000,000 from the Supply Bill. But all that I required to make the statement accurate was to use the word "Statutes" instead of "Statute." I will find in the Statutes of 1874-5, the votes brought down in his Estimate, put into the Supply Bill, and voted chargeable to Revenue, a sum between \$26,000,000 and \$27,000,000. That was just the question.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT : No.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER : That is the question. They were charging my hon. friend with bringing in an extravagant Estimate. That was the issue. My answer to the hon. gentleman was that he ought to be the last man in the world to make this Estimate an extravagant one, at a time when my hon. friend is obliged to provide for \$1,600,000 for Interest and Sinking Fund, over and above what he had to provide for in 1874. The Statutes show every dollar in the Supply Bill, chargeable to Income. I think it is hardly worthy the hon. gentleman to seize captiously upon an expression of that kind, and deliberately say to me across the floor of this House, that I do not know the difference between the Estimates and a Supply Bill. I think the hon. gentleman would not like to be treated in the same way from this side of the House. I would not wish to treat him so, because I am not obliged to go beyond a fair and honest criticism in order to give the hon. gentleman quite as much as he finds it convenient to deal with.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Resolutions reported, read the second time and agreed to.

SUPPLY BILL.

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

FIRST READING.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY introduced a Bill (No. 126) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required

for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1880, and the 30th June, 1881, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.

Bill read the first time.

BANKING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 115.]

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. DOMVILLE : This is a matter of great importance, and is one that should be thoroughly considered before it is laid before the country. I think it might be well to consider the question of merely extending the charters for one or two years, in order to get rid of the difficulty of the maturity of the charters. I am of opinion that the bank circulation should be taken up by the Government. If there is any profit to be made by the circulation, that profit should be made by the Government. I am opposed to the circulation being made a first lien on the bank, believing that immediately upon unfavourable rumours being circulated about a bank, the depositors would immediately convert their deposits into notes. Banks depart from their legitimate business when they take liens on different kinds of products or goods. It was never intended, in the history of banking, that banks should enjoy that monopoly. Banks have a right to buy and sell exchange. They have a right to deal in gold and public securities, but they have no right to deal in other articles of a miscellaneous character. I would ask the hon. the Finance Minister, if this Bill has not gone too far, and seeing that we are at the close of the Session, to let the Bill stand over till next Session, and we shall have time before then to fully think it over.

MR. GUTHRIE : There is no doubt that the Bill touches matters of the utmost importance, and it ought to be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. It touches not only the question of banking, but the rights of property very seriously. The warehousing clauses are proposed to be so extended as to open the door to wholesale fraud. It is well-known by legal men that the Ontario Courts do not view with much favour the power which banks have of

obtaining security for money by way of warehouse receipts. It is a violation of chattel mortgage law, which requires that a mortgage of a chattel, in order to be valid, shall be registered. The giving of these warehouse receipts is a purely private transaction, a sort of secret security, and the system is not to be viewed with favour; at all events, it is to be looked upon very jealously. It is proposed to authorise any person to give a warehouse receipt. Under the old law, and under the Bill, before it was corrected, the power was conferred to a miller, or one or two other businesses. It is proposed now to make valid any receipt given by any person or any company for any goods, wares or merchandise in possession of the bailee or bailees, so that all a merchant has to do is to get a brother merchant to take part of his stock and issue a warehouse receipt. The public know nothing about the affair, and it will give a valid title to the goods under the receipt. Before such a sweeping change is made it should be fully considered. It is also proposed to give the banks power to take security for any debt, whether due, matured or maturing, or for any liability of a person endorsing a note, or a person secondary liable. Under the old law it could only be done for a bill or note discounted at the time. That clause, the 47th, is taken out altogether; it provided that no bill of lading or warehouse receipt should be a valid security for a bill or note unless given at the time. The Act also purposes to give the banks a lien upon their stock against all obligations of the owner of that stock. The hon. gentleman who spoke before me dealt with one or two other points; but viewing the Bill from the point of view as a lawyer, I think these changes, before being made, should be well discussed before the House.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: I do not know that the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Domville) should take exception to the bank statements being required to be signed by the president before the manager. There has been too great a disposition for the presidents to shelter themselves behind the manager. The president is supposed to know as much as the manager, and it was thought better that the chief accountant should

make the statement as proposed in this Bill. I was led to alter the provision respecting warehouse receipts, from the fact that the tendency has been to afford facilities to the trade of the country by permitting banks to make advances on lumber, grain and cereals of various kinds, and to pork packers and various other industries, the means of the people being limited, and a man's credit depending upon his character to a certain extent. It is important to a business, having character and reputation, that the old Bill should be extended by the provisions of the new Bill, to enable them to obtain advances on goods when they have limited capital. It will be seen, after careful consideration, that the term "bailee" will obviate the other difficulty raised by my hon. friend. While it has been the desire of the Government to give facilities for increasing our commerce and manufacturing industries, we have been very anxious to guard against anything which might place innocent parties in a false position. If we go into Committee we can fully discuss these various clauses.

MR. DOMVILLE: I would like to point out an error that has crept in—I have no doubt inadvertently. The hon. the Finance Minister said that the practice of the cashier signing statements before the president, had been reversed, because, hitherto, presidents had sheltered themselves behind the statement as signed up to the present time. I think the responsibility should be consecutive—should follow from one to the other, and when the president signed he would have the assurance of every one before him.

MR. McLENNAN: This Bill has been pretty well considered by the representatives of the banks, and I may say to my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Domville), that this is an Act for banking, not for the Law Courts. With respect to warehouse receipts and bills of lading, I think they should be as free for transfer or lending upon, or any other purpose of exchange, as the ordinary bill of a bank.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): With respect to the declaration to be made by the president and general manager, I think that after the accountant has approved of the statement, it ought to be the duty of the president, in concert with the general manager, to examine it, and they ought

to be satisfied, as far as possible, that it is correct.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. BLAKE said they ought not to be compelled to pass certain clauses of this Bill without communicating with persons with whom they ought to have an opportunity of communicating with.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: They have been before the House for several days.

MR. BLAKE said they were dealing with a corrected copy of the Bill, in which there were many changes. We have been sitting up to two o'clock and three o'clock in the morning, and it has been utterly impossible to give a proper consideration to its details. I suggest that there are clauses, in regard to which we should not go through the farce of legislating on.

MR. ABBOTT: There is no doubt that a great many points have arisen on the clauses respecting bills of lading and receipts. The effect of Clause 46 is only to remove a few ambiguities in the old law, and set at rest the uncertainty of the law as to the legality of warehouse receipts, and the persons who can give them. The 45th Clause has been recast, to make it plain that any person, not a professional warehouseman, may give such a receipt, and it also makes plain what a bill of lading is, and for what wares or goods it may be given.

MR. GUTHRIE: It has been for ten years held in Ontario that none but professional warehousemen can give these warehouse receipts. There are two or three warehousemen who give valid receipts, and no receipt has been valid except given by those, or by a miller, and some special persons like that class.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: The discussion has shown that these points are of special interest; and that there is great difference of opinion. We will, therefore, pass over these special clauses, for the present, and let them have further consideration.

Progress ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Progress reported.

House adjourned at

Twenty minutes after

One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 5th May, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVILEGE—THE MEMBER FOR RICHELIEU.

The petition of L. Morasse and others, representing that there has been a failure of justice, in the matter of the trial of the Election Petition, complaining of an undue Return for the Electoral District of Richelieu, and praying to be allowed to make proof before the House, was read.

MR. MASSUE: I beg to state from my place that the allegations made in a petition, presented to the House by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), on Monday last, during my absence, are untrue and unfounded.

MR. LAURIER: At this late stage of the Session, I will not move that the petition be received to-day, but I will reserve to myself the privilege of bringing it up again next Session.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Perhaps it would have been as well if the hon. gentleman had not made that statement. Of course, it is his privilege to introduce the petition next Session, or any time he likes, but it looks as if the hon. gentleman were holding out a threat.

MR. LAURIER: I presented this petition as every petition is presented. I do not undertake to take charge of it, or be responsible for it. I merely made the remark to save the privilege of the petitioners and not mine.

MR. BLAKE: Had my hon. friend proposed to withdraw the petition without making that statement, I think the fair inference would have been that it was not to be brought forward again. It was perfectly legitimate that the hon. gentleman should be furnished an opportunity to make the statement he did make, and it is equally clear that the petition could not be properly dealt with at this late stage of the Session. The remark was simply to indicate that the petition was withdrawn, not because it was not intended to prosecute it, but simply because of the late stage at which it was presented.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That places the matter in quite a different

position and is quite right. I am glad that it will appear in the Debates that such is the ground upon which the withdrawal is based.

Petition, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

VILLAGE POST-OFFICES.

QUESTION.

MR. LAURIER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a second post-office in the village of Lachute, in the county of Argenteuil; and, if so, will it be hereafter the policy of the Post Office Department to multiply post offices in the several villages of the Dominion?

MR. O'CONNOR: As there is one post-office in the village already, it is not the intention to establish another. I cannot say what the future policy of the Government will be.

LAMBTON COUNTY COURT JUDGE.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any action upon the petition signed by about 1,000 ratepayers of the county of Lambton, presentments by Grand Juries of the said county of Lambton, motions of the County Councils of the said county of Lambton, asking to have a Commission appointed to enquire into the conduct of Judge Robinson, County Court Judge of the said County of Lambton.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): It is not the intention of the Government to take any such action.

PRINTING COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

REMARKS.

MR. BANNERMAN: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to know what steps are to be taken in connection with the Report of the Joint Committee on Printing. It is about time to decide what is going to be done with it, if it is to be dealt with during the present Session. I am sorry that the Chairman is not in his place; if he were, some of the members of the Committee have an amendment to make to the adoption of the Report.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman is not in order; there is no motion before the House.

MR. BANNERMAN: I will move that

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the House go into Committee to consider the Report, if I am in order.

MR. BLAKE: The time is past.

MR. BOWELL: The proper course would be to move the adoption of the Report of the Printing Committee. I would suggest that the matter be allowed to stand till the Chairman is in his place.

MR. BLAKE: The time is now past; it must be done by an arrangement.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 95.]

(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

THIRD READING.

Order for consideration of the Bill read.

MR. BLAKE: I think that one of the clauses of this Bill should receive another amendment—that which deals with the minerals and coal measures. I have before me the amended Bill, which shows that there has been very properly taken out of the ordinary regulations the mineral lands and coal measures of the North-West. No subject could be more important to the future of that vast country than the disposition of the coal measures particularly. I cannot consider anything more vital than that sound regulations, calculated to preserve, for the population at large, the benefit of those coal measures, and prevent any possibility of monopoly in them or any considerable possession of them by speculators could be adopted. All I have to propose is, that the hon. the First Minister should add to the clause, with reference to the regulations to be made by the Governor in Council, the same clause which, at my suggestion, he made with respect to the British Columbia lands—that the regulations should be published in the *Gazette*, and laid before both Houses of Parliament for thirty days, without disapproval by either House. I do not think that the Government ought to ask the House to give it absolute power to determine how that important part of the economy of the North-West should be disposed of.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. I accepted that suggestion for another Bill, and think it ought to be accepted here. I will move that the amendments be referred to the Committee of the Whole for amendment.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I would like to call the attention of the Government to the propriety of reserving, absolutely, after due exploration has been made, a very considerable proportion of the best coal lands as the property of the Government. I know that, in our country, it has never been a very popular thing to alienate, to a great extent, mineral lands; but a large amount of public revenue has been obtained from just such reservations. Now, in addition to that, we are likely to become very extensive railway proprietors in the North-West, and on both those points I think it is worth while, at any rate until we know a great deal more about that country than we do now, to retain absolutely a very considerable portion in hand in the nature of Crown domain. If the hon. Minister has considered that question at all, I would be glad to hear his views on the subject. He is aware, no doubt, that, in other countries, this has been done with great advantage. I really do not see any reason why, in future, some additional revenue might not come from that source.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It has been suggested that we should prevent any disposition of the mineral lands between now and next Session. So far as the coal measures are concerned, I do not think there can be any objection, because I do not think there can be any disposition of the coal measures in that country, until we know a great deal more about them. With regard to the other minerals, if we locked them up, it might retard explorations.

MR. BLAKE: I think we had better settle up the country in the meantime.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We are doing that, to a large degree, contrary to the suggestions of my hon. friend. As regards the suggestion of the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard J. Cartwright), I entirely agree with him as regards the expediency of keeping a certain amount of reserves of coal for our own railways. I do not know the extent of that coal field. There is a great rush of speculators where this coal is known to exist, but the nature or the value of the supply is not known. If it be a limited supply for our railways, then great precautions should be taken by the Government that speculators do

not get hold of it, and raise the price and rule our railways so far as the fuel supply is concerned. Very large privileges have been granted to prospectors in order to induce people to go into that country. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Centre Huron is a good one, that there should be a royalty charged on every mine.

MR. MILLS: If the hon. gentleman is going to charge a royalty on coal mining in the North-West it will increase the price of coal there, and that country would have to pay a tax that the rest of the Dominion would not pay. I do not think the policy will be found advantageous.

MR. BANNERMAN: I would like to ask whether it is the intention in this Bill to deal with parties whose claims have been entered previously, who have spent large sums of money in opening up those coal fields. To my knowledge one party has spent over \$20,000.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This Bill does not affect any rights acquired under the old law. Any parties who have legal or equitable claims under the present law are supposed to be considered in the future.

MR. MILLS said that a good deal of inconvenience resulted from the operation of Section 5. If settlers were permitted to dispose of their settlement to new-comers, and allowed to take up another homestead, we would retain a considerable population at present lost.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that there were men who preferred to live by their wits ends, and who went round and homesteaded the best portions of the country with a view of disposing of them to emigrants, and thereby making \$50 or \$100 out of new-comers. The clause referred to was framed with a view to stop that kind of thing.

MR. MILLS said it was a great advantage to a settler with a few hundred dollars to be permitted to buy a homestead on which there was a house and buildings. Under this regulation it was utterly impossible that that could be done.

MR. BLAKE said the mischief alluded to by the right hon. gentleman should be avoided, but, on the other hand, he thought it really would be a very great improvement in the case of a substantial

settlement to allow the homestead to be sold.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole, and *reported* the Bill as amended.

Bill *read the third time* and *passed*.

NAVIGABLE WATERS OBSTRUCTIONS
LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 107.]

(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*)

SENATE AMENDMENTS CONCURRED IN.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to the said Bill be now *read the second time* and *agreed to*.

MR. ANGERS: I must apologise to the House for drawing attention to this Bill. I was not in the House when it was passed, but before leaving I made a suggestion in relation to part of the wording, which I think was of some importance. I find, however, that the language remains unchanged, and I think, if the measure passes into law, it will have the effect of materially injuring the shipping in Canadian waters. The owners of a vessel will be responsible to the Government for raising the hull of a shipwrecked vessel, even when the remains of the shipwreck are insufficient to defray the expenses of the removal. This is more stringent than the English Maritime Law in relation to collisions. There are many shipowners who do not sail their own ships, which are chartered to incorporated companies, and those companies navigate the vessels in the St. Lawrence. If a collision occurs under such circumstances, the real owner of the vessel is not responsible for the collision. You must take the action at them or against the company navigating the vessel. That is the common Maritime Law of England; but this Bill would make the position of an owner of a vessel, who, without any negligence on his part, has lost his vessel, responsible for the expense of removing the remains. Shipowners will hesitate about letting their vessels come up the St. Lawrence when they are exposed to this penalty, in case of shipwreck, and trade will be greatly injured thereby. I would suggest that it is inexpedient, at this late hour of the Session, to concur in the amendments. It would be better to leave the matter over until next Session.

MR. BLAKE.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.): I stated when this Bill was introduced, that it was simply for the purpose of saving the Government a large amount of money which they had to expend for the purpose of getting rid of the obstructions left about the shores, and the sides of channels to the endangerment of navigation. The St. Lawrence is not the only navigable water in the world, and the measure will not affect it more than any other part. Vessels are usually well insured, and the owners can well afford to remove the remains of shipwrecks. There is no reason why the people should pay for the neglect or carelessness of shipowners in this respect. I cannot see how the Act would affect the chartering of ships, or interfere with the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and I hope my hon. friend will withdraw his objections to the Bill. There is no desire on the part of the Government to deal harshly with the shipowners, or involve them in any unnecessary expense. We simply desire to protect the public from the expense of taking away obstructions which ought properly to be removed by the owners of the shipwrecked vessels.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I fear very much that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Angers) is a little out of order in reintroducing a discussion upon a Bill which has passed this House; and I am afraid I must also censure my hon. friend (Mr. Pope) for discussing a matter which has been settled by this House. The expression of the House has been given on this measure, and I do not see how the House, with a due sense of respect, can reverse its decision. We passed this Bill after full consideration.

MR. BLAKE: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We passed it after such consideration as hon. gentleman opposite and those behind me chose to give it, and they must be accountable in a parliamentary sense. But the Bill passed this House, and was sent to the Senate, who passed it with a single amendment. The simple question now before the House is whether that amendment should be adopted or not, and I hope the discussion will be confined to that point.

MR. BLAKE: I must protest against the statement of the hon. gentleman. We

are called upon to consider whether we will agree to this amendment or not, and the hon. member for Montmorency suggested reasons why the amendment should not be considered. If the consideration is postponed, certain results will follow which may be good results. It may be that this Bill is all right. I maintain that the hon. gentleman is all wrong when he says there was opportunity for full discussion in reference to this measure, and when he charges upon us parliamentary responsibility if it was not fully discussed. It was the 29th April when this Bill was read the second time, when no less than thirteen Government Bills were advanced that stage. Prior to that day, full, fair and parliamentary discussion had become impossible owing to the lateness of the Session, and except in a single instance of a speech upon the subject of temperance, which was delivered under some difficulties and some stress upon the patience of the House, I know of no full, ample, parliamentary discussion since April 29th. Those of us who are opposed to converting this Legislative body into a mere machine for registering the views of individual Ministers, do not like to see matters pressed in this fashion. I thought there were objections to some parts of the Bill. Some portions are not unreasonable, but others I think will be extremely harsh in operation. I agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Montmorency that it would be better to let this measure go over for another year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think the hon. gentleman has passed considerable censure upon himself when he intimated that there had been no opportunity to consider the Bill. I know the indefatigable industry of the hon. gentleman, and I think he is rather too modest in that statement. I deny the statement that Parliament is less fit or less capable to do work in the last days of the Session than at the first. The hon. gentleman knows well that the Crown will not exercise the despotic power of prorogation until all the business before the House is disposed of; and if the House feels that the interests of the Dominion require discussion of the measures before it for some weeks more, I have no doubt the constitutional advisers of His Excellency will not advise

him to come down and ruthlessly cut the thread of the discussions. The hon. gentleman suggests that, while the Opposition would be prepared to fight the Ministerial measures at the beginning of the Session, their courage, like that of Bob Acres, oozes out of their finger ends at the close, and my hon. friend cannot offer so effective a criticism as his parliamentary virtue and conscientious principles would have induced him to offer at the beginning of the Session.

MR. DOULL: I am sorry the Government are pressing this Bill through the House. I have endeavoured to convince hon. Ministers of its unfairness and injustice. The hon. member for Montmorency has stated good reasons why it should not pass. I will give an instance of the probable evil operation of the Bill. A lighter or scow, which I rented to a party to carry stone to the railway, was sunk at the entrance to the harbour and had to be removed. Would it not be a great hardship to compel me to remove that vessel, or any owner of a vessel, sunk through the fault of another?

MR. SPEAKER: The question under consideration is that of the amendments made to Bill No. 107 by the Senate. The discussion ought to be confined to them.

MR. ANGERS: I apologise to the House for protracting the discussion when out of order. I now move that the House do not concur in the Amendments made to the Bill in the Senate, because it is inexpedient to consider the same at this late period of the Session.

Amendment *negatived* on a division.

Amendments read the second time and agreed to.

BANKING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.
[BILL 115.]

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

THIRD READING.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: When the House was in Committee this morning, early, some objection was taken to certain provisions of the Bill, and I have had some amendments prepared which will meet the objections of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)

that those securities should be held for old debts, and extending over a certain period, or upon the understanding that such warehouse receipts or bills of lading be transferred to the bank.

MR. GUTHRIE: These amendments, I think, will meet the objections I urged. I think the Act thus amended will be a good thing for the public as well as the banks.

MR. BLAKE: So far as I can judge of the amendments, they are certainly improvements. I have stated that the general public has had no opportunity of considering or consulting about the clauses of this Bill. We understand to-day from the hon. the First Minister that, although that is the case, yet, constitutionally speaking, we are presumed to have had the opportunity, and are responsible for this legislation being proceeded with. I renew my protest against such a responsibility being imposed, in the face of the physical impossibility of dealing with the subject. The partial measure of discussion the Act has received, without that opportunity of communicating with the persons most interested in its provisions, which was very desirable, has shown that serious and important improvements are necessary—that the proposed law is defective. It was defective with reference to the liability for bank shares, and is defective in regard to the very important question now under consideration, and was very defective and injurious in respect to the power it gave banks to take warehouse receipts in relation to past overdue debts. All this indicates one cannot trust as infallible the wisdom of an Administration in bringing down laws, and it is important there should be some time for discussion. There has not been sufficient time in this case. But these alterations are improvements in the crude and defective measure which, at this late stage of the Session, the Government calls on Parliament to pass.

SIR SAMUEL L. TILLEY: It is not unusual, when a Bill of this importance is submitted, to find many amendments suggested; and, although this Bill was submitted very late in the Session, the hon. member for South Wellington, in his parliamentary right, called attention to certain propositions which the Government asked time to consider; and the discussion, though, at a very late hour,

has secured a consideration of the subject and propositions which, I am happy to find, meet with the approval of hon. gentleman on both sides.

MR. BLAKE: My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon), who has been obliged to leave, desires me to call the attention of the hon. Ministers to what he thinks is a serious defect—not one created by these changes, however. It appears the mode by which agents is defined, is by reference to a former Act—the 59th chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of the late Province of Canada. He states that this mode of defining an agent is one of great practical inconvenience to everybody, and particularly to persons in the outlying Provinces, who have not the old Consolidated Statutes, and cannot get them, the edition being long out of print. Under these circumstances, if the Administration is not able to bring down a moderate clause, giving a proper definition of an agent—and it would only involve the expense of a little printer's ink—it might attach as a schedule to the Bill that Act of the Consolidated Statute in question, so that those to be governed by the law may have it before them.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I do not think it would be quite convenient to have the schedule proposed attached to the Bill. An inconvenience that had not been much felt for the last ten or twelve years, could not be greatly felt the coming year. I do not mean to say it would not be better to define the word "agent" in the Statute, so that every person would understand it clearly; but, at the same time, I do not think the emergency so pressing as to require us to delay the Bill for the present.

MR. BLAKE: It is not inconvenient to the profession in my Province, for we have the old Statute. But my hon. friend from St. John says, it is not to be found in the Lower Provinces. I do not make the suggestion with a view to delay, but I do not think it need very much delay the Bill to insert five lines, stating, as to the old Act of the Consolidated Statutes, that the Act is the schedule appended.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I have no objection to that.

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Bill reported.

Question proposed on the third reading of the Bill.

MR. GUTHRIE: In reference to bringing down such important matters, at so late a period in the Session, I find that the very same objections which have been urged from this side of the House on that point, were urged two years ago by the hon. gentlemen now composing the Government when they were in our places. It was in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill. *Hansard* says:

"MR. TUPPER said he did not intend to enter into a long and vain discussion at this advanced stage of the Session, because he knew it was useless. He might say, however, that it was a great pity that measures of such great importance should be brought down so late in the Session."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It only shows that all the charges brought against the present Government were equally applicable to the late Government.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I move that the Bill be referred back to the Committee to insert a clause. I find there have been some individuals in the country who have been assuming a very important title, and have formed themselves into partnerships, calling themselves bankers, and assuming corporate names. I hold in my hand the advertisement card of a firm who call themselves "The Bank of New Hamburg." I find that some gentlemen elsewhere call themselves "The Richelieu District Bank." They give themselves out to the public as receiving deposits. They assume these names, evidently with the intention of misleading the public, and getting themselves trusted as incorporate bankers coming under this Act. But they are in nowise amenable to the law we have just passed. I think it is our duty to protect the people of the country, so that they may not be misled into thinking that these individuals, who assume these high sounding titles to which they have no right, have any status under this Bill. I think that persons who assume these names should be made amenable to the Act. I, therefore, move the following additional clause:—

"That any person, firm or company, assuming or using the title of bank or banking company, without being authorised so to do by this Act or by the Acts relating to Banks and

Banking, or by some other Act in force in that behalf, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour."

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): Do I understand that an individual cannot engage in a private banking enterprise and advertise himself?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It does not apply to him if he calls himself a banker, but only if he assumes the title of a bank.

MR. ROSS: Suppose Mr. Kirkpatrick should say: "Mr. Kirkpatrick's Bank," and John Brown should say, "John Brown's Bank," and put his name on the sign?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If he is a banker that is no harm—if he has money enough to support the title.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I think the penalty proposed to be inflicted is rather severe. Calling an offence of this kind a misdemeanour, without some consideration, seems to me to be going too far. A more proper penalty would be to fix a fine on the party. I think it would better come from the hon. the Minister of Finance to say whether we should call a thing of that kind a misdemeanour.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not think the evil can be put down effectively without making it a misdemeanour. If there be two or three men who join themselves together and call themselves "The Bank of Hamburg," or "The Bank of Richelieu," or "The Bank of Galt," etc., it must be for the purpose of entrapping the public. They know perfectly well that they have no right to take a corporate name.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): I do not think that a private individual should be prevented from doing business in his own name and calling himself a banker.

MR. BLAKE: I think he ought to be allowed to call himself a private banker; but I think an Act of this nature should not come into force until 1st July next, because there may be honest persons who call themselves bankers, as the law at present allows it, and they should have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with this Bill.

Motion in amendment agreed to.

House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole and reported the Bill as amended.

Bill read the third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING CON-
TRACT.

MOTION TO ADOPT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. STEPHENSON moved that the 13th Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses be now concurred in.

MR. BLAKE: Is it intended that this motion should include the adoption of the Report of the sub-Committee.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No; the Report of the sub-Committee is merely appended for the information of the House.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): The Report of the sub-Committee is a part of the Report of the Committee, by which it was regularly adopted.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman does not read the Report as I read it.

MR. ROSS: The right hon. gentleman will find the words appended to the Report: "All of which is respectfully submitted for the consideration of both Houses."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You submit it, but you do not approve of it.

MR. ROSS: I know the Report of the sub-Committee was adopted.

MR. BLAKE: It would appear that the Committee has imperfectly performed its work. They have only given a partial answer as to the point of cancellation.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): We have the recommendation of the Committee to the House. Speaking for myself, I should say the matter should not be questioned for a moment. If these contractors have made themselves liable to the severe censure passed on them by this Committee, surely we cannot say with one breath, you have been guilty of gross fraud, and your contract ought to be cancelled; but, inasmuch as it would be slightly inconvenient to part with you fraudulent contractors just now, we will hold on to you a few weeks longer, until it is more convenient to part with you. That is a kind of thing I cannot personally understand. Therefore, I think we have only one question to consider, and that is, whether the contract ought to be cancelled or not.

MR. BOWELL: The remarks of the hon. the First Minister are strictly correct. The Report is not a correct Report of the proceedings of the Committee. Not only was the

Report of the sub-Committee adopted, but it was adopted on a division. There were three voted against it. I am surprised that that portion of the Report does not appear on the record. The sub-Committee went fully into the question as to the best mode of securing tenders, so as to prevent fraud in the future; they decided to advertise for contracts in the future, and to require the tenderer to deposit \$1,000, which he must forfeit on refusal to enter upon his tender. The manner in which printing is done in the United States, in France, and in England, was considered, but it was thought by the sub-Committee that there was no time to enter into it; they thought they ought to cancel the contract at once, and that none of the parties interested in the recent fraud should be permitted to tender again, but the difficulties of carrying on printing in a city like this presented themselves, and they did not consider it would be advisable to go to the extreme that they could have gone in a city like Toronto or Montreal, and, therefore, it would, on the whole, be better to defer the change for the present.

MR. BLAKE: I think after this frank explanation, it is quite impossible to act upon the Report as it stands. If there is any possibility of putting out the printing as it should be, it is quite clear that we should not delay the cancellation of the contract; but I think we ought to have evidence of what the deliverance of the Committee was, and deal with it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think we have got the deliverance of the Committee as a Whole that the contract should be cancelled, on the ground that it was obtained by improper and irregular means. There is a Report of the sub-Committee that it should not be cancelled immediately; but I quite agree with the hon. the Minister of Justice that it should be immediate. The matter was brought fairly before the House, and the contract was to be cancelled without reference to consequences. My idea is that we should adopt the Report cancelling the contract, and send the Report back to the Committee on Printing for further consideration. If the House believes that the Committee was right, that there was irregular practices, and that, therefore, the contract

should be cancelled, it ought to be cancelled. I propose, therefore, that the Report of the Committee should be adopted, and that the Report of the sub-Committee should be referred back for further consideration.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) : The remarks of the hon. the First Minister would seem to imply a censure upon the Committee. The right hon. gentleman should not come to a hasty conclusion. The sub-Committee is part of the Committee, and their Report is part of the Committee's Report. It would be unfair to the Printing Committee to say that the Report they supplemented does not represent their views and opinions, after a careful consideration of the whole question.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) : The Joint Committee on Printing have recommended the cancellation of the contract; and it would be unjust, under all the circumstances, to delay the cancellation. Without making any further remarks, I move in amendment :

"That in the opinion of this House the Government should take the necessary steps to cancel the contract awarded to Messrs. McLean, Roger and Company, for the Printing of Parliament from the 1st of January, 1880; and that the said contract be offered to Patrick Boyle of Toronto, whose tender appears from all the evidence to be the only legitimate tender below that of Messrs. McLean, Roger and Company; and that so much of the Thirteenth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, as is consistent with the foregoing Resolution, be adopted."

MR. BLAKE : In order to give the hon. Chairman of the Committee on Printing an opportunity to call his Committee together, and remedy the existing defect I rise to a point of order. It is necessary that two day's notice should be given before the adoption of the Report.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I object to this; the hon. gentleman has spoken twice or thrice to the motion.

MR. BLAKE : I have not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The question before us was the adoption of the Report. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman is out of order altogether. He cannot, in any way, make the objection in regard to want of notice; it is too late for him to do that after speaking on the question, and discussing it so far. One would think it was the desire of the hon.

member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) to allow a continuance of these irregular and improper practices.

MR. BLAKE : I rose to a point of order.

MR. MILLS : I—

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Order.

MR. MILLS : I am about to speak to a point of order. It is always competent for a member to rise on a question of order. If any motion is out of order, its irregularity is not cured by any discussion that takes place on it. A question of order can always be taken.

MR. SPEAKER : From what I can judge from the debate, the question is, whether the Report of the Committee ought to be adopted or not.

MR. BLAKE : Whether notice of motion for its adoption is requisite.

MR. SPEAKER : I think that notice is required.

INDIAN LAWS AMENDMENT BILL. [BILL 90.]

(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : When I introduced the Bill I explained its meaning partly. It is a consideration of the laws relating to Indians, including a system for newly organising the Department and creating the Indian Branch into a separate and distinct Department, under the control of the hon. the Minister of the Interior. My worthy subordinates agree with me that the duties of the Indian Branch are so onerous, that instead of being a sub-branch, it should be a separate Department, under one Minister.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) : This Bill is of considerable importance to some members of the House, and it is desirable, at this late period of the Session, that it should be allowed to stand over.

AN HON. MEMBER : Oh, no.

MR. PATERSON : It is scarcely fair to discuss this Bill now. The hon. the Minister is well aware that many may want to speak on the Bill. My objections to the Indian Bill passing at this time, are as follows :—In the first place it is a consolidation of the Indian laws, and that being the case, the hon. the First Minister would be disposed to resent next Session the introduction of any amendments by private members. The objection

would be that the law was only consolidated last year, and there was no necessity for re-opening the question after so short an experience. Then the Bill does not provide for the enfranchisement of the Indians, for according to them the rights, opportunities and privileges of citizens is, I think, the only solution of the Indian question, more especially the only solution which affects the more advanced tribes, on whose behalf and with respect to whose circumstances, I am more particularly acquainted. Any change that has been made in the law is only in the direction of still more firmly fastening the shackles of tutelage upon them—a change tending to keep the Indians in their present condition. I speak on behalf of 3,000 Indians, among whom six missionaries have been labouring for the past thirty years, and who have twelve public schools and an industrial institute. In that band there has never been but one enfranchised under the Act of 1868, and that Indian was unable to get the land to which he was entitled; he petitioned to be restored to his former condition as an Indian. If there is such a record after twelve years' experience, is it not time that some step was taken by which more progress might be made? The whole Indian law discourages the assimilation of the whites and the Indians, and the solution of the Indian problem can only be found in wiping out the distinction which exists between the races, in giving the red man all the liberties and rights enjoyed by the white man, and entailing upon him all the responsibilities which attach to those rights and privileges. For those reasons I am opposed to the discussion of this subject at the present time. The Indian question is the question of the country. It means, as we know from the Estimates brought down yearly, the expenditure of millions for the maintenance of the Indians—it means one of the most pressing and vital questions of the hour, and I warn the House, as I warn the hon. the First Minister, that legislation in the direction proposed, old-time legislation, simply means that it will entail upon the people, year after year, and for all time to come, the voting annually of hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep the Indians in the low, degraded state in which they are at

present. What I advocate is this: That we should have an Indian policy, which will not only tend to relieve us from those heavy burdens, but will give to the Indians more rights than they now possess, and wipe out the race distinctions that now exist. The policy adopted by this Government, whether mistaken or not, has had in view the object that the Indian should not have a wrong done him. We have endeavoured to show ourselves superior to our neighbours in the management of those men. I submit, and I say it without egotism, that without any greater ability than other hon. members possess, that I know more of this subject than most of the members, because it has been forced upon my consideration. I wish my words had weight enough to induce the hon. the First Minister to allow this measure to lay over. I would be glad to render any assistance I could in trying if we could introduce a Bill, next Session, which would bring about what I think the hon. gentleman desires, and by which our Indians may be benefitted to a much greater extent, and in a more rapid manner, than is possible under the provisions of the Bill now under consideration.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): The hon. member stated that he did not want to address the House at this period of the Session. At what period would the hon. gentleman like to speak? Have the Government said we must close? This House can, if necessary, sit all next week, or the following week, in order to complete the business of the people. The hon. member has said some very true things. It is time we began to give our intelligent Indians all the rights and privileges which pertain to other classes of the community. He has referred to the fact that we are yearly giving thousands of dollars which are of no real benefit to the Indians. I believe that is correct. We are making them believe that the country will support them, and putting them in a position in which they have no credit or standing in the community. We should no longer treat the Indians as children. Something should be done to put them in a position to make them know and feel that they were responsible to themselves and to the country. On one reserve there are not more than two Indians; the rest are half-breeds, and many of them are edu-

cated, and had they responsibilities of members of this House, could fill positions here with credit to themselves and to the country. I hope the hon. the First Minister will give one or two days more for the consideration of this measure, and I hope the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) will stay and give his assistance. No one is more anxious to do his duty towards the Indians than the hon. Premier, and there is no one in the world whom they respect more; and I trust this measure will be carefully considered before it passes into law.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not propose to reply to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) at length, but I may say, in reference to one of his objections, that this Bill has passed the Senate, and has been printed and distributed for a very considerable time. If any hon. gentleman wishes to move an amendment he has plenty of opportunity. He said that whatever alteration is made in the Bill has the effect of limiting the power of enfranchisement. I see no clause altering the Bill in such a way, and think the hon. gentleman is misinformed.

MR. PATERSON: The right hon. gentleman misunderstands me on that point. I did not say that.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman made an appeal to the House about the necessity of advancing the interests of the Indians, civilising them and putting them in the condition of white men. After all, I am afraid that the hon. gentleman's views are affected by the influence of party. Disguise it as we may, wherever there is an Indian settlement the whites in the vicinity are very naturally anxious—when they see the slovenly, unfarmerlike way in which the Indian lands are cultivated especially if the lands be very good—to get rid of the red men, believing, and perhaps, truly, that the progress of the locality is retarded by them, and that the sooner they are enfranchised, or deprived of their lands, and allowed to shift for themselves, the better. I dare say it would be better. If the Indians were to

disappear from the continent, the Indian question would cease to exist. But we must remember that they are the original owners of the soil, of which they have been dispossessed by the covetousness or ambition of our ancestors. Perhaps, if Columbus had not discovered this continent—had left them alone—they would have worked out a tolerable civilisation of their own. At all events, the Indians have been great sufferers by the discovery of America, and the transfer to it of a large white population. We are bound to protect them. The United States, British and Canadian Governments have all agreed as to the necessity of defending and protecting the Indians. As to giving the Indian lands away, enfranchising the Indians, and giving patents for their lands, the policy would be a failure in this country, as it has proved a failure in the United States. The experience in regard to the granting of lands to the Indians, call them enfranchised or not, means simply this: The Indian gets his deed, and by some injurious or unfortunate process, sells or leases his land, and becomes a vagrant without property. We have seen individuals of this race succeed, by means of education, but the exception proves the rule. The general rule is that you cannot make the Indian a white man. An Indian once said to myself: "We are the wild animals; you cannot make an ox of a deer." You cannot make an agriculturist of the Indian. All we can hope for is to wean them, by slow degrees, from their nomadic habits, which have almost become an instinct, and by slow degrees absorb them or settle them on the land. Meantime they must be fairly protected. The hon. gentleman says this Bill should stand over until we have an opportunity of discovering or inventing some new system of civilising the Indians. I am afraid he and I would not agree as to the best means of doing so. I am afraid he would favour the dividing of the different reserves among the Indians, giving them deeds in fee simple, and leaving them to shift for themselves. That would be cruelty of the worst kind. I think this Bill is called for until we can, by common agreement, come to some understanding as to some means of advancing the Indians in the scale of civilisation.

MR. FLEMING : The hon. First Minister says he is in favour of the enfranchisement of the Indians, but only by slow degrees. When the right hon. gentleman, in 1857, introduced the first Enfranchisement Bill, he expressed himself then as being desirous of seeing them speedily placed in the same position as the white settlers. Twenty-three years have elapsed since that Bill became law. Amendments have been made to it from time to time, all with the view of giving increased facilities for enfranchisement. What has been the result? Some fifty-seven persons, including children, out of the 90,000 Indians of the Dominion, have been enfranchised. At this rate, five persons every two years, it would take 36,000 years to enfranchise the Indian population of Canada. Surely, this is proceeding by very slow degrees indeed. The right hon. gentleman thinks the object of the advocates of enfranchisement is the possession of the Indian lands. In defence of the white settlers in the county of Brant, living in the neighbourhood of the reserves, I beg to say that they are actuated by no such covetous desire. They simply wish to see Indians made subject to the same law they themselves are called on to obey. At present settlers on land adjoining a reserve suffer a great many annoyances, for instance, the reservation is very often a perfect nursery for noxious weeds; a farmer may see, day after day, the seeds of the Canada thistle blown on to his land, but he has no redress. Indians are not subject to municipal law. It is said the reason why so few Indians are enfranchised is because they are not fit for the position. With regard to the Six Nation Indians, the fact that the more intelligent and industrious among them have not enfranchisement, under the present law, is the most conclusive proof of their ability to look after their own interests. At present many of this class occupy from 200 to 300 acres of land a piece, were they to be enfranchised, as the law now stands, they would get only their share of the reserve, something less than fifty acres. In such circumstances they are not so foolish as to seek for enfranchisement. I am sure the hon. the First Minister must see that if it is desirable to raise the Indian to the station of the white man, our legislation hereto-

fore has been inoperative; on the other hand, if it is not desirable so to raise him, the enfranchisement clauses ought to be eliminated from the Statute-book, as it is they are regarded by the Indians themselves as a perfect farce. Surely, the right hon. gentleman will not attempt now to keep the red men in their present position for an indefinite period. I trust rather he will give this subject his attention, and try if a scheme cannot be devised which will hasten rather than retard their advance in civilisation. The hon. the First Minister cannot but see that the old machine which has been tried for twenty-three years has failed to do the work for which it was designed, a new one, therefore, is essentially necessary.

MR. MILLS : The hon. Premier has, in this Bill, added very little that is new. There is no material change in the law, as it stands, as to the status of the Indians. The existing law is simply consolidated. But there is some change in the organisation of the Department itself. If I understand it rightly, the policy aimed at in the Bill is to make the Indian Branch of the Department of the Interior a distinct department. It is to place the Chief Clerk at the head of that Department, and make it separate and distinct from the ordinary Department of the Interior. I do not think that this part of the Bill can be sustained by the argument of the First Minister. If, because the business of the Indian Branch be separate and distinct from the Lands Branch, there should be a separate and distinct Deputy head, by the same parity of reasoning there should be a Deputy Minister for the administration and the government of the Territories. At present there are but two governments for the district of Keewatin and the North-West Territories. But if the hon. gentleman's anticipations of the future are likely to be realised, at no distant day the North-West Territories will be divided into a number of distinct colonies, with a territorial government in each, if the population be not sufficiently numerous to warrant the organisation of each into a Province. If, then, the argument, by which the hon. gentlemen undertake to support the making of the Indian Branch a distinct department, has any force, it is equally applicable to

the branch for the administration of the territorial Governments. The proposed policy does not coincide with my own views. I think the hon. gentleman has a Surveyor-General at the head of the Lands Branch. He requires a person capable of supervising the work at the head of the Indian Branch. I hold there is great advantage in having a permanent Deputy Head supervising the entire work of the Department, who is not immediately connected with the administration of each particular branch in that Department. It saves the hon. Minister a great deal of work, and there are too important persons upon whose judgment considerable reliance may always be placed by the Minister. To consider every question of administration, there will be the Deputy Minister and the Chief Clerk of the branch, so that the Minister will have every question sifted through them, men of experience and ability, and one of whom will take the official—the routine—view. The other will be farther removed, and it is most desirable that he should be so. I think that is an advantage too great to be lightly estimated, and that the plan proposed will not be an improvement in this respect. For some time the Department was organised in this way: One person had charge of the Ordnance Lands; one of Indian Affairs in the old Provinces; the Deputy Minister had charge of Indian affairs in the North-West and Manitoba and the territorial government; and the Surveyor-General had charge of the Lands Branch. Each acted, practically, as Deputy Minister of his own branch. Before I left the Department the practice had been changed, and the person, nominally Deputy Minister, was acting as Deputy Minister for all the affairs in the Department. I believe that was an advantage, because there were, as I have said, two to consider every question before its final disposal. The judgment of two being thus secured, in all affairs coming up for disposal, was an unquestionable advantage. If the hon. gentleman's plan is to be acted upon, there is one provision that will have to be changed. If it is intended by the 3rd Section that this should be a separate Department, to be placed under some other Minister, this clause ought not to be here. If it is the intention of the Gov-

ernment not to do this, but to retain this as a branch of the Department of the Interior, then there is no propriety in calling the hon. the Minister of the Interior Superintendent-General for Indian Affairs. He is the Minister for that branch, the same as for any other of the Department. If it is the object to have a separate Deputy for this particular branch, on account of its importance, he ought to be called Deputy Minister of the Interior for Indian Affairs. I observe, too, there are certain clauses of this Bill, from Clause 23 to Clause 28, to which there were strong objections offered two or three years ago, by the present hon. Minister of Public Works. He strongly objected to the arbitrary power, that he said was given to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, with regard to trespassers upon Indian lands. I was Minister of the Interior at the time the objection was made, though not Minister when the law was enacted. But this Bill has not made any change in the law in these particulars. The same extensive powers of dealing with trespassers without appeal to the ordinary courts of justice, which existed in the old law, and which, he said, were so objectionable—and I agree with him—are retained in this Bill precisely as they were before. With regard to the question of the administration of Indian affairs, I am of the opinion that this Bill is wholly inadequate to the wants of the country at this moment. I think legislation of a much more radical character than anything contained in this Bill is required to meet the present exigency in the administration of Indian affairs. When I was at the head of the Department of the Interior, having given a good deal of attention to this subject, I came to the conclusion that important changes in the law were necessary, and had we remained in power, it was the intention of the late Administration to submit a measure to Parliament on this subject. When the hon. Minister proposed that we should occupy a long series of ages—on the principle of development, I suppose—in the elevation of the Indians, on the ground that it was absolutely necessary, I did not agree with him. If you can select a single Indian tribe, and if, in the administration of the affairs of the Indians of that tribe, you can show that, on the whole, they are capable of intellectual and industrial improvement, you

show thereby that the whole Indian race is capable of being elevated from the condition in which they now exist. An experiment of that sort was tried. Mr. Duncan, in the administration of the affairs of a particular tribe of Indians in British Columbia, has succeeded in civilising this people, and in making them an industrious population. They are not only self-supporting, but they are producing much more than is necessary for their subsistence. What he has accomplished shows that there is a radical defect in the administration of Indian affairs in this country, or the condition of the Indians would not be what it is at present. I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a work which will throw some light on this subject, and that is the "Life and Labours of Sir James Brooke in Borneo." It is a work of great interest. It shows what can be accomplished in the elevation of a race comparatively barbarous. What Sir James Brooke accomplished then, may be, in a large degree, accomplished with regard to the Indian population of this Dominion. Now, the objection I have to the present management of our Indian affairs is, that we are going in the in the same groove in which we have long been moving, and are rapidly reducing the Indians of the North-West and of British Columbia to the same condition of helplessness and dependence in which the Indians are in the older Provinces. I think that ought to be guarded against, and to that end very important changes are necessary in the legislation upon the question. There was one thing that impressed itself very strongly upon my mind, and that was the mischievous effects that flow from allowing the Indians, on the various reservations in the old Provinces, to hold their property in common. In these cases they have all sunk, and necessarily so, to the level of the most indolent; and I fancy that, if the white population of any district was dealt with in the same way, if the consciousness of separate and independent property holdings was taken away, you would, in great measure, reduce them to the same barbarous condition in which the Indians are found at this moment. One of the difficulties of dealing with the Indians in their present condition is the fact, that, although you do

not allow the white population to purchase real estate from them, or to lease real estate from them, you do allow one Indian to traffic with another with regard to his holding, and the consequence is, that upon the reservation in the vicinity of Brantford, you find overreaching, grasping Indians holding, not merely his own fair share of the reservation, but that of half a dozen others; you have those half dozen others without any property holdings at all, without any means of subsistence, and who, in case of disease or famine, are the first the Government require to deal with. One of the first things we ought to do is, not to emancipate the Indians, but to authorise those who hold more than a fair share, to sell their property or cause it to be divided up so as to give to each Indian his fair holding. My impression is that while an Indian might be allowed to sell, this power to sell should be something like the power of the Israelites, in ancient times, to sell or alienate it for a limited time, that he should be liable for necessaries but he should not lose his property for debt for more than a limited period, and that, at the expiration of it, he should again come into possession. This system would put each Indian upon an equality, and at each recurring period he would be able to make a new start in life. I think if this were done, great changes for the better would be made in the present condition of the Indians in the older Provinces. If this were done with regard to the North-West Territories, I am satisfied that you would have at a very early period a wholly different state of things from that which exists at this moment. On Walpole Island, in my constituency, there are some 1,500 Chippewa Indians. Some twenty years ago, through the carelessness of the Indian Department, a number of the Pottawatamies came from Michigan and settled among the Chippewas on that Island. These Pottawatamies were drawing annuities from the United States, and they were allowed in some way to acquire rights upon the Island. When I proposed to the Indians there that the Island should be divided up, and each Indian have a separate holding to cultivate as well as he pleased, many of them were pleased with the proposition, and there would have been no difficulty in inducing

them to accept that proposition if some other provision could be made for the Pottawatamies who are settled amongst them. But, they said, the moment you make that division, you will be giving them a share of our lands, and so they pronounced against the proposition. Then, again, I hold not only that our Indian population should have some limited power in disposing of their holdings amongst themselves, but that more extensive and liberal provisions should be made for the emancipation of the Indians. Under the present condition of the law the Indians are discouraged from seeking emancipation. I think the moment the Department is satisfied that the Indian is fit for emancipation, every effort should be made to emancipate him and throw him wholly upon his own resources. I think there should also be a provision made to introduce, amongst the various Indian bands, a system of municipal government. I do not say that the Indians should be incorporated with the municipalities in which the reservations are situated, but I think they should be required to take an active part in the administration of their own affairs. They can be easily guided and assisted in this matter by the agents, and by the hon. the Minister of the Interior himself. I know there is a provision in the Act, with regard to the performance of statute labour, and for other purposes, connected with the management of the Indian reservations; but with these reservations 1,500 or 2,000 miles away from Ottawa, it is utterly impossible for the Minister to judge of their condition and give them proper supervision. Municipal institutions of a simple character should be given them, such as the election of a council, to impose taxation, to a limited extent, for certain specified purposes; to require them to perform statute labour; to require them to contribute from the products of their industry towards the maintenance of schools amongst themselves. I am satisfied such a change would be greatly to the benefit of the Indians. I maintain that the provisions of the law exempting the Indians from all obligations for debt have not worked satisfactorily. I am sure that must have been the experience of the hon. gentleman himself. I know from my own observation that the tendency is to demoralise the

Indians. They have gone to traders and bought necessary articles of food, and being protected by the law against any legal process for the enforcement of their obligations, have refused to pay their debts and have set the white population at defiance. The effect has been to make them dishonest, and to make them unpopular with the white population. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the extent to which the Indian lands are bought up by the whites in their immediate neighbourhood. Now, if the Indians were an industrious population, there would be no more disposition to buy them out than there is for one portion of the white population to buy out another. The first duty of the Government is to seek to promote habits of industry, independence and honesty among them by the means I have indicated, or at least to make the experiment. If intelligently and efficiently made I have no doubt as to the result.

MR. DAWSON: In this discussion there seems to be a general idea prevalent that it would be greatly to the advantage of the Indians if they were allowed to dispose of their lands. Now I am of opinion that the tribal system, at present followed, is the best for the protection of the Indians. If you give an Indian the power of selling his lands whenever he chooses, the result would be that a few white people would get possession of the Indian lands, and the Indians themselves would be driven all over the world. Within the past six or eight years, under a more careful administration of Indian affairs than formerly prevailed, the condition of the Indians has very much improved, and is continuing to improve. I think the present Act is very defective in some respects, particularly in the provision with regard to enfranchisement. The only condition on which an Indian can become enfranchised is by separating his share of the lands or his particular allotment from the lands or reserve held in common by the band at large. This is holding forth a premium for the breaking up of the tribal system, which is the only true protection remaining to the Indians against the rapacity of the white man. If an Indian is an educated man, if he has become equal to his white neighbours, why not allow him to become enfranchised without hampering him with a lot of utterly impracticable rules and

regulations, such as are continued in this Act? Why should it be impossible for him to become enfranchised, and still remain a member of his band. That would lead to the Indian bands being scattered. I think it would be possible to devise some system by which the Indians could be enfranchised and the tribal system, at the same time, continued. I know Indians at present who are very well off, who employ white men as their servants, and yet cannot vote at Elections, because they will not consent to separate from their people. They look upon separation from their bands as a disgrace, and the Indian who does so is stigmatised among his people as a traitor to his race. I am satisfied that the Indians would be elevated in their own estimation, and that it would tend to their civilisation, if they could become enfranchised, when otherwise qualified, and still remain connected with their bands. The tribal system is the first protection of the Indian, and the abolition of that system would lead to the demoralisation and eventual destruction of the race.

MR. CASEY: I do not consider it is treating this House with the consideration to which it is entitled to bring down a measure of this importance upon the last working day of the Session, and more especially is this the case when this Bill, as it professes to be, a consolidation of the laws relating to Indians. There is really very little that is new in the measure. There is nothing new in it that is urgent, unless it is claimed that the changing of the name of the head of the Department is so. I am of opinion that it would be well to allow it to stand over until it can be rationally considered, which it cannot be now. The general tendency of our Indian legislation has been to make matters worse than they were before. The hon. member for Algoma has stated that the tribal system is the best for keeping the Indians together. The question for us to consider is, whether it is advisable to keep the Indian tribes together, and separate from the rest of the community. That was necessary, no doubt, when the Indians were the helpless wards of the Crown, but I should be very much surprised if the country at large would think it advisable, in the case of Indians who have settled down, that they should con-

tinue in that state of tutelage for ever. For my part, I do not consider that it is advisable to make this condition of things permanent. I think Indians, who are equal to whites in intelligence, who are superior to many whites in wealth, and who are full grown citizens of the Dominion, should not be placed in a worse condition than the negro. I think it is quite possible to get over the objection the hon. member for Algoma has alluded to, that Indians will not leave their bands by allowing them to retain their tribal connection, but not their share of the funds. In the 24th Clause there is another objectionable provision. It provides:

“ That if a person has been once convicted of trespassing on Indian lands, he can afterwards be imprisoned by the Superintendent General, or whoever he may depute, without notice or trial, on the information of interested parties that he has repeated the offence.”

An instance came to my knowledge, recently, in which a man was arrested and put in jail without having received the slightest notice that he was charged with a repetition of the offence. He claims that the affidavit was a perjured one, but he had no opportunity of showing its falsity, and no remedy whatever; such a law is monstrous. There are several other sections which interfere with citizens' rights. One says that if any timber, stolen from Indian lands, becomes mixed with other timber so as not to be easily distinguishable, the whole may be seized. In such a case the timber may belong to an innocent third party, who may be thus deprived of his property for the benefit of the Indians. I do not see why the laws protecting the rights of Indians in regard to trespass should be any more stringent than those affecting the white man. The tendency of the Bill is to place Indians under the protection of the Government and above all law.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On Section 12,

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said its principle was all wrong, since it maintained the tribal system. This was wise and prudent years ago, and was wise and prudent yet with regard to many

lands in the North-West; but an Indian law should be so elastic that its conditions would operate among the most advanced Indians. He trusted that the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) would see the propriety of striking out the clause.

Section agreed to.

On Section 22,

MR. PATERSON said this clause also involved a principle that was wrong in itself. It declared that no white person, or any one not an Indian, shall be permitted to lease or occupy land on the reserves. He thought it was desirable, in the interest of the Indian, that he should have the right to lease to white men if he saw fit. The presence of white men on the reserves would tend much to instruct the Indians in the proper modes of working the land.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not believe in the whites getting into the reserves so long as the tribal system is kept up.

MR. CASEY said he thought it would be of great advantage to the bands if Indians were allowed to lease to persons who knew how to till the soil.

MR. DAWSON said the result of such a privilege would be to break up the bands. Until the Indians are further advanced and better instructed in the ways of the white man, it would not do to introduce a foreign element amongst them. Experience proved that such experiments were ruinous to the Indians in their present condition. There were some non-treaty Indians in Algoma, a good many of whom were not recognised as belonging to the band. They are looked upon as American Indians, but they are not, and they had sent down petitions to be considered as the rest of the tribe. It was desirable something should be done to let those poor people into the band.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : That is worthy of consideration.

Section agreed to.

On Section 77,

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said he was opposed to the principle of protecting Indians from being sued. This "protection clause," as it was called, was rather a disadvantage to them than otherwise. An Indian might desire credit, and it might be in his interest to have credit, but there being no recourse

for the collection of a debt against him, no one will give him credit.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there were great difficulties in the way of a change.

Section agreed to on a division.

On Section 81,

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) said he was in sympathy with the hon. the Minister of the Interior in this matter of the sale of liquor to Indians. Situated as they were in his county, there was a great deal of trouble arising from the liquor traffic. He would suggest a provision to this effect: That if a person saw an Indian drinking liquor, he should lodge information with the Local Superintendent, that officer being allowed to prosecute without divulging the name of the informer. The trouble was that no one liked to inform, because when their names were divulged they subjected themselves to annoyance from the drink seller. The informer should be allowed to give the names of witnesses who might be summoned, but not compelled to give evidence himself.

Section agreed to on a division.

On Section 94,

MR. PATERSON asked if it would be too much to keep the Indian until he did tell where he got his liquor.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : That is pretty hard; it is not treating them like white men.

Section agreed to on a division.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

(In the House.)

Bill reported.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of the Bill.

MR. CASEY moved in amendment :

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend it, by leaving out all the words in Section 23 between "made to him" in line 13 and "issue" in line 14, and inserting the following :—"summon before some Stipendiary Magistrate, Police Magistrate, or Justice of the Peace such person or Indian; and such Stipendiary Magistrate, Police Magistrate or Justice of the Peace shall, after hearing the complaint and defence, if the complaint be proven to his satisfaction."

Motion, in amendment, negatived on a division.

Bill read the third time and passed.

QUEBEC, MONTREAL AND OTTAWA
OCCIDENTAL RAILWAY BILL.

[BILL 118.]

(*Mr. McDonald, P. C. O.*)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for second reading read.

MR. McDONALD (Pictou): The preamble explains its object. The clauses are very short. Their object is to remove some difficulty with respect to the title of the Railway acquired by the Province of Quebec in two Sections, one from Quebec to Montreal, and another from Montreal to Ottawa. I need not call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that the road from Montreal to Aylmer was by an Act of this Parliament made a Dominion road, and, therefore, the legislation in reference to it rests in this Legislature. The road from Montreal to Quebec was previously ceded to the Local Government, and it is the opinion of the officials of that Government that the cession of these rights should be ratified by an Act of this Parliament, and it is for the purpose of obtaining that ratification that this Bill is introduced.

MR. BLAKE: I am obliged to object to the second reading of this Bill. I have a letter from a well-known advocate in the Province of Quebec, setting forth that this Bill will interfere with the rights of parties who have claims against this Railway; and as there is no petition of right in that Province, the Local Government could not be proceeded against. This Bill, affecting as it does private rights, ought to have been introduced in the proper course by petition. That would have enabled these private rights to be discussed before the appropriate Committee. On the 12th of March, 1875, a motion was made by a member of then Government for leave to bring in a Bill affecting the Northern Railway. It was objected that as the Bill affected private rights it should be introduced as a Private Bill. The Speaker then held that this point was well taken, and it seems to me the same point of order arises here.

MR. ANGERS: I am sorry the hon. member for West Durham has raised this point of order in relation to this Bill. By referring to the Statute passed by the Province of Quebec, I think the House will be easily convinced that the point of

order does not lie, and that there are no private rights which may be affected by the Bill. The Bill is rather a public measure, affecting one of the Provinces of the Dominion. The Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway Company will still remain in existence after this measure is passed and may be sued by any parties having rights of action against it. Therefore, I maintain that no private rights can be affected by the measure and that it should be treated as a public Bill. A Bill was introduced last Session to empower the Province of Quebec to build a bridge over the Ottawa, but I do not believe it was treated as a Private Bill but rather as a Public Bill.

MR. ABBOTT: No private rights can be interfered with, because the Province of Quebec will assume the liabilities of the company.

MR. BLAKE: I think the discussion shows that there is some question as to whether private rights are affected.

MR. McDONALD moved that the order be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

CANADIAN WATERS NAVIGATION
BILL.—[BILL 121.]

(*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.*)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne): This is a very important Bill, and should, in order to be properly discussed, have been brought in at an earlier stage of the Session. It makes many changes in the law. I am aware that similar Acts have been adopted by the Parliaments of the maritime nations of the world, but the clause in reference to lights of fishing vessels, largely affects that important industry, and should be suspended as in those other countries where similar legislation has been adopted. The regulations regarding lights should be suspended, so far as fishing vessels are concerned, as suggested in England by the Board of Trade.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.): The rules and regulations have been adopted by the United States. The consequences would be serious if this Bill did not become law, and you cannot adopt a part of the regulations without the whole. The rules are necessary to prevent collision,

Mr. McDONALD.

and they will keep fishing boats from the risk of being run down when outside the three-mile limits.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. Minister has been kind enough to give me a memorandum showing what the Bill proposes to do, and to show me that there is very little difference between the old Bill and the new Bill; but still it is to be regretted that this measure has not been brought down earlier. Taking into account the statement made by the hon. member for Shelburne (Mr. Robertson) to the effect that the new rules are to be suspended elsewhere, it would seem that if we put them in force before the end of another year, we shall be, during that time, in advance of other countries, and that we shall, meanwhile, be making a distinction between this and other countries. It would be better to amend the Bill as regards fishing vessels, so as to give the Governor in Council power to suspend those regulations, and bring them into operation when it is found expedient after due consideration.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have spoken now to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and he thinks there is a good deal in the suggestion of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and we shall arrange to have it carried out.

MR. BLAKE: Then on that statement it would be as well to allow the Bill to go to-night.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time, and passed:—

Bill (No. 122) To ratify and confirm an agreement therein mentioned, between the Government of Canada and the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

Bill (No. 124) To amend the Act respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.)

Bill (No. 125) To confirm a certain Order of the Governor in Council respecting the Graving Dock at Esquimalt.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LAND REGULATIONS.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Resolution:—

That it is expedient to substitute for the seventh of the series of Resolutions relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway, adopted by this House on the 12th and 13th May last, the following Resolutions:—

(a) That one hundred millions of acres of land in Manitoba and the North-West Territories be appropriated for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway.

(b) That such lands shall be from time to time selected and reserved by order of the Governor in Council as Railway lands, and shall be of fair average quality for settlement.

(c) That such lands shall be sold at prices to be fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council, but in no case at a rate of less than one dollar per acre.

(d) That the proceeds of such sales, after deducting the cost of survey and management, shall be devoted exclusively to the purpose of defraying the cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

(In the Committee.)

MR. ANGLIN: Parties will not be permitted by the Resolutions to go in upon those lands and take up homesteads.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: The Resolutions will not prevent that. It is not proposed to alter the regulations for the sale of lands, but it is proposed to conform the Railway Resolutions of last year to the existing Act, which leaves the homestead regulations as at present.

MR. BLAKE: I think some explanations should be given before those Resolutions pass. I think the purpose of the hon. the First Minister is to substitute these Resolutions for the 7th of the former series, with a view to their harmonising with the present policy of the Government which has been developed by the regulations in Council in the formation of the various belts, and not with a view to any new policy. It is out of the belt of 220 miles, established by these regulations that the 100,000,000 acres are expected to be obtained?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Not necessarily.

MR. BLAKE: How many acres do you expect to find in that belt for your purpose, and how many are fit for fair average settlement?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I cannot state the exact quantity of land in those belts. It will not fall short of 100,000,000 acres. It has been ascertained beyond a doubt that beyond those belts there are good lands—220,000,000 acres fit for settlement. That is the Report of the Surveyor-General and the Deputy Minister of the Interior. So, whatever may be the deficiency of those belts, it can be made up elsewhere.

MR. BLAKE: The statement is certainly very satisfactory. Not long ago we had a detailed statement, with a map, from the hon. the Minister of Railways, to the effect that the whole region from the American boundary on the south and the Rocky Mountains on the west, including the whole Peace River district, contained but 189,000,000 acres, of which he estimated that from 30,000,000 to 39,000,000 acres were unfit, and 150,000,000 acres fit for settlement, comprising the arable and pasture land. Does the hon. the First Minister, in his totally different statement, include the British Columbia lands?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Whatever I may have said, I intended to say this: My calculation applied to the region from the western boundary of Manitoba to the Rocky Mountains, including only a portion of the Peace River district, as was based upon a very careful examination of the territory by Professor Macoum, whose Report will shortly be published.

MR. BLAKE: No information can be given as to the exact quantity of land supposed to be available for settlement?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No.

MR. BLAKE: Are the free grant lands counted in the 100,000,000 acres? We have first the railway lands; second, the preemption; last, the free grants. Are the 100,000,000 acres to be exclusive of the homestead lands?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: In that case you will have to set apart about 133,000,000 acres or thereabouts, because you have now four distinct portions: two are reserved for the Railway, one for homesteads, and one for preemptions.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER: Yes.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT:

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

I shall be delighted if the computation of 220,000,000 acres proves accurate. I may observe that 100,000,000 acres by themselves make 160,000 square miles.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I will lay on the Table a map prepared by Professor Macoum, that has been placed in my hands, showing 220,000,000 acres of good arable land fit for settlement. It is prepared upon the best information that can be got in the country. The Professor has gone all over that country and tried every available means to ascertain its character. He has found that even in those parts heretofore considered a desert, considerable portions are fit for settlement.

MR. MILLS: In my opinion no real advantage can be derived from reserving lands for the construction of a road that are not to be improved or made available by the road, and that all the lands situated at a greater distance than twenty miles from the line of Railway ought not to be reserved for the construction of that road. If railways through these lands are necessary to make them good for settlement, how are you going to get railways through them if the lands themselves are reserved for sale to build the railway?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We must remember that we are obliged to build the Pacific Railway without increasing the taxation of the country, and, therefore, we must set aside lands for that purpose. If there were no such restrictions as to taxation we might allow other considerations to enter into this subject. But these two premises being granted, first, that we must build the Railway, and second, that we are not to incur increased taxation for it, we must use those lands. As the lands increase in value, we will, in my opinion, derive a much larger fund from the sale of those lands than will be required to pay for the Railway. I am quite satisfied of that. The whole experience of the United States proves that. Look at the Northern Pacific road, where, at this moment, it is found that the company have made so much money out of their lands, that the subject is up in Congress to take away the balance of the land, because they are selling it for \$150 an acre instead of \$10. It is important for us that we should be able to show in

Europe, as well as America, that our lands are of sufficient value to build the road, that there will be no taxation, that emigrants can go and settle in that country and have railways, and that they are not going to suffer from extreme taxation. My estimation may be a sanguine one, but if my ideas about the value of those lands be correct, then their sale will produce not only enough to build the Railway, but leave a large fund besides, with which we can do just as we like. We can assist auxiliary railways, and pay all the expenses of the Government.

MR. MILLS: The objection to the hon. gentleman's proposition is that it prevents the construction of auxiliary railways until the main line is built, and it locks up all the lands for the time being. There can be no advantage to the country in reserving any lands to build this Pacific Railway that are not to have a direct increased value given them by the construction of that particular road. If you commence reserving lands 100 miles away which can only have a value by building a road through those lands, you prevent yourselves from building such roads. Such roads are to be built long before the Railway reaches them, and the policy proposed by the Government is one which will retard the settlement of the country. The policy should be to confine the land reservation to a reasonable distance from the road, leaving the hands of the people and the Government untied to their lands, free to aid those roads which will best contribute to the settlement of the country, which is of far more consequence than any sum of money to be derived from the sale of those lands.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Government do not at all propose to lock up any given piece of land in that region of the country. They have provided that the even-numbered lots shall be provided for homestead purposes, and the odd-numbered lots for railway lands. The hon. gentleman must know that the proposition of the present Government is far more liberal in these matters than the proposition of his own Government. The hon. gentleman knows that by the Orders in Council of his own Government, there are twenty miles on each side of that road, as far as North Lake, absolutely reserved, with-

drawn from settlement as railway lands. When the line of Railway was altered by the present Government and was run south of the lake, the same provision which exists in regard to North Lake was carried out in the South Lake. Then, in consequence of the statements made in the press, that we excluded the settler by making a provision similar to that of the hon. gentleman's Government, the regulations were altered and only alternate lots were reserved for railway purposes. We adopted the United States system which was that there should be alternate sections, one of which should be railway land and the other homestead preemption land. All that this Resolution provides for is simply that there should be 100,000,000 acres reserved. If the same policy is adopted with regard to any other land lying outside the present belt, then, of course, it will be that every alternate section shall be railway land and every other section open to the settler. Should that policy require alteration, we can modify it at any time. But it is of great importance, in order to relieve all anxiety about this country being overtaxed, to build the Railway, that the emigrants from Europe should know that the produce of those acres stand between them and the possibility of taxation. Hereafter should it become known that, instead of 100,000,000 acres, a smaller amount was sufficient for the purposes of building that Railway, then we can gracefully diminish the amount to 75,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres, and we can afford to be more liberal in the sale of those lands. The hon. gentleman must see that we are only carrying out the policy his Government proposed. Now let us look at these Orders in Council.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman was mistaken, because he knew there was an Order in Council reserving those lands.

MR. BANNERMAN said he had travelled fifty or sixty miles over that road, and until he came within twenty-eight or twenty-nine miles of the city of Winnipeg, there was not one lot of land taken up.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is because they did not know what price would be charged.

MR. BANNERMAN said that was exactly what he was trying to prove. He was told by parties that they would have gone on the Railway Belt, but they did not know what price would be charged. Since the new regulations had been made, quite a number of settlers had gone on the original Railway Belt.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was in error in regard to the statement he had made with regard to the Order in Council, and he apologised to the hon. gentleman for the statement he had made.

Resolution *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

(In the House.)

Resolution *reported*.

Question *proposed* on the second reading of the Resolution.

MR. BLAKE moved :

That the said Resolution be not now concurred in, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that the sales of Railway lands shall be on condition of actual settlement.

Question *proposed* on the amendment.

The House *divided*.—Yeas, 25 ; nays, 76.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Anglin	Gillies
Béchar	LaRue
Blake	Mills
Bourassa	Oliver
Brown	Olivier
Burpee (Sunbury)	Paterson (South Brant)
Cartwright	Rinfret
Casey	Rogers
Caugrain	Rymal
Dumont	Skinner
Fiset	Smith (Selkirk)
Fleming	Trow.—25.
Geoffrin	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers	Kilvert
Baker	Lane
Bannerman	Langevin
Benoit	Lantier
Bergeron	Macdonald (Vict., B.C.)
Bergin	McDonald (Cape Breton)
Bill	McDonald (Picton)
Bourbeau	Macmillan
Bowell	McCarthy
Brecken	McCuaig
Bunster	McGreevy
Bunting	McKay
Carling	McLennan
Cimon	McRory
Colby	Masson
Connell	Montplaisir

MR. BANNERMAN.

Costigan	Patterson (Essex)
Coupal	Perrault
Currier	Plumb
Cuthbert	Pope (Compton)
Dawson	Pope (Queen's, P. E. I.)
DeCosmos	Ross (Dundas)
Desaulniers	Routhier
Domville	Ryan (Marquette)
Drew	Ryan (Montreal Centre)
Elliott	Rykert
Farrow	Schultz
Ferguson	Sproule
Fulton	Tassé
Gigault	Tellier
Girouard (Kent, N.B.)	Thompson (Cariboo)
Grandbois	Tilley
Haggart	Tupper
Hooper	Wallace (S. Norfolk)
Houde	Wallace (West York)
Jones	White (Cardwell)
Kaulbach	White (East Hastings)
Keeler	Williams.—76.

Motion *resolved* in the negative.

Resolution *read* the second time and *agreed* to on a division.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

RAJIFICATION OF CONTRACT.

Resolved, That the House do approve of the contract for the construction of one hundred miles of that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, commencing at the end of the 48th Contract, near the Western Boundary of Manitoba, and extending to a point on the west side of the Valley of Bird Tail Creek, which Contract was laid on the Table of the House on the 3rd instant.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

SUPPLY BILL.—[BILL 126.]

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading *read*.

MR. COLBY: Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I desire to call the attention of the House to a subject, which although outside the general range of subjects now engaging our attention, I deem to be of sufficient importance to justify a brief mention, even at this late period of the Session and this late hour of the night. I refer to the great project which is now attracting so much attention on this continent and in Europe, namely, the project of an inter-oceanic canal across the Central American Isthmus. The Conference at Paris last year, the project which has been inaugurated under the auspices of ex-President Grant, the recent visit of M. de Lesseps to the Isthmus and to the United States, the recent discussions in the United States Congress, the recent message of the President in reply to a resolution from the Senate, the active interest manifested in high financial

circles on this continent and in Europe, all indicate a growing feeling among the statesmen and capitalists of the most wealthy nations that the time has arrived when, in the interests of commerce, the narrow band that separates the two oceans should be pierced and a great national water-way opened for the traffic of the world. I shall not delay the House by any disquisition with regard to the comparative merits of the rival routes, or the great commercial advantages of the scheme, nor will I refer to the engineering difficulties which have to be overcome, or any material questions of that kind. But there is one incidental question which forces itself upon our attention, deeply affecting, as it does, the prosperity, the commercial interests and the prestige of this Dominion. It is a question of international concern, and one which may be the subject of negotiation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain, before we shall have an opportunity of meeting in this hall. It is obvious, and, I believe, undisputed, that this canal, when constructed, must be open to the commerce of the world, as freely as are the great oceans it will connect. Those oceans are the common property of mankind, and should not, nor should any waterway, natural or artificial, which may unite them, be subjected to the sovereign authority or exclusive control of any particular nation. Whatever route may be adopted, it must pass through the territories of some feeble Central American State, which is quite unable either to construct the work, or to protect the foreign capital invested in it. Some one or more of the great powers, therefore, will, in the interest of all commercial nations, be under the necessity of assuming the directorate of that canal, and the protection of the capital therein invested. The practical question which is likely to be forced upon the attention of nations, very shortly, will be this: Which power or what combined powers shall assume that responsibility? It is obvious that, of the great commercial nations, the two having the greatest interest in the work are Great Britain and the United States. It concerns not only the American possessions of Great Britain, great and important as those possessions are, but it con-

cerns also the interest of the Empire at large. She is the foremost commercial nation, and having dominions on all the continents and in all the seas, she lacks this link only to complete the girdle of direct continuous navigation around the globe, which would bring more nearly together her scattered possessions. The interests of the United States are felt, by the people of that country, to be even greater than those of Great Britain and the other nations. They seem to feel that the project is peculiarly their own. The question of a protectorate of this great enterprise was, at one time, a subject of negotiation between the United States and Great Britain, was once settled—and is now settled, so far as treaty obligations and conventions can settle it—by the Treaty known as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. I beg to call the attention of the House to the provisions of that Treaty, to the fact that it was initiated by the Government of the United States, and to the grounds upon which it is based. In a letter from Mr. Rives to Mr. Clayton, dated September 25th, 1849, Mr. Clayton is informed by Mr. Rives that, under his instructions, he had an interview with Lord Palmerston on the question, and Mr. Rives says he told Lord Palmerston, in this interview:

“That the United States sought no exclusive privilege or preferential right of any kind in regard to the proposed communication, and their sincere wish, if it should be found practicable, was to see it dedicated to the common use of all nations, on the most liberal terms, and a footing of perfect equality for all, securing it beforehand, by proper stipulations, against unreasonable and oppressive exactions for the use of it, either from the State through whose territories it should pass, or the individuals or companies who might be authorized to construct it; that the United States would not, if they could, obtain any exclusive right or privilege in a great highway, which naturally belonged to all mankind, for they well knew that the possession of any such privilege would expose them to inevitable jealousies and probable controversies, which would make it infinitely more costly than advantageous; that while they aimed at no exclusive privilege for themselves they would never consent to see so important a communication fall under the exclusive control of any other great commercial power.”

That was the basis on which the overtures were made, and those overtures were accepted in the same spirit; and the result of the negotiations which ensued was the Treaty consummated in 1850,

known as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. The preamble sets forth the following:—

“The United States of America and Her Britannic Majesty, being desirous of consolidating the relations of amity which so happily subsist between them, by setting forth and fixing in a convention their views and intentions with reference to any means of communication by ship canal which may be constructed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, etc.”

The first article provides :

“The Government of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal; agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same, or in the vicinity thereof, etc.”

Guaranteeing, in fact, the neutrality of the proposed canal. Article three guarantees the protection of those who might be engaged in the construction of the work. Article six provides :

“The contracting parties in this Convention engage to invite every state with which both or either have friendly intercourse, to enter into stipulations with them similar to those which they have entered into with each other, to the end that all other states may share in the honour and advantage of having contributed to a work of such general interest and importance as the canal herein contemplated. And the contracting parties likewise agree that each shall enter into treaty stipulations with such of the Central American States, as they may deem advisable, for the purpose of more effectually carrying out the great design of the Convention, namely, that of constructing and maintaining the said canal as a ship communication between the two oceans for the benefit of mankind on equal terms to all, and of protecting the same.”

That is the scope and effect of the Treaty. Mr. Webster, in 1852, speaking of this Treaty, says, in his instructions to Mr. Lawrence :

“Considering that the United States and Great Britain have jointly agreed to protect such a canal, and in consequence of their possessions on the coast of the Pacific, and of other obvious causes, have a similar interest in its success, it seems desirable that the capital required for its construction should be advanced by the citizens and subjects of both countries.”

These statements establish sufficiently that the canal was conceived to be an enterprise in the interest of all mankind, while it specially interested those two nations. Mr. Webster said the interests of Great Britain and the United States were similar. The Convention was designed to consolidate and perpetuate the

relations of amity existing between the two countries. The eighth Article of the Treaty says :

“The Governments of the United States and Great Britain not only desired, in entering into this Convention, to accomplish a particular object, but also to establish a general principle.”

It was, therefore, designed to permanently settle the question. A more liberal, generous, cosmopolitan arrangement than that, one characterised by greater consideration for the interest of contracting parties and of the world at large, could not be conceived. It recognised the more immediate interest of the contracting parties, but made equal provision for all other nations who might choose to undertake the responsibilities and share the advantages of the contemplated water-way. True, some complications subsequently arose; some questions as to the abandonment of rights which England claimed to have acquired previously, but the substantial fairness of the main propositions was never questioned, I believe, until recently. Some members of this House who have not given attention to the subject, may be surprised to learn that the President of the United States has recently, in a communication to Congress, submitted as the policy he proposes the United States should pursue in this matter, one as nearly as possible the reverse of that which these two contracting parties deliberately agreed upon in 1850. Without any cause assigned for this novel proposition, he announces that hereafter this is not to be considered an Anglo-American project in the control of which other nations may join, but is exclusively an American project, and must be exclusively under American control. In the overtures for the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty the United States expressly disavowed any desire to have exclusive control. Now the new and somewhat startling doctrine is announced that the United States must have exclusive control of the great inter-oceanic canal, and that if any obstacles stand in the way of that policy they must be removed. The President, in his Message to the Senate on the 9th of March last, states :

“In further compliance with the Resolution of the Senate, I deem it proper to state briefly my opinion as to the policy of the United States with regard to the construction of an inter-oceanic canal, by any route across the

American isthmus. The policy of this country is a canal under American control. The United States cannot consent to the surrender of the control to any European power, or to any combination of European powers. If existing Treaties between the United States and other nations, or if the rights of sovereignty or property of other nations stand in the way of this policy—a contingency which is not apprehended—suitable steps should be taken by just and liberal negotiations to promote and establish the American policy on this subject consistently with the rights of the nations to be affected by it. The capital invested by corporations or citizens of other countries in such an enterprise must, in a great degree, look for protection to one or more of the great powers of the world. No European power can intervene for such protection, without adopting measures on this continent which the United States would deem wholly inadmissible.”

He goes on say :

“ Without urging further the grounds of my opinion, I repeat, in conclusion, that it is the right and duty of the United States to assert and maintain such supervision and authority over any inter-oceanic canal across the isthmus that connects North and South America, as will protect our national interests.”

The proposition seems to be this, if I rightly apprehend the significance of this Message, that, if existing Treaties stand in the way of the policy he proposed, those Treaties must be removed by negotiations or otherwise. We are, consequently, on the eve of negotiations between the United States and Great Britain for the removal of any difficulties that may stand in the way of carrying out this exclusively American policy. Now, Sir, this policy, which the President recommends is, as I view it, an entirely new policy—a new departure. It foreshadows the inception of negotiations for the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. It signifies an exclusively United States protectorate, in place of a joint protectorate of the Central American States. It means the supremacy of the United States in commercial affairs on this hemisphere. My purpose in drawing attention to this subject, is not so much to controvert this proposition thus stated, in explicit and firm, though not offensive, language, as to state it, in order that the House and the country may consider whether we, as a community, occupying a considerable portion of the North American continent, would be in any way affected by it if adopted. I observe that some American press writers, and some speakers in Congress, treat this de-

claration as the legitimate outcome or sequence of the Monroe doctrine so-called, and discuss the question as if the Monroe doctrine was universally accepted and recognised, and had become part of the law of nations. Now, Sir, I venture the proposition that the Monroe doctrine was never so recognised, and that if it were indeed so recognised the case, now being considered, does not fall within either its terms or intentions. The Monroe doctrine was purely of political significance. The inter-oceanic canal is essentially a commercial question. The Monroe doctrine was promulgated to meet a special exigency, and being addressed by the President to the Congress of his own country, was not stated in a way to challenge acquiescence or dissent or definitive action by other nations; indeed it has been disregarded by the United States themselves. The occasion which drew out the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine, and the doctrine itself, may be briefly stated. In 1822, an alliance was formed, between France and Austria, for the purpose of suppressing the destructive and revolutionary ideas then widely prevalent. Spain wishing to reclaim her revolted American colonies, invoked the assistance of the alliance. England was opposed to the intervention of the allied powers, and invited the cooperation of the United States in her endeavours to prevent it. The Government of the United States cheerfully fell in with the proposition. The “Monroe doctrine,” as first announced by President Monroe, in his seventh annual message to Congress in 1823, was enunciated as follows:—

“ In the wars of European powers, in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defence. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more intimately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candour and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt, on their part, to extend their system to any portion of the hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety.”

That refers to the system of the allied pow-

ers, the political system of Austria and the legitimist Government of France, the nations which then were attempting to strike at those principles for which Americans had fought, and it was against that system that this "Monroe Doctrine" was a protest. It was so considered by one of their great writers on International Law, Henry Wheaton, who says :

"It was impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of these continents without endangering the peace and happiness of the United States. It was, therefore, impossible that the latter should behold such interposition in any form with indifference."

This doctrine was purely political. It was a protest against the establishment of a certain political system on this continent. Such is the view taken by Henry Clay upon the memorable occasion when he, as Secretary of State, had been solicited to assist Mexico when it was supposed France was meditating an invasion of Cuba. In his report of March 24, 1826, to the House of Representatives, he said :

"If, indeed, an attempt by force had been made by allied Europe to subvert the liberties of the southern nations on this continent and to erect upon the ruins of their free institutions monarchical systems, the people of the United States would have stood pledged, in the opinion of their Executive, not to any foreign State, but to themselves and their posterity, by their dearest interests and their highest duties, to resist to the utmost such attempt."

This was, so far as other nations were concerned, a declaration expressive of the policy of the United States, given by their Executive to their own Congress, a policy by which they distinctly disavowed any form of connection with the other States of America or obligation to carry out the Monroe doctrine, except so far as it suited their own interests. That this doctrine was never recognised by other nations, I shall quote from Calvo on International Law :

"This political formula has been to a great extent acted upon by the United States, especially with regard to their taking no part in European politics. Nevertheless, it still exists as a 'doctrine,' and has not been incorporated into any legislative enactment or into any convention."

It has never been recognized by foreign nations as a doctrine which binds them in any way. True, the United States have abstained from intervention

in the affairs of Europe, and in one instance have had occasion to exercise that doctrine. That was the invasion of Mexico by France, and the endeavour to establish the ill-starred Maximilian as sovereign of that country. There were several circumstances, apart from the Monroe doctrine, which would justify the United States in not recognising the Government he established at Mexico. He was there under the auspices of Napoleon III., who endeavoured to obtain recognition of the Southern Confederacy, and to establish an Imperial system in America under the auspices of the European powers; and the United States could, therefore, be justified in refusing to recognise his *de facto* Government, and subsequently assisting in expelling the French army of occupation. This doctrine propounded by President Hayes, is not the one promulgated by President Monroe. The Monroe doctrine was purely political. This is a purely commercial question. It is difficult to see how the Monroe doctrine, which was merely a protest against the compulsory establishment of the political systems of Europe upon feeble and reluctant States on the American continent, can be made to cover the policy of the exclusive control of a great commercial enterprise, which is of interest to all the world, and the establishment of a United States coast line remote from the boundaries of the nation. The isthmian canal involves no political question. No European power seeks to obtain new territory, or to impress its political system upon any part of the continent. It is strictly a commercial project and does not fall within the scope of the broadest interpretation of the Monroe doctrine. Suppose that, by some great natural convulsion, the wall which divides the two oceans should be rent asunder and a great waterway opened for the commerce of the world, by what right could any nation except the one having the sovereignty, appropriate the exclusive control of a great natural channel? Unless a single nation provides the capital and constructs the work, how can it pretend, except by convention with other nations, to the right of exclusive control? The assumption of such a right would, I think, be untenable and the message of President Hayes, properly interpreted, may mean nothing more than the recom-

mendation of a policy to be adopted with the assent and concurrence of the other great powers. It is well to consider what would be the relations of European powers to the affairs of this continent if the new policy be engrafted upon the Monroe doctrine and both be adopted as a rule of International Law. Thereafter no European power could, under any circumstances, interfere with political affairs on this continent; but the United States would be free to throw the great weight of their power and influence into any political contest in any of the weaker States. Thereafter, not only the European States but all the American communities, except the United States, would be precluded from any voice or control of the interoceanic canal in which all have an interest, and they would be obliged to content themselves with such privileges as the United States declares she is willing to accord to the world at large. The unconditional recognition and acceptance of this policy would be a precedent to justify the occupation of every strategical commercial point on this continent in the interest of American commerce, just as the Monroe doctrine, if accepted in its broadest sense, would justify the occupation of every strategical military and naval position in the interest of the peace and safety of the United States. Now, Sir, I do not think that Great Britain, which is a great power on this continent, and has great possessions and great interests here, can be fairly asked to unconditionally accept this new policy, engrafted upon the old doctrine and all the logical consequences, which would flow therefrom. In the interests of the millions of her faithful American subjects she has duties and responsibilities of which she cannot divest herself. It may be convenient, in the interest of the world at large, that the United States should be permitted to assume the protectorate of the Central American, States and the control, as the trustee of all the nations, of the interoceanic canal. Such an arrangement, based upon comity and considerations of mutual convenience, would involve no principle to which any reasonable objection could be taken. But there is a broad distinction between such a convention and one which would compel the Queen of Canada, and of her other

possessions in America, to abnegate the powers, functions and influence which she exercises, without question or objection, upon all the other continents in similar circumstances. As Empress of India she observes and takes an active interest in all affairs, political and commercial, which concern the welfare of her Asiatic subjects. As Queen of the British Isles, her voice and influence are potential in the affairs of Europe. It would be anomalous if, upon this continent alone, she should refrain from the exercise of her legitimate influence in matters which concern the welfare of her faithful subjects here. We, Sir, as a British community in North America, occupy a territory as extensive as that of the United States. Like the United States we span the continent and have a frontage upon both oceans. We are striving to develop our great resources and populate our extensive territory, to build up internal commerce by great systems of railways and canals. But while doing so, we should not forget the requirements of our external commerce, or our great capabilities of becoming a great commercial nation. Our facilities for building and manning ships are unrivalled. Our forests and our mines, upon both oceans, abound in the best material for ship-building. We have, upon both oceans, the finest Fisheries in the world, the nurseries and training schools of seamen. What California is to the United States, British Columbia is to us. We desire to compete with the United States in commerce with the South American States upon the Pacific coast. For whatever purposes the United States require to use the interoceanic canal, when built, we need it also for similar purposes. I believe, Sir, that for the reasons I have suggested, rather than explained, we should consider this great subject in its relation to our future as a growing community on this continent; that we should protest against the surrender of any power, influence, or prerogative of our Sovereign, which might be rightfully exercised for our advantage, and that as an American community having a deep interest in all questions relating to the interoceanic canal, we should be vigilant and energetic in pressing for a recognition and guarantee of our rights and privileges.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am

sure the House, on both sides, are very much obliged to my hon. friend for bringing up this subject, even at this late period of the Session. I am quite sure that every hon. gentleman who has heard this speech must agree with me that his statements have been made with great clearness and moderation, and with the usual logical power which distinguish that hon. gentleman, as much, if not more, than any other hon. gentleman in this House. The question is one of the very greatest importance, and it has already attracted the attention of the other branch of Parliament, and in the Senate *Debates*, no doubt, every hon. member has read with very great interest the elaborate speech of Senator Wark on the subject. As far as Canada is concerned, I take it that it has no immediate interest in the building of the canal at Panama. We are building a Canadian Pacific Railway across the continent which will, I believe, serve our purposes for very many years. The United States are in the same position. They are not only building a trans-continental railway, but they have already such lines in existence, and I rather fancy the United States do not desire a canal to be built at Panama any more than we do. But when the project was entertained in Europe, the United States took the action to which the hon. member for Stanstead has alluded. All we have to say in the matter is that, if that canal is once made, we have as much interest in it, in proportion to our population and trade, as the United States. We have almost, if not quite, as large a territory as the United States have. We have nearly as large an Atlantic and Pacific coast line as the United States, and it would be absurd to suppose that if a canal should be carried across the isthmus, all the shipping of the United States, coasting from the Atlantic to the Pacific, would go through the canal and visit the Pacific ports, and enjoy all the Pacific trade, while Canadian vessels would have to take the longer route by Cape Horn, or more than double the distance for Canadian vessels visiting the Pacific coast. With respect to the Monroe doctrine, there can be no doubt that it has no immediate reference to this subject. It is historically known that what is known as the Monroe doctrine, originated in an ill-advised casual remark of

George Canning which, no doubt, he regretted very much before he died, and from that came the Message of President Monroe. Suppose that doctrine were admitted to the utmost extent—suppose every nation in Europe or America should admit that the United States had established a right to consider the Monroe doctrine as a principle of International Law, it could have no possible effect on Canada. The Queen of England is as much an American power as the United States. As Queen of Canada she has the same rights as the South American Republics through which the canal would pass; and admitting the Monroe doctrine to its utmost extent, which I do not admit, which England cannot admit, which no European power will admit, yet the Queen of Canada and the people of Canada have the right to expect that, in regard to any canals across the continent to connect the Atlantic and Pacific, the same principle should prevail that prevails in respect to the Suez Canal, namely, that it should be a canal open to all nations and under the guarantee of all nations, and that not even war should close that channel.

MR. DECOSMOS: I think the House and the country owes a vote of thanks to the hon. gentleman from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), who has brought up the question of the Monroe doctrine. I intimated to the House when addressing it upon the subject of the Pacific Railway, that I would take occasion before the close of the Session to speak with respect to the Esquimalt-Nanaimo section of the Pacific Railway. I propose to do so now, and will be as brief as possible. With regard to this section of the Railway that was agreed to be built under the Carnarvon Terms, I expect the Government during Recess to prepare a measure for its construction, and submit it for the sanction of Parliament at its next Session. At this advanced period of the Session, it cannot be expected. I have no express authority from the Government for stating that I expect it to be prepared and submit a measure for the construction of the Esquimalt-Nanaimo section of the Railway, except its general expression of intention to keep faith with British Columbia, supplemented as that has been by making contracts to construct the Yale-Savona section. The hon. Min.

ister of Railways and Canals, when making his general statement on the Pacific Railway, alluded to the obligation assumed by the late Government under the Carnarvon Terms to construct the Esquimalt-Nanaimo section; and stated that it would cost \$4,000,000. I am satisfied, Sir, that the hon. gentleman has placed the cost too high. The result of my enquiries in various quarters, satisfy me that it can be completed and set at work for \$2,500,000. I will not trouble the House with details on this subject at this late hour. I will, however, undertake to show how small an outlay of capital and interest will be required to construct the road, which when completed, will only be sixty-eight miles long. It will be remembered that the hon. the Minister of Finance, as part of his scheme to provide funds to meet the expenditure of the Dominion Government, asked and obtained the sanction of Parliament to a resolution authorizing him to increase the issue of Dominion Notes to \$20,000,000, on condition of always holding for the redemption of such notes "in gold, or in gold and Dominion securities guaranteed by the Government of the United Kingdom, equal to 25 per cent. of the total amount of notes then outstanding, and that at least 15 per cent. of the total amount of such outstanding notes shall be held in gold." Now, Sir, on this financial basis I propose to submit for the consideration of the House and Government certain statements that will show conclusively that the means to construct the Esquimalt-Nanaimo section of the Pacific Railway are within the easy reach of the Government, and that the expenditure will fall so lightly on the country as not to make it necessary to increase appreciably the annual charge for interest on expenditure in British Columbia. I estimate that the total cost of the Esquimalt-Nanaimo section will be \$2,500,000; that it may be completed within four years; and that that sum may include the entire sum for working surveys, construction, and interest. I will not, however, enter into detail on this branch of the subject, but will direct attention to the following statements:

STATEMENTS of Estimated Expenditure necessary to build and complete Esquimalt-Nanaimo Section of Canada Pacific Railway,

if built between July 1, 1881, and July 1, 1885—four years—and showing the amount of Dominion Notes required to be issued in each year, the Bond Reserve, the Gold Reserve, and the interest on the Gold Reserve till the Esquimalt-Nanaimo Section is completed; also, the annual interest on Total Expenditure after its completion.

Statement of Dominion Notes, Bond Reserve and Gold Reserve.

Year.	Dominion Notes Issued.	Bond Reserve 10 p.c. of Dominion Notes	Gold Reserve 15 p.c. of Dominion Notes
1881-2	\$625,000	\$62,500	\$93,750
1882-3	625,000	62,500	93,750
1883-4	625,000	62,500	93,750
1884-5	625,000	62,500	93,750
Total	\$2,500,000	\$250,000	\$375,000

STATEMENT of Interest on Gold Reserve, from July 1, 1881, to July 1, 1885, date of completion of E. and N. Section.

Year.	Gold Reserve.	Rate of Interest.	Time.	Total Interest on Gold Reserve.
1881-2	\$93,750	4 per ct.	4 years.	\$15,000
1882-3	93,750	"	3 "	11,250
1883-4	93,750	"	2 "	7,500
1884-5	93,750	"	1 "	3,750
Totals..	\$375,000			\$37,500

The interest is calculated on the assumption that the Gold Reserve will be held at the commencement of each year, and makes the total Interest for four years, \$37,500.

STATEMENT of Gold Reserve held in each year, and the Interest paid in each year.

Year.	Gold Reserve held.	Rate of Interest.	Interest paid each year.
1881-2	\$93,750	4 per cent...	\$3,750
1882-3	187,500	" ...	7,500
1883-4	281,250	" ...	11,250
1884-5	375,000	" ...	15,000
Totals..	\$375,000		\$37,500

SUMMARY.

Total Dominion Notes issued, July 1, 1881 to July 1, 1885.....\$2,500,000
Total Bond Reserve held..... 250,000

Total Gold Reserve.....	\$375,000
Total interest on Gold Reserve paid	37,500
Total yearly interest on Gold Reserve, \$375,000 at 4 per cent after completion of E and N section of Canadian Pacific Railway.....	15,000
Total cost of Esquimalt-Nanaimo section when completed.....	2,500,000

These statements, Sir, show conclusively how very small an annual expenditure for interest is required to build the Esquimalt-Nanaimo section of the Pacific Railway, and to meet the interest on the Gold Reserve after its completion. The amount of the annual charge is so insignificant that it can never be felt, whilst the construction of the Railway will meet one condition of the Carnarvon Terms, keep faith with British Columbia, and fulfil a solemn obligation too long delayed in its fulfilment. Before leaving this branch of my subject, I will state that half of the \$750,000 offered by the hon. member for West Durham, when in the late Government, to British Columbia as a consideration for all future delays—for postponement for an indefinite period—in construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway in that Province, is equal to the total Gold Reserve required to build the Esquimalt-Nanaimo section on the financial basis that I have proposed; and that the other half would pay the annual interest on the Gold Reserve for twenty-five years after its completion, without counting the interest on it, if it were invested. I will now endeavour, Sir, to show that no increased taxation will be required to pay interest on the money required to build this section of the Pacific Railway; and further, that the reduced expenditure for the Mail Service between San Francisco and Victoria, with the increased Customs Receipts, consequent on the increase of population on Vancouver's Island, incident to the building of this section of the Railway, will show an aggregate gain and saving of several hundred thousand dollars over interest on Gold Reserve. It will be remembered that the Mail Service between Victoria and San Francisco costs annually \$54,000. The contract expires on the 1st of July next. The new contract for the Service goes into operation at that date, and will cost only about \$18,000 a year. That will make a saving of \$36,000 per annum, or a total saving, in five years, of

\$180,000. I estimate that the minimum increase of the population in Vancouver Island, between 1881 and 1885, if this Railway be constructed, will be 3,000. At \$10.42 the present *per capita* of Customs paid by British Columbia, the minimum increase of population 3,000 would, in four years, yield \$125,040 additional Customs Revenue over the present Receipts. The following summary shows the net aggregate gain and saving between 1880 and 1885:

SUMMARY.

Saving on San Francisco Mail Subsidy during five years, 1880 to 1885, at \$36,000	\$180,000
Increase in Customs receipts on increase of population, the minimum 3,000 at \$10.42 <i>per capita</i> ..	125,040
<hr/>	
Total gross Gain and Saving.....	\$305,040
Interest on total Gold Reserve of \$375,000 from 1881 to 1885—(see prior statement).....	37,500
<hr/>	
Total net aggregate Gain and Saving, 1880 to 1885	267,540

From this showing, it is apparent that there need be no fear of increasing taxation, or laying a heavy additional burden on the country, in order to build this Section of the Railway, and carry out the Carnarvon Award. On the contrary, it is established that there would be a net aggregate gain and saving of \$267,540, showing that the construction of the Railway will be a profitable transaction for the Dominion. I will now direct attention, Sir, to the estimates of Expenditure and Receipts of this section of the Railway, after it shall have been set at work. It is important that the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Section of the Canadian Pacific Railway should yield enough annually to meet the yearly charge for maintenance, repairs, and operating expenses, and leave a net surplus besides. I know of only one railway on the Pacific coast of which the expenses and receipts would give an idea of what the probable expenses and receipts of the Esquimat-Nanaimo Section would be; that is the Tacoma-Kalama Section of the Northern Pacific Railway, connecting Puget Sound with Columbia River, a distance of 105 miles. Speaking from memory, and subject to correction, for I have mislaid my notes on the subject, the annual expenses of this Railway under all heads, a few years ago, was \$105,000;

and the net profits over interest and charges, \$37,000. I give this statement merely from memory, without vouching for its exactness. I will, however, draw your attention to two short railways connecting with this city of which we have statistics of the cost of maintenance, Repairs, and operating expenses in the return of Railway Statistics for 1877-8 laid before Parliament. The first is the Brockville and Ottawa Railway, 86½ miles in length, and cost of maintenance, repairs, and operating charges, \$119,126; and secondly, the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, 59 miles in length, and expenses, \$112,559. Now, Sir, the Esquimalt-Nanaimo Section will be about 68 miles in length, and I estimate that the maximum expenditure for its maintenance, repairs, and operating expenses will be \$100,000. My reason for placing the expenses lower than the two roads entering this city is, that the chief freight that will be carried for some years will be coal, and according to the regulations with respect to moving coal on the Intercolonial in Nova Scotia, the shippers and consignees of the coal have to load and unload at their own expense, making a very considerable saving to the Government; and applying the same regulation to the Esquimalt-Nanaimo Section. I reduce the expense to a maximum of \$100,000 per annum. Now, Sir, I will give a statement of my estimate of receipts and expenditure of this section of the Railway after it shall have been fairly put in operation. It is as follows:

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.

40,000 tons coal delivered at Victoria for local consumption, at \$1.00 per ton.....	\$40,000
60,000 tons coal, delivered at Victoria, or Esquimalt, to be shipped foreign, at the special rate on the Intercolonial between New Glasgow and Londonderry iron mines, at 65 cents per ton.	39,000
50,000 tons coal, delivered to shipping at Nanaimo for exportation at 50 cents per ton.....	[25,000
5,000 tons produce and merchandise at \$2 per ton.....	10,000
10,000 passengers at \$2.....	20,000
Royalty on 100,000 tons coal raised within the Railway coal fields, at 20 cents per ton.....	20,000
Saving on carrying mails between Victoria and Nanaimo, per annum.....	4,000
Sales of land, timber, &c.....	10,000

Total gross estimated receipts....	\$168,000
Total annual expenditure for E. and N. Railway.....	\$100,000
Interest on Gold Reserve.	15,000
	<u>\$115,000</u>

Total Estimated Net Receipts... \$53,000

I believe, Sir, that, in the near future, after this road shall have been put fairly in operation, my estimate of receipts and net profits will be verified; and that when the continental portion of the Railway shall have been extended to English Bay, Burrard Inlet, with a ferry to connect with Nanaimo, that the passenger and freight business that will be done by the Island Section of the Pacific Railway, will exceed any other short section on the whole transcontinental line. I have only now to direct attention to the Railway Land Belt on Vancouver Island that will pass to the Dominion Government as soon as it is prepared to commence the construction of this section. There will be a very considerable area of land, chiefly timber land, in the belt, that will prove valuable. But it is the coal fields along the line of Railway that will be most valuable. I estimated that between Esquimalt and Nanaimo, within the Railway Belt, that there are 200 square miles of good coal fields. Now, the very least it will be worth to the Government, on the average, is \$50,000 per mile. At that rate the 200 square miles would be worth ultimately \$10,000,000—a sum equal to four times the estimated cost of the line between Esquimalt and Nanaimo. This shows, in connection with my estimates of the net receipts that the building and operating of this section would prove a profitable undertaking. I trust the Government, during Recess, will give this subject their best attention, and at the next Session of Parliament will submit a measure for its construction.

MR. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.): I desire to say, in reference to the petition against the National Policy, that it was signed not by 6,000 as was stated, but by 5,000. In regard to the number of electors who signed that petition, I may say, that while 2,400 voted against me, only 1,300 voters, or 1,100 less than voted against me, signed the petition against the National Policy, notwithstanding the fact that the constituency was scoured for the purpose of obtaining signatures. The petition, if it shows anything, shows that a

smaller number of people than voted against me are opposed to the Tariff.

MR. BLAKE: It was my desire to have made a short review of the work of the Session, but our time has just been taken up by so many topics that I do not intend to detain the House at this late hour. We have built the Panama Canal, we have vilified the Monroe doctrine and scattered it to the winds, we have proved most conclusively, of course, that the building of the Nanaimo Railroad would be one of the richest investments presented to the world; and having done all this, we may fairly go to bed. I desire, however, to make one or two remarks. I think we began the Session too late: if we meet earlier, in future, than we did this year, I think it will be better. I should like to see the Session commence in the latter part of January or extremely early in February. Having said so much with reference to the period of commencement, I desire to suggest that the financial statement should be brought down earlier, so that we may get sooner into Supply. Having, this year, met on the 12th of February, the financial statement was not submitted until the 9th of March, and we did not get into Committee of Supply until April 2nd. My third observation is in reference to the Government business, which ought also to be presented to this House at an earlier period than it has been this year. In the last week—that is from the 29th April—we have read a second time twenty-six Government Bills, on more or less important subjects, but all becoming law so far as this House is concerned. Of those twenty-six, I think only three were susceptible of any parliamentary discussion whatever, by virtue of there being Resolutions on which they were founded. The Supply Bill and one or two other Bills, of course, were not open to those observations in regard to the lateness of introduction of Government measures. Three of the twenty-six Bills were presented, adopted and disposed of in the last week of the Session, and I say that is converting this House not into a body for making laws, but into a body for registering the views of hon. gentlemen who bring down measures and those who support them. However much we may desire the Monroe doctrine, as applied to another country, it is

MR. MACDONALD.

plain that the hon. gentleman has made a practical application of that doctrine in this House, because the inference is that the majority shall have exclusive right to deliberate and discuss and determine what shall be done. I hope the hon. gentleman will initiate some reform in this particular next Session. This could be done if it were understood that Ministerial measures were to be prepared during the Recess, and that if introduced at a late period of the Session they will receive scanty encouragement, and will only be agreed to when some obvious, pressing emergency requires prompt action. Our own reputation and the interests of the country require that we should set ourselves to work to remedy this evil. There are two other practical suggestions that I will mention in order that Ministers should consider them during Recess. We have had a good deal of discussion with reference to the evils caused by the delays of Private Bill legislation. I think it would be convenient in the future after the first Standing Orders' Committee has been appointed, they should, except in the case of death or vacancies from other causes, continue for future Sessions, and should meet immediately after the opening of the Session, so that the persons having charge of Private Bills would be able to take steps for their early introduction. Then, with regard to the Public Accounts Committee, I gave notice at the last meeting of a Resolution to the effect that it was essential it should be constituted at a very early period of the Session. The Public Accounts are brought down immediately, and the slack time of the Session, which takes place before the other great Committees get to work, might be properly utilised in the discussion of matters which come before that Committee.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am afraid I lost some of the remarks of my hon. friend in the beginning of his speech. When I came in, however, he was speaking of the importance of the House meeting early. We thought of that, having had it discussed in 1867 and 1873, when we were succeeded by another Administration which had the same opportunity of observation that we had, and which came to the conclusion, apparently, that Parliament could not profitably meet before the

first week in February. In the first place, by the whole system of our Statutes the Reports, Returns and Accounts end on 31st December, and cannot be adjusted and prepared in any satisfactory form in a shorter period than four or five weeks. Then, there was a practical objection to an earlier meeting, which more particularly affected Ontario and Quebec. A great many members of Parliament are more or less intimately connected with the municipal institutions of the country; and we knew that when we met in January, on one or two occasions, Ontario members left Parliament to attend to the municipal elections. Some members were Mayors, some Reeves, and some Wardens. We came to the conclusion, on both sides, that the earliest time we could meet profitably is February. I think the earlier we meet in February the better. There were some reasons why we did not meet, this year, a week or ten days earlier. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) complained that the Government measures were not brought down early enough. That is a complaint always made by the Opposition. It was made by us when we sat on the opposite side, and by hon. gentlemen of the Liberal party when in Opposition, from 1867 to 1873, and now we have a recurrence of it. But the real answer to that objection is, that the Government measures, the mere acts of legislation, form, really, a very small portion of the work of Parliament. We have got a very large body of law copied from England, and I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this fact, that, supposing, with the exception of the Supply Bill, we did not carry a single measure for the next five years, this country would not be impeded in its progress. We have got a good, large, sound body of law.

MR. BLAKE: I thought I would rise to eliminate all question as to the number of Bills submitted. We objected to the late period at which you brought down your Bills.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) will admit that the House applied itself at once, from the day the Speech from the Throne was delivered, with great zeal and industry to the discussion of the various matters brought forward. It is a matter of no consequence, in a free country,

whether the measures be introduced by the Government or by independent members, or whether the questions raised in the first place emanate from the Government, so that Parliament has a full, free and fair opportunity of discussing all those measures. From the very beginning of the Session we have sat late and early to discuss all those matters; and I think that the *Hansard* of this year and Session, when read hereafter, will disclose a greater amount of earnest discussion on matters affecting the interests of the country than any other Session I ever saw. Of course, it is well the Government should bring down its measures as early as possible. The measures of chief importance this Session were the Tariff, Currency and Banking. Those subjects were discussed to a very considerable extent in the press and by experts. The hon. the Finance Minister received, after Parliament met, a series of deputations and delegations on the various subjects connected with the Tariff, Currency and Banking, and I think that the result has been a success, and that the measures laid before Parliament have received, not only the concurrence of the Ministerial supporters, which might have been expected, but the concurrence of hon. gentlemen opposite, except the single measure of the Tariff. Now, in regard to Private Bills, I go very far with the hon. member for West Durham, as he knows, in relation to the necessity of checking legislation. I have seen so many instances, during my Parliamentary life, of wrong done by Private Bills, the introduction and manipulation of which have injured interests that nobody in Parliament knew were being prejudicially affected, that I concur with him in the propriety of full notice being given in regard to every matter connected with Private Bill legislation. I would go with him, perhaps, altogether in his proposition that the Standing Orders Committee, at the beginning of any Parliament, should be considered a permanent Committee, to reassemble the moment a new Session commenced, in order to deal with this class of legislation. The hon. gentleman has stated that the Public Accounts Committee should be made permanent. I think that would be highly unconstitutional. I think he will find the doctrine laid down by Sir Robert Peel on

that point, was in opposition to a Public Accounts Committee. He laid down the sound constitutional doctrine. We have gone infinitely further than the Commons of England in this matter. Every Government has resisted the establishment of a permanent or Sessional Public Accounts Committee, upon the ground that no Government could stand or be supposed to submit to a permanent, an annual, indictment. We have submitted to it, and I do not know we have suffered much by it. But a Public Accounts Committee, supposed to be a permanent tribunal, sitting outside the House, fixed at the beginning of the Session, to be a continued court of impeachment of the Government, could not constitutionally, be sanctioned. I agree with the hon. gentleman in this respect that a Public Accounts Committee, judging from our own experience, which differs from the experience of England, in which they oppose it, is a serviceable institution, inasmuch as it is a very considerable check on the Government of the day. I do not think it is an unsalutary check, but I do not think that we ought to go so far as to make it a permanent Committee.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood me. I do not wish it to have any functions outside the Session.

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT: I would remind the hon. First Minister that unless he had been greatly assisted from this side of the House, this Session must have lasted several weeks longer. But we have been badly repaid by the extreme disorderliness which has marked the meetings of this House the last fortnight. You know, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. First Minister knows, that this House has never presented so unruly an appearance for so long a time. Undoubtedly, most expensive results must occur next Session if that kind of thing is persisted in. I propose for the consideration of the hon. First Minister—who, to do him justice, has generally been desirous to uphold the decorum of the House—whether we can permit these interruptions to go on in future without taking some more effectual steps to restrain those who have deliberately and constantly interrupted hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The difference

has been very marked. Hon. gentlemen have risen on that side and not a word has been said from those hon. gentlemen who support my hon. friend; but when hon. gentlemen have risen on this side, there has been a steady and continuous interruption. Now, I say, if this is continued the results will be extremely unpleasant, and will tend greatly to protract the length of the Session.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I quite agree with every word the hon. gentleman has said about the necessity of putting down these unseemly interruptions. It is a great degradation of our dignity and our position. But I will not accept the statement of the hon. gentleman that the disorder comes from our part. We have occasion to know that the interruption sometimes comes from hon. gentlemen who usually act with him, and if the noise is not so great it is because the number supporting him is not so great. The fact of the matter is, we can throw no reproaches on each other. In the last Parliament, the majority were rioting in their strength, and sometimes, perhaps, the present majority may be guilty of the same charge. But it is absolutely necessary that better order be observed. I speak with all sincerity, as the oldest member of the House—I may say, the father of the House—that I have been deeply grieved at the noises and unseemly interruptions that have taken place. There are legitimate means of putting down a member of the House, who forces himself against the patience and the common sense of the House, generally. At home they raise cries of “question,” “hear, hear.” A member rising in the House of Commons in England, and attempting to speak against the will of the House, has not the slightest chance of being heard. The experience there has been such, that a man can at once see whether he has the ear of the House, and if he has not, and is a man of common sense, he will not attempt to speak. There are parliamentary means of indicating to a member that the House does not wish to hear him. I grieve much to know that, in the House of Commons here, we go much further than the utmost limit allowed in the House of Commons in England during the greatest excitement. I had occasion to regret

that fact years ago when members of the English Parliament were present at one of our sittings, and when papers and books were thrown about and a riotous state of confusion existed. This greatly injured us in their estimation as a legislative body. I hope that when we meet again we will be more decorous in the expression of our approbation or disapproval. I intend, if I live, to take an early opportunity when the House meets again, and before the doors are open, to appeal to the hon. gentlemen, on both sides, to restrain their animal spirits and those unseemly disorders which must tend to diminish respect for a grave assembly of this kind, whose duties involve the happiness and future of this country.

MR. ANGLIN: I think it would be unfair for us to allow to pass unchallenged the statement of the First Minister that we, on this side of the House, have done much to prolong the Session. The hon. gentleman has more than once had occasion to check the unseemly interruptions that were made by gentlemen usually supporting himself. I must say that neither during last Session nor this Session did I know of a single instance of a member of the Opposition speaking with a view to waste time, nor do I remember of a single occasion during the five years of the former Administration when an important question was brought up at an early hour in the evening, when only one or two members had spoken upon it, that an attempt was made to put down the other speakers as has been done during the present Session. We on our side feel that we have done everything we could to make the Session pass pleasantly, and to facilitate the progress of public business, and we want to go away with kindly feelings towards hon. gentlemen if they will allow us to do so. All we want is fair play, but we are determined we will not allow ourselves to be placed in a false position before the country. Let us resolve, when we part this morning that if we meet again, to try to behave as a deliberative assembly should behave.

Bill read the second and third times and passed.

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASCENSION DAY.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until Friday at

Eleven o'clock, a. m.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 116.]

(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order for Committee of the Whole discharged and Bill withdrawn.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes before

Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 7th May, 1880.

The Speaker took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

MR. SPEAKER communicated to the House the following letter:—

“OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S

“SECRETARY'S OFFICE,

“OTTAWA, 6th May, 1880.

“SIR,—I have the honour to inform you, that His Excellency the Governor-General will proceed to the Senate Chamber, to prorogue the Session of the Dominion Parliament, on Friday, the 7th instant, at Four o'clock.

“I have the honour to be, Sir,

“Your most obedient servant,

“F. DE WINTON, Major R.A.,

“Governor-General's Secretary.

“To the Honourable

“The Speaker of the House of Commons.”

RETURNS TO ORDERS OF THE HOUSE.

REMARKS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, in presenting a Return, said: I desire to call the attention of what remains of the House, to the inexpediency of granting, just because a member chooses to satisfy his curiosity, every motion for a Return of papers. Here is a Return, that costs an immense sum of money to prepare, and I do not suppose that the member who asked for it will ever look into it.

PARLIAMENTARY PRINTING CONTRACT.

COMMITTEE'S REPORT CONCURRED IN.

MR. STEPHENSON moved that the Thirteenth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament be now concurred in.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) moved in amendment, that the following words be added to the said motion:—

“And that in the opinion of this House the Government should take the necessary steps to cancel the contract awarded to Messrs. MacLean, Roger and Company, for the Printing of Parliament, from the 1st January, 1880; and that the said contract be offered to Patrick Boyle, of Toronto, whose tender appears from all the evidence to be the only legitimate tender below that of Messrs. MacLean, Roger and Company; and that so much of the Thirteenth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, as is consistent with the foregoing Resolution, be adopted.”

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The difficulty in the way of the amendment is this: Any motion in this House can have no effect. The Printing Contracts of the House are under the Joint Committee of both Houses. The Senate has already concurred in the Report, and any action of this House is of no value whatever, because it would only put the two Houses in conflict.

MR. COSTIGAN: The amendment does not attack the Report, but states the Contract ought to be cancelled, pointing out certain other things that should be done afterwards. The Report of the Committee merely declares the Contract should be cancelled, and this amendment does the same thing, only going a step further.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: If it is a separate motion, of course it cannot be moved now. If it is an amendment, it must be in the form of an amendment.

MR. COSTIGAN: My desire is to add to the amendment. We had a great deal of difficulty to move a proper amendment, and the Report itself was pretty hard to deal with. The amendment was prepared to meet the case as it came before the House. The Committee have spent a great deal of time in enquiring into this matter, in accordance with the expression of public opinion in this House and in the Press. A thorough investigation into the facts connected with the Printing Contract was demanded, and the Committee have been taking evidence during the whole Session, and enquiring into the subject. It is unfortunate the Report was not submitted earlier. It might have been presented two or three days earlier. But it was kept back, and it places those, who differ from the majority of that Committee in a false position, in trying to find it out now. But one thing is certain, to my mind—the Report does not go far

enough—it does not carry out, fully, the instructions of the House. It might have gone on and stated that the parties found guilty of the practices they were charged with, in connection with the Printing Contract, were not entitled to tender for a new contract. Besides, at this late stage of the Session, the Committee cannot give effect to what, I think, the public expected. There is no doubt that from the first moment of those exposures, public opinion has been in favour of the cancellation of the Contract. Now, the Report simply says it should be cancelled, and that has been adopted by the other branch, and the adoption of the Report has been moved in this House. The mover of the amendment simply declares that, in adopting the Report, the next *bona fide* tenderer should have the benefit of his tender.

MR. TROW: I dissent entirely from the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I consider the Joint Committee on Printing had no jurisdiction in the matter. The reference to the Committee on this subject, did not give them any authority to transfer the Printing Contract to any party, or even to consider that matter at all. The Committee's instructions were merely to investigate the evidence in reference to the tenders and letting of the Contract, and advise some means for the prevention of improper practices, in regard to tendering, for the future. The Committee was not officially aware who were implicated in such practices in the past. I do not know but that Mr. Boyle was as much implicated in those practices as the others who tendered. We find Charlton and Cotton swore that they had authority from Mr. Boyle to make the best bargain for him that they possibly could with MacLean and Roger. They were his agents, and whatever they did he should be held responsible for. I cannot see any reason why the House or Committee should interfere with his claim any more than with that of any other tenderer. It is evident there was blackmailing in this business. The present contractors have done the printing properly, and in a manner creditable to themselves; they have given general satisfaction. They have a very expensive plant on their hands and would, if deprived of the contract, sustain great loss. Unprincipled characters

levied blackmail upon them, and placed them in their present unfortunate position. Their only safety, under the circumstances, was to yield and purchase imaginary interests held by unprincipled parties, or suffer heavy loss in disposing of their plant at a sacrifice.

MR. JONES: I do not see how the amendment can be carried. It would create very great confusion. How could the Contract be cancelled for the period mentioned in the Report? The whole of the work has been done from the first day to this. How is it to be paid for and settled? Is it to be paid for under the terms of the Contract? I think this amendment would create very great confusion. Messrs. MacLean and Roger must continue the work, on account of this Report being insufficient, and not being brought down in a proper manner. They should be allowed to continue the work, at all events, until next Session, until its completion.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): Unless some action is taken to-day, MacLean and Roger will continue to hold the Contract from the end of this Session, and they will retain it after the commencement of the next Session, the difficulty continuing also. The people of the country have been educated to thoroughly understand this question. I give all credit to the *Globe* for discovering the discreditable acts of the parties concerned in this Contract. Though prosecuted in the Court for its action, the *Globe* won its case. The *Mail*, another able paper, has exposed the fraudulent, corrupt transactions of the parties, in this city, implicated. This paper went further, declaring that every person connected with Parliament, from the highest to the lowest, should be exposed and punished for any action against the public interest. I contend that Roger and MacLean have no right to hold the contract which they got by corrupt practices. It is said that every tenderer or contractor, who comes to Ottawa, is blackmailed—has to pay parties, who profess to control the departments, for their influence, a large sum. Is not that corrupt, dishonest, wrong? Is it not against the honest administration of public affairs? The Printing Committee have not properly discharged their duty. What did the Committee appointed by

the late Administration, to investigate certain printing matters with which the late Speaker of this House was connected, do? They kept the Report against him to the last moment of the Session in the same way as the present, and, at last, one Minister was seen going out this way and another that way, while the Chairman was watching for Black Rod, so that at the last moment there was no chance to say a word. If there was one thing more than another that condemned that Administration, it was its dark, mysterious acts. Let us not do things in the dark—let us do our work openly, honestly, and in good time. The Printing Committee should bring in proper Reports. The hon. leader of the Opposition, the other day, said this Report did not come before the House properly. The hon. the Minister of Customs said the Report was adopted by thirteen members of the Committee, but the Chairman sat still. Why did he not rise like the hon. Minister, and frankly admit the Committee adopted that Report? What is the use of this beating about the bush? Let us see if we have men in Ottawa who swindle the people in this way and blackmail contractors, and use their position to pull down the public men of the country. Why not let the Chairman of the Committee give the facts in full to the public, instead of keeping them back to the last moment? I can tell that hon. gentleman that he has lost a good deal of that nobleness of character, and goodness of heart, which were formerly ascribed to him. I am sorry to see in this House an attempt to screen that man at the expense of the Conservative party. I say, unhesitatingly, that Mr. Mackintosh need not think that because he is editor of the *Ottawa Citizen* he is going to drag the Conservative party of this country at his feet, while he pockets \$12,000 of Roger and MacLean's money. The Conservative party of this country are not going to take on their shoulders the responsibility of an act of that kind. I, for one, will take none of the sins of Mr. Mackintosh, or any other Conservative, on my shoulders in the East Riding of Hastings, when the next Election comes round. I think we ought to give that Contract to the man that had put in the only honest tender, and I think we ought to have brought in a report giving that contract

to Patrick Boyle. He is entitled to it. It is said he has not the plant, but if he gives security he will have the plant. Unless we stamp Mackintosh out, we cannot go to the country with a clean record. I think the *Globe* and *Mail* newspapers deserve thanks for what they have done in exposing him.

MR. STEPHENSON: I am surprised at the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) taking this matter up so warmly. If that gentleman had given as much attention to his Parliamentary duties, and the working of Committees generally, as the members of the Printing Committee have done, he would be more reticent on many matters than he is. This Committee, I do not hesitate to say, has sat more times and has done more days' work this Session, than all the other Committees of the House put together. We have presented to the House no less than sixteen Reports, to say nothing of sub-Committee meetings. When, therefore, the hon. member for East Hastings gets up and talks about certain hon. members beating about the bush, I think if he looks over the evidence carefully, he will find that he has gone a little too far, and is not altogether fair. I, for one, am not so positive on all matters as some hon. gentlemen are; but when I am sure that I am right, I act upon a certain prominent person's advice, and then go ahead. When, two days ago, this matter was sprung upon me at a moment's notice, I stated, in reply to the question put to me by the hon. member for West Durham, that I could not positively answer the question that was asked, but it was my opinion that the Report of the sub-Committee had been submitted to the General Committee, and that it had been adopted. I could not state positively whether it had been adopted on a formal Resolution or not. Therefore, I hesitated in giving a decided answer, and sent a page to the Clerk's office to get the Minute-book. The debate, meantime, proceeded, and was concluded before I had time to get the information I sought for, and which was contained in the Minute-book; and, moreover, I wish the hon. member for East Hastings to understand, once for all, that I am not a person to beat about the bush in this or in any other matter. I have a reputation in this House and

country of far longer date than the hon. gentleman has, and I have never yet been accused of beating about the bush, or of shirking any responsibility that rightfully belongs to me. The Committee discussed this matter with reference to Mr. Boyle, and the other parties who tendered for the contract, and in connection with the Report of the sub-Committee, I will recite the following Resolution, as it appears on the Minute-book:—

“Moved by Mr. Ross, and seconded by Mr. Macfarlane, that the Report, as read by the sub-Committee, be adopted.”

The following amendment was also moved to the main motion:—

“That Patrick Boyle having withdrawn his tender, and as we find no evidence of anything improper on his part, the Committee think him entitled to the contract, if he is prepared to enter into it.”

This amendment was voted down, and the original motion was carried by a vote of 14 to 3; and now, if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Essex be put to the House and carried, it will place this House in conflict with the Senate, who have adopted, without opposition, the Report which is now in the hands of the Speaker. We have, therefore, got to adopt this Report as it is, and without amendment, during this Session, or else all our action will be null and void. I think the amendment is ill-timed, and will result in no good to the party whom it is designed to benefit.

MR. WHITE: I do not wish the hon. gentleman to think that I am all alone in this opinion of him. A great deal of fault has been found with him by different members, who have not independence enough to come forward and say so. I certainly wish the hon. gentleman well, occupying the position he does, next to that of a member of the Cabinet; I think he ought to have a portfolio in the next Ministry. I do not want to hurt him; I would rather stand up in defence of his character. I want him to hold an independent position in this House. I would not say a word against him to injure his feelings. The hon. gentleman says, no other Committee of Parliament has done so much work; I may make this remark—perhaps it is not parliamentary—that a cow is a very poor cow that gives a large pail full of milk and then kicks it over. All the work of the Com-

mittee amounts to nothing at this moment. It leaves the parties who have got the contract in the same position for twelve months longer.

MR. TROW : I consider the remarks of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) are unguarded and uncalled for, with reference to the conduct of the Chairman of the Printing Committee (Mr. Stephenson). I regret that an error did creep into our proceedings through the inadvertence of the Chairman. At all events, the sub-Committee's Report, with the Resolution of the Committee, should have been brought before this House, and then all the proceedings would have been proper. But a mistake crept in, and it was our duty to-day to rectify that mistake. I am satisfied it was the unanimous desire and expressed opinion of the Committee that the Contract should be cancelled. I take credit to myself that I was the first who proposed to the Committee to cancel the Contract. I considered those who tendered were all equally guilty, and the proper proceeding was to have advertised for tenders at the close of the work for this Session. The Committee thought that, until the proceedings of this Session were printed and placed before the country, it would be out of place to cancel the Contract, and could not be entertained and carried out without the country suffering loss.

MR. BANNERMAN : As a member of the Committee, and one of those who voted in the minority, I feel that, before this matter is settled, I should give expression to my views upon this subject. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) says they were all equally guilty. Now, no member of that Committee can show that they were all equally guilty. Any one who looks into the matter will see that Mr. Charlton's evidence before the Committee, and that given before the Court in Toronto, do not agree. Mr. Charlton stated before the Committee that he understood Mr. Cotton was acting as agent for Boyle, while in his evidence at Toronto he distinctly stated the contrary. Moreover, the only evidence that went to show that Boyle was willing to come to an agreement with MacLean, Roger and Company, was, that he was prepared, if he received the contract, to enter into partnership with them at his prices, they receiving two-thirds and he one-third.

Mr. Starrs' evidence also shows that Boyle would not entertain any other proposition except to enter into partnership at the prices specified in his tender. Mr. Boyle says himself, in his evidence, that when he delivered his letter of withdrawal to Cotton, there were no conditions whatever accompanying it. The evidence also goes to show that Boyle did not give this letter of withdrawal to Cotton until two days after the Committee had awarded the Contract to Mackintosh. The hon. member for Perth says the Committee would be going beyond their power in recommending that contract to be awarded to Boyle. I think it was the duty of the Committee to make whatever recommendation they thought best, leaving the House to adopt it or not. It was the right and duty of the Committee to sift the matter, and if they found an honest tenderer in the whole crowd to award the contract to him.

MR. TROW : The hon. gentleman states that Charlton exonerated Boyle before the Court of Queen's Bench, in Toronto. I think quite the reverse; and for the information of the House will read the evidence on that point. The question was put to Mr. Charlton :

"Can you remember anything more that was said ?

"Answer. When Mr. Boyle was going away, he said he would leave the matter in Mr. Cotton's hands, or, I think, in Mr. Cotton's hands and your hands."

Evidently, Mr. Boyle left the matter entirely in their hands for them to decide. They received the money for him, consequently he is responsible for their acts. They received \$3,000 in notes and cash. Roger and MacLean both swear before the Committee that they paid the money expressly for Boyle; whether he received it or not, is a matter of indifference.

MR. ROBINSON : I regret much that after all that has been said, the vote which this House is about to give, can have little or no effect. For my part, I find fault with what has been said against Mr. Boyle, because he is an esteemed and estimable citizen of Toronto, and particularly skilful in the printing business. I think he has done nothing to forfeit his position in the matter of this contract, and if the question came up in an independent way, I think his case is irresistibly strong. Some two years ago he took a

contract for the printing of the Corporation of Toronto, and he did it as well as any other contractor has been able to do it. No fault was found with him whatever. He has an excellent plant, and is a very industrious, capable man of business. I am very sorry he did not succeed in obtaining the contract, which, in my opinion, he tendered for in good faith.

MR. ORTON: Not a tittle of evidence has been adduced to implicate Mr. Boyle. A letter was obtained from Mr. Boyle, and sold to McLean, Roger and Company for \$3,000, of which Mr. Boyle did not receive one cent. It is, therefore, nothing but right, in the interest of public morality, that the tender of Mr. Boyle should be accepted. I regret that the matter has been brought before the House in this irregular way, but I desire to express my views before any further step is taken.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex): I think the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) has taken advantage of this debate to assail the character of an honest man, and to make statements on the floor of this House which he dare not make outside. There is not one word of evidence that implicates Mr. Boyle. If this Report is adopted, the Contract is cancelled, and it will be for the Government to let the Contract for the printing for the time being. I do not think any injury can be done by carrying the amendment, but that it will complete an act of justice commenced by the Committee, and I think it is due to the only man who came out of this unsavory matter with clean hands. The hon. member for South Perth has also assailed Mr. Boyle, while the facts of the case do not warrant it. I consider it my duty to press the amendment before the House.

MR. TROW: The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has entirely misconstrued my observations. I have not said a word against Mr. Boyle, as a contractor; I merely said his agents had implicated him. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto, I know nothing whatever about the circumstances of Mr. Boyle, but I am informed that he was not prepared to take the contract for the printing for the Local Legislature some three months before this contract was let for the Dominion printing. I also know that he had to get a cheque for

\$500 from Mr. Starrs, in order to enable him to tender for the work in question.

MR. ORTON: If the previous remarks of the last speaker meant anything, they were a special effort in favour of McLean, Roger and Company, and a special effort against Mr. Boyle, the only honourable man connected with this scandal.

MR. TROW: If the hon. gentleman will examine the reports in the local press in reference to the evidence taken before the Printing Committee, he will find that I was the first to impress upon the Committee the absolute necessity of cancelling the Contract of Roger and MacLean, consequently I could not have been advocating their claim.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am glad to learn from the remarks made by the hon. member for South Perth that he was the first man to move the cancellation of that Contract, but I think he ought to explain how it was that this morning he took quite a different course.

MR. TROW: Not at all.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In regard to the matter before the House we are unfortunately in a difficulty, and we must try to get out of it. The Report was discussed the day before yesterday, which provided, merely by mistake, that the Contract should be cancelled. The Upper House has adopted that Report; therefore, so far as the Senate is concerned, they have cancelled that Contract. It is not at all likely that the Joint Committee can make another Report this Session. If we concur in the Report, then, so far as we are concerned, the Contract is cancelled. I am quite in favour of its being wiped out. I think the conclusion of the Committee is a right one. The amendment, however, goes a step further. The Government has no control, as a Government, over the printing, which pertains to the Joint Committee of both Houses. Therefore, that portion of the amendment must fall. Then, as to giving the contract to Mr. Boyle, the carrying of that portion of the amendment would have no value unless the Upper House passed a motion to the same effect. It seems to me that the only course for the hon. gentleman to take is to withdraw his amendment. He has stated his case, and evolved the opinion of the House, to a certain extent, with regard to the case of Mr. Boyle, and I think he ought to leave

it there. By concurrence in the report the contract of MacLean, Roger and Company is cancelled, and there is an end to it.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) : In deference to the opinion expressed by the hon. leader of the Government, although I am personally dissatisfied with the delay of the matter by the Committee, and although I am satisfied justice has not been done in the premises, I beg to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, with leave of the House, *withdrawn*.

MR. STEPHENSON : In reference to the remarks made in relation to the delay of this matter, on the part of the Committee, I have to say that the Committee has held sixteen meetings. The first was held on the 21st of February and the last to-day. So, I think, that no other Committee could act more fairly.

MR. ALLISON : It appears to me that the country will be dissatisfied if something is not done. If there is anything in which absolute faith should be kept, it is the question of Government contracts.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : This is not a Government contract.

MR. ALLISON : I very gladly accept the hon. the First Minister's correction. Then, I say, that in a question with reference to all public contracts of this character, not only with regard to individual tenderers, but with respect to the general public, it is important that absolute faith should be kept. It is well that this subject has been prominently brought forward by the Press. There is no doubt that, for years, all matters of Government contracts have been made too much a matter of speculation. I have no doubt of it in my own mind. For myself, I can see no ground of complaint against a contractor, who has obtained a contract in the usual way, by the acceptance of the lowest secured tender, if he chooses to sell it out to any other contractor, provided the Government receive the same security for the performance of the contract ; but whenever such dealings has a tendency to lead to the rejection of a lower and the acceptance of a higher tender, then such speculation should not be allowed. It appears to me that the matter would be very largely remedied by this simple means : as soon as the contractor, who makes the

lowest tender, fails to pay his deposit or give security, let the Government readvertise it, and after a general notice relet the work. This would have a tendency to check the system which seems to have prevailed for years.

MR. MACDONELL (North Lanark) : I concur in the remarks of the hon. members for East Hastings (Mr. White) and Victoria, N. B., (Mr. Costigan), and I regret that the amendment, proposed by the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Patterson), was ruled to be not in order. I must also express my disagreement with the remarks of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), in reference to Mr. Boyle. In glancing over the evidence, I came to the conclusion that, Mr. Boyle, personally, had no knowledge of the corrupt practices that have prevailed, no matter what his agents may have done or how he may have been deceived by them. His hands were clean, and I believe that those who know him personally, and are acquainted with his transactions, would not, for one moment, claim him to be capable of anything dishonourable in any way. When we find the Printing Committee bringing in a Report at so late a date, when it must have been known that this question has occupied public attention so long, we should pause before we shut off discussion ; there ought to be a thorough investigation. As a humble member of this House I do very much regret that the Printing Committee, no matter for what reason, delayed bringing down their Report till this late period of the Session. It will be a greater injustice to the country if discussion is shut off now, with so few members here, than if it were left over to the next Session. It may be an injustice to give the contract to MacLean, Roger and Company till next Session, but it may be a greater injustice to shut our mouths, than to leave it over till next Session. I, therefore, ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the proper notice of the adoption of this Report has or has not been given ; I ask your ruling, so that if you rule that it has not, the members of this House will have plenty of time till next Session to consider the question, and be then able to discuss it in a proper manner.

MR. SPEAKER : When the question was under discussion, the other day, no notice had been given. Notice has

now been given. I have already ruled that the adoption of the Report is in order.

MR. DOMVILLE: In reply to the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Macdonnell), I would point out to him that there could not be much discussion; there are only four or five members on that side of the House.

MR. MACDONELL (North Lanark): The Report should have been brought down sooner.

MR. DOMVILLE: I think it has been shown that it could not, and that my hon. friend has nothing to complain of on that score. As regards corruption, my hon. friend ought to take that word back. He has endeavoured to make the country believe that we are making additional taxation, which is not the fact, for this Contract has been given out at a lesser rate than before. I doubt if any firm would take it at a less price. Many may have been struggling to get the work, and some may be disappointed. Any private bargain made between two people, however questionable a construction we may put upon it, is really of no consequence, if we bear this in mind—as we most certainly do—the country does not lose money by it. It was a private arrangement. One of the parties said: "There is so much money in it." I am not going to justify the transaction at all, but I want to do away with the idea that there was corruption, or that the Government or the country lost anything by it.

MR. HESSON: The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Macdonnell) tried to leave the impression that the hon. members on this side of the House, or hon. members of the Committee, were attempting to put down discussion on this question.

MR. MACDONELL (North Lanark): No; I charged the Committee as a Whole, and my grounds were the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria, N. B., and the hon. member for East Hastings.

MR. HESSON: He must remember that the hon. the leader of the Opposition raised an objection the other day, and had the discussion thrown over when there were more members in the House to carry on the discussion, and the onus of shutting off discussion and throwing it over to a time when there are so few members in the House, must be thrown

upon the hon. the leader of the Opposition clearly.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): One word to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville). If there was nothing wrong about the Contract, why was it cancelled after an investigation into the circumstances? Does he think that the people of this country do not see through this matter? If MacLean and Roger can give a large sum to one man and another large sum to another, the people must pay for it at last. The other House has adopted this Report, and we must adopt it; but what course will be pursued?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to ask that question. I can only say that I do not know. The Government have nothing to do with making the Contract. The Contract must be cancelled by the Joint Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses before the desirable result of advertising it for tenders, and letting it to the lowest, can be attained. The censure upon the Committee is altogether unfounded; they have other duties besides this one Contract to attend to. The whole of the printing of the House—comprising some fourteen or fifteen Reports—is under their care; and it is in the discretion of the joint body to say when and how they are to report. The Chairman, who is only the mouthpiece of the Joint Committee, is in no way open to the attacks made upon him. I may say to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), who has taken a very strong, and I do not say improper stand in behalf of Mr. Boyle, that if the Report had been duly presented, and the Report of the sub-Committee incorporated in it on Wednesday, it would have been adopted, and Mr. Boyle would have been cut off. I do not think that I am uncharitable in saying that the objection taken by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) was taken to throw over the Report.

MR. DOMVILLE: I did not, as the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) seems to think, endorse the statement that there was corruption. I do not endorse the transaction at all. I merely say that the country loses nothing by it.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings): Mr. Boyle is not my friend at all; and the

only ones to whom I am a friend are the honest contractors. I am in favour of honest contractors: nothing beyond that.

MR. BOULTBEE: It seems to me that the whole conduct of this transaction has been unfortunate in some shape. The net result of the whole matter seems to have been to place the contract in the hands of men who obtained it corruptly, and who ought to have been deprived of it. The result seems to be a miscarriage of justice in preventing this man Boyle, who appears the only honest tenderer, from obtaining the Contract, and this unfortunate result seems to have been brought about by two causes, namely, the delay of the Committee, and the prevention, the other day, of the matter being gone through in consequence of the objection raised by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake).

Motion agreed to and Report concurred in.

RELIEF OF THE DISTRESS IN IRELAND.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

MR. SPEAKER read the Message, and it is as follows:—

“LORNE.

“The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a Despatch from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, conveying the thanks of Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of Canada, for the grant of \$100,000 in aid of the great distress in Ireland, and enclosing copies of a correspondence which has passed relative to the application of the Fund.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“OTTAWA, 7th May, 1880.”

ONTARIO AND QUÉBEC SAVINGS BANKS BILL.—[BILL 127.]

(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported, read the third time and passed.

CERTAIN MEMBERS' INDEMNITY.

Resolved, That the Accountant of the House be authorised to pay to C. J. Coursol, Esquire, Member for Montreal East; J. B. Mongenais, Esquire, Member for Vaudreuil; and M. P. Ryan, Esquire, Member for Montreal Centre, the full amount of their indemnity, as if they had been present in this House on the 12th of February, last, in consequence of the severe ill-

ness which prevented these members from attending to their parliamentary duties.—(Mr. Caron.)

CLOSE OF THE SESSION.

REMARKS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It was understood, at our adjournment on Wednesday, that no new measures of legislation should be undertaken to-day, and, indeed, it would be unfair and improper, in consequence of the thin state of the House, and the fact that the leader of the Opposition went away on that assurance from myself. I hope that arrangement will be considered obligatory on the House. Without moving any formal adjournment, I think it should be understood that the Speaker may leave the Chair, and resume it for the purpose of receiving Messages from the other Chamber and for no other purpose.

MR. TROW: I notice in the *Court Journal* of April 17th, that Captain E. Palliser has been appointed Military Attaché to Sir A. T. Galt. The brother of that gentleman has made himself familiar in this country by his construction of materials of warfare, and I would like the hon. the First Minister to inform us whether Captain Palliser has been given that position for any particular purpose.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think that question requires notice. If the hon. gentleman will give two days' notice, I will answer it.

MR. PLUMB: As the time draws near when we shall be compelled to part, I may be permitted to congratulate my hon. friend of the Opposition the member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), for the masterly way in which he has discharged his duties in this House since all his friends on that side have deserted him and gone home. It is fortunate for my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, that there was no division to-day in the ranks of his party, because it would have been exceedingly difficult for him to have divided himself. But I see the hon. gentleman for North Bruce (Mr. Gillies) is also in his seat, and if there had been a division to-day the Opposition could have cast two votes, which, no doubt, would have been quite as effective as any other vote cast by the Opposition during the Session. I am glad to see in his place—and indeed a little in advance of his place the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr.

Wright) who holds regal sway in his district as the "King of the Gatineau." That hon. gentleman has the largest constituency, the largest majority and the largest heart of any member of this House. I trust we may all meet again next Session in the enjoyment of health, and with our strength undiminished.

MR. TROW: My extreme modesty will not permit me to accept the flattery that has been heaped upon me by the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). If the Opposition are few in number they are strong in weight and backbone. I must say my following to-day has not been as encouraging as I anticipated. One of my hon. friends went off at a tangent and the other left for the smoking room.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Is the hon. gentleman going to say the Opposition ends in smoke?

MR. TROW: At all events we are here on duty. For myself I never lost a day in Parliament, and I am determined, when I occupy that honourable position to do my duty to the best of my ability. I can say that the Opposition have done their duty during the Session, and have assisted materially in maturing and perfecting the laws this Parliament has passed.

MR. WRIGHT: It is exceedingly gratifying to all of us to notice that the pleasing murmur from Niagara has not entirely ceased, nor that voice become silent. I think we can congratulate the House and the country upon having passed a useful and pleasant Session. I think, notably, our congratulations are due to yourself, Mr. Speaker, for the excellent manner in which you have conducted yourself in the Chair. I am sure that both sides of this House will bear witness to the kindness, the urbanity and the wisdom with which you have performed the duties appertaining to your distinguished position. We have enjoyed very pleasant relations and intercourse with the gentlemen who represent both the great political parties in this country. During the Session we have had many pleasing incidents, and also some painful ones, but in both cases, I think, the House has shown that it always does rise above mere party feeling, and elevate itself into that higher latitude where our common humanity alone bears

MR. PLUMB.

sway. I have again to thank this House, and the members individually, for their sympathy and great generosity in the sad calamity which a few days ago overtook the city of Hull. I may state, for the information of the House that the evil effects of that calamity have been repaired so far as that was possible, and that an active and energetic people have devoted themselves to relieving the distressed in such a way that I believe the object in view will be attained.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor-General, by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

"MR. SPEAKER,

"His Excellency the Governor-General desires the immediate presence of this House in the Senate Chamber."

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate.

In the Senate Chamber.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act to amend the Act intituled an Act respecting offences against the person, and to repeal the Act intituled an Act to provide that persons charged with common assault shall be competent as witnesses.

An Act respecting the Credit Valley Railway Company.

An Act to extend the powers of the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway Company, and to further amend the Act incorporating the said Company.

An Act respecting the Ontario Reformatory for Boys.

An Act to repeal the Act extending the Dominion Lands Acts to British Columbia, and to make other provision with respect to certain Public Lands in that Province.

An Act for the relief of Permanent Building Societies and Loan Companies.

An Act to provide for the winding up of La Banque Ville Marie.

An Act to incorporate the Great North-Western Telegraph Company of Canada.

An Act to authorise the corporation of the town of Emerson to construct a Free Passenger and Traffic Bridge over the Red River, in the Province of Manitoba.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Montreal Telegraph Company.

An Act to incorporate the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.

An Act for the appointment of a Resident Representative Agent for Canada in the United Kingdom.

An Act to amend the Act 42 Vic., cap. 15, intituled an Act to alter the Duties of Customs and Excise.

An Act for extending the Consolidated Act of 1879, respecting duties imposed on promissory notes and bills of exchange to the whole Dominion.

An Act to enable the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to pay a life annuity to the widow of the late Hon. John Young.

An Act to authorise the raising of a further sum to enable the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to complete their Tidal Dock.

An Act to repeal the Act 42 Vic., cap. 5, for granting an annual subsidy towards certain telegraphic communication.

An Act further to amend an Act respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia.

An Act respecting the Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders in Prince Edward Island.

An Act respecting the Industrial Refuge for Girls of Ontario.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the the Canada Central Railway Company.

An Act to authorise and provide for the winding up of the Consolidated Bank of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Assiniboine Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company.

An Act to amend and consolidate the several Acts relating to the North-West Territories.

An Act respecting the administration of criminal justice in the territory in dispute between the Governments of the Province of Ontario and of the Dominion of Canada.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting Dominion Notes.

An Act to authorise making certain investigations under oath.

An Act to amend the law of evidence in Criminal Cases, as respects the taking and use of depositions of persons who may be unable to attend at the trial.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Cruelty to Animals.

An Act to incorporate the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company.

An Act to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874, and the Act amending it.

An Act to amend the law respecting the removal of obstructions in navigable waters, by wrecks.

An Act respecting the Montreal Assurance Company.

An Act further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act.

An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway and Steamship Company.

An Act to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1879.

An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Inland Revenue.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Inspection of Petroleum.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act to make better provision respecting the navigation of Canadian waters.

An Act to confirm a certain Order of the Governor in Council, respecting the Graving Dock at Esquimalt.

An Act to ratify and confirm a certain agree-

ment therein mentioned, between the Government of Canada and the Canada Central Railway Company.

An Act to amend an Act relating to Banks and Banking, and to continue for a limited time the charters of certain Banks to which the said Act applies.

An Act relating to interest on moneys secured by mortgage of real estate.

An Act respecting certain Savings' Banks in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

An Act to amend and consolidate the laws respecting Indians.

The SPEAKER of the House of Commons then addressed His Excellency the Governor-General as follows:—

"May it please your Excellency:

"The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

"In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency a Bill intituled an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1880, and the 30th June, 1881, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service, to which I humbly request Your Excellency's assent."

To this Bill the Royal Assent was signified in the following words:—

"In Her Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor-General thanks Her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill."

His Excellency the Governor-General was then pleased to close the Second Session of the Fourth Parliament of the Dominion with the following Speech:—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In relieving you from your attendance in Parliament, I desire to offer my thanks for the care and assiduity with which you have applied yourselves to the performance of your important duties.

The evidences of a recovery from the long continued state of depression, to which I alluded at the opening of the Session, are, I am glad to believe, steadily accumulating, and we may, I trust, look forward with some confidence to a prosperous year.

The measures relating to Banking and the Currency and to the amendment of the Tariff, with the other laws passed this Session, will, I hope, aid in the promotion of the anticipated prosperity.

The expectations of a large immigration of valuable settlers into the North-West, in which I then ventured to indulge, appear from the latest information to be fully realised.

The laws for the better organisation of the North-West Territories, for the amendment of the Dominion Lands Act, and for the more efficient management of Indian Affairs, must tend greatly to the advantage of that vast and interesting region.

The measure for the consolidation of the laws concerning the Inland Revenue, and the other important Acts relating to the public interests, seem well adapted to promote those interests.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I thank you in Her Majesty's name for the Supplies you have so liberally voted.

I trust that the vigorous efforts made to settle the Indian bands of the North-West, on their

Reserves, will diminish, in the future, the calls made on the public Treasury for aid to save them from starvation.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

The appropriations made will enable my Government steadily to prosecute the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to hasten the completion of our Canal system.

In bidding you farewell, I desire to express my earnest desire for your happiness and prosperity in your several homes.

The Parliament of the Dominion of Canada was then prorogued to Wednesday, the 16th June next.



INDEX.

SESSION 1880.

1. In the *general* sections of the Index, the *names* in italics and parenthesis, after the subject, are those of the *movers*.

2. In the *personal* sections, the *Motions, Bills, etc.*, in italics and parenthesis, are those which emanate from the member under whose name they occur.

3. Words commencing with "Mc" or "Mac" are indexed after the other words commencing with "M." Also, "St." is indexed after "S."

4. The following subjects are indexed under General Headings:—BILLS; COMMITTEES; DIVISIONS; HOUSE OF COMMONS; INDIANS; MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY; ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE; RAILWAYS. Subjects relating to any Province, *as a whole*, are indexed under the name of that Province.

5. Abbreviations:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three months' hoist, Six months' hoist, Six weeks' hoist; *, without remark or debate; Ad., Address; Adj., Adjourned, Adjournment; amd., Amended; Amt., Amendment; Ans., Answer; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Co., Company; Com., Committee; Com. of Wh., Committee of the Whole House; Cor., Correspondence; Ct., Court; Deb., Debate; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; H. E., His Excellency the Governor-General; H. of Com., House of Commons; I. C. R., Intercolonial Railway; Incorp., Incorporation; Lt.-Gov., Lieutenant-Governor; M., Motion; m., moved; Man., Manitoba; Mar., Maritime; Mess., Message; N. B., New Brunswick; N. S., Nova Scotia; N. W. T., North-West Territories; O. C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; Parly., Parliamentary; P. E. I., Prince Edward Island; Pet., Petition; P. O., Post Office; prop., proposed; Prov., Province or Provincial; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Rep., Report; rep., reported; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Riv., River; Ry., Railway; Sen., Senate; wdn., withdrawn; Y., N., Yeas, Nays.

Abbott, Mr.

Introduction of, 45.

ABBOTT, Mr.

Marriage with a deceased wife's sister legislation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on M. for 2°, 298.

Insolvent Cos. winding-up (B. 97, 1° and 2°*) 1223.

Insolvent Traders' Assets Distribution (B. 101, 1°*) 1326.

Bank Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir S. L. Tilley) in Com., 1981.

Accident to Vice-Regal Party. See "Governor-General."

Address in Answer to His Excellency's Speech.

M. (*Mr. Richey*) 4; sec. (*Mr. Houde*) 9; agreed to, 43; H. E.'s reply, 113.

Adjournment for Ascension Day.

Res. (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 2015.

Adjournment for Easter.

Res. (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) 781.

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*).

1°, 2.

Agricultural Fertilizers Fraudulent Sale Prevention B. No. 82 (*Mr. Landry*).

1°, 802.

Alberton, P.E.I., Sub-Collectorship of Customs.

Remarks (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I., and Mr. Yeo*) 330.

Explanation (*Mr. Yeo*) 782.

Allard, Omer, dismissal of.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 508.

ALLISON, Mr.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 318.

Stratford Post-office, 369.

Supply—Rys. (Windsor B. Ry.) 1907.

Parly. Printing contract, on M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2021.

American Cattle, restrictions on importation of.

Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1040.

American Ry. Decoy Agents.

Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 786.

Anchor Marine Insurance Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 29 (*Mr. Cameron, South Huron*).

1°, 196; 2°, 236; in Com., 761; 3°, 761.

Angers, Mr.

Introduction of, 111.

ANGERS, Mr.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 218.

I.C.R. Br. at Lévis, 486.

ANGERS, Mr.—Con.

- Marriage with a deceased wife's sister legislation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Williams) 593.
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) in Com., 1879.
Supply—Ocean and River Service (Dom. Steamers) 1951.
 Wrecks Removal Law Amt. B. 107 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on Sen. Amts., 1984.
 Q. M. O. and O. Ry. B. 118 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on withdrawal of B., 1998.

ANGLIN, Mr.

- Address, on the, 36, 39.
 Coteau du Lac Ry. Bridge, on M. for Reps., 49.
 C. P. R. route *via* Peace River Valley or Pine River Pass, 53.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 1^o, 79.
 Bound, between Ont. and Can. Territories, 94.
 B. C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges, 117, 125.
 Relief of the distress in Ireland, on Res., 126; on M. for Address, 181; (*Remarks*) 745.
 Mar. Provs. Lobster Fishery, 134.
 I. C. R. Dismissals and Appointments (*M. for Ret.*) 136.
 I. C. R. employés at Moncton (*M. for Ret.*) 139.
 I. C. R. rolling-stock awaiting repair (*M. for Ret.*) 140.
 Man. and N. W. T. land sales (*M. for Ret.*) 156.
 Grain imports from U.S., 173.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 187, 194.
 Prohibition of immigrants' landing, 215.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 221; on Amt. (Mr. Blake) 287.
 The Member for Lennox (*Remarks*) 282; on Amt. (Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria) 412.
 Marriage with a deceased wife's sister legislation Bill 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on M. for 2^o; 303; on Amt. 6 w. h. (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 445; on Amt. (Mr. Mills) 590.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 314.
 Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right, 346, 347.
 Private Bills Pets., on Ms. to extend time, 415, 453.
 Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 428.
 C. P. R. location by Marcus Smith, 506.
 Printing of a Parly. paper (*Remarks*) 569.
 Fish Inspection, on Res. in Com., (Mr. Baby) 657, 660.
 Northern Ry. Co. Act Interpretation B. 76 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2^o, 761.
 Riv. du Loup Br. Purchase Confirmation B. 81 (Sir C. Tupper) on M. for 1^o, 782.
 Mar. Prov. claims on Fishery Award, 798, 1223.
 Immigration pamphlets, 811, 814.
 I. C. R., supply of nut locks, (*M. for Ret.*) 942.
 I. C. R., carriage of sugar from Halifax (*M. for Ret.*) 944.
 Shippegan Gully Channel (*M. for papers*) 945.
 Grand Anse Breakwater (*M. for papers*) 947.
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on reception of Rep. of Com., 988.
Supply—Penitentiaries (Kingston) 1013, (Dorchester) 1020; Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1030; Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1335, 1882, (Quaran-

ANGLIN, Mr.—Con.

- time) 1949; Rys. (C.P.R.) 1673; Ocean and Riv. Service (Dom Steamers) 1675, 1951; Indians (N.B.) 1690; Rys. (I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry.) 1712, (Windsor Br. Ry.) 1906; Canals, 1808; Indians, (Man. and N. W. T.) 1811; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Rys. and Canals) 1841; Miscellaneous, (Relief of distress in Ireland) 1886; Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Quebec Exhibition) 1947; Public Buildings (Man. Lt.-Gov's residence) 1950; Harbours and Rivs. (N.B.) 1951.
 Can. Public Lands, on Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1060.
 I. C. R., purchase of lumber for, 1227.
Ways and Means—On M. to recommit Res., 1262, 1284; on M. to concur in Res. (Books) 1327.
 C. P. R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1580.
 Chinese Immigration, on M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. DeCosmos) 1640.
 Dom. Notes Act Amt., in Com. on Res., 1747.
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 1^o, 1773; in Com., 1879.
 Civil Service Expenditure, on Res. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1829.
 Tarif B. 102 (Sir S. L. Tilley) on M. for 3^o, 1853.
 Pictou Harbour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 3^o, 1854.
 Can. Resident Agent in United Kingdom B. 88 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2^o, 1862.
Concurrence—Dom. lands chargeable to capital, 1892; Militia (conversion of ordnance), 1894; Rys. (I.C.R.) 1895, (C.P.R.) 1896.
 Mr. Cameron's vote on concurrence, 1902.
 Investigations under Oath B. 113 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2^o, 1935.
 Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Ross, W. Middlesex) 1972.
 C. P. R. land regulations, on Res. (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 1999.
 Preservation of order in the House, on M. for 2^o Supply B., 2015.

Appointments and Dismissals since Feb. 1879.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 178.

Argenteuil Election.

Judge's Rep., 1; announcement of certificate of return, 45; Member introduced, 45; Res. introduction on certificate of Returning Officer not to form precedent, 45.

ARKELL, Mr.

- Stratford Post-office, 366.
 Port Stanley Lighthouse (*Que.*) 380.
Ways and Means—On M. to receive Rep. of Com., 723.
 Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^o, 899.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^o, 971.
Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1354.

Armstrong, Toronto Leather Inspector, charges against.

M. for papers (*Mr. Robinson*) 594.

Ascension Day, adjournment for.

Res. (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 2015.

Atlantic Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Albany, N. Y.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 821.

Audit of Parliamentary Expenditure.

Res. (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 594.

BABY, Mr.

Inland Revenue Rep. (presented) 44.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation (B. 7, 1st) 56; on M. for 2^o, 989, 995, 1002.

Coal oil tests, on M. for Reps., 135.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors' Superannation Money Refund (Ans.) 155.

Inspection of smoked herring (Ans.) 306.

N. S. Weights and Meas. Inspectors (Ans.) 306.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 313, 320; on M. for Rep. (Mr. Casey) 807.

Fish Inspection (Res. in Com.) 657, 659, 660, 661.

Canadian tobacco cultivation, pamphlets on, (Ans.) 785.

General Inspection Acts Amt. (Res. in Com.) 933, (B. 84, 1st) 934.

Supply—Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1036, (Library) 1037; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Inland Revenue) 1838; Collection of Revenues (Excise) 1848, (Weights and Meas. and Gas) 1848; Miscellaneous (Mr. Miall's services and Judge Armour's services) 1885, (Todd's "Parly. Govt.") 1954.

Cross Point Ferry, N.B. (Ans.) 1628.

Promissory Notes Duties Act Extension (B. 108, 1st) 1659; on M. for 2^o, 1856.

Concurrence—Collection of slide and boom dues, 1890; Weights and Meas., 1891.

Petroleum Inspection Act. Amt. (Res. in Com.) 1917, (B. 123, 1st) 1923; on M. for 2^o, 1973.

Baie des Chaleurs, Surveys for piers in.

M. for Rep. (Mr. Beuchesne) 508.

Baie St. Paul Pier, Surveys for.

M. for Rep. (Mr. Perrault) 508.

Baie St. Paul Wharf.

Ques. (Mr. Perrault) 787.

BAIN, Mr.

Prohibition of immigrants' landing. 204.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 808.

Immigration pamphlets, 815.

BAKER, Mr.

Philipsburg Breakwater (Ques.) 380.

Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on M. for 2^o (Amt. 6 m. h.) 419.

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Sir S. L. Tilley).

Res. in Com., 1752; 1st, 1772; 2^o, 1979; in Com., 1981, 1985; 3^o, 1987.

Bank Act, security in, use of guaranteed bonds.

Ques. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1788.

Bank deposits to credit of the Dominion.

M. for Ret. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 55.

Banking and Currency.

Ques. (Mr. Mackenzie) and Remarks, 282.

Bank Inspection by Govt. officers.

Res. withdrawn (Mr. Orton) 803.

BANNERMAN, Mr.

Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railroad and Steamship Co. (B. 46, 1st) 305.

Rapid City and Souris Riv. Colonisation Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 69, 1st) 568.

Immigration pamphlets, 814.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^o, 976.

Printing Com's. Rep. (Remarks) 1982.

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 3^o, 1983.

C. P. R. Land Regulations, in Com. on Res. (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 2001.

Parly. Printing Contract, on Amt. (Mr. Paterson, Essex) to M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2019.

Baptist Union of Can. Incorp. B. No. 27 (Mr. Mackenzie).

1st, 180; 2nd, 218; in Com., 484; 3rd, 484.

Barnard, Mr.

Return of, 2.

Introduction of, 2.

BARNARD, Mr.

Address, on the, 40.

B. C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges B. 44 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 1st, 279.

Mail Contract between Victoria, B.C., and S. Francisco, on Res. (Mr. Bunster) 498.

C.P.R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1616.

Indian Lands in B.C. (M. for Ret.) 1633, 1636.

Battleford, N.W.T., Brewery at.

M. for Cor. (Mr. Fiset) 496.

Bay Fortune Breakwater, P.E.I.

Ques. (Mr. Muttart) 234.

Beauchesne, Mr.

Return of, 2.

Introduction of, 2.

BEAUCHESNE, Mr.

Bonaventure County, Surveys for Piers in (M. for Rep.) 508.

Baie des Chaleurs, Surveys for Piers in (M. for Rep.) 508.

St. Charles de Caplan P.O. (M. for Pet.) 1398.

Quinn's Ferry License (M. for Cor.) 1398.

Bonaventure Breakwater (M. for Rep.) 1399.

Beauharnois Canal.

Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 155.

Beauharnois Canal Paymaster, appointment of.

M. for papers (Mr. Bergeron) 950.

Beaver and Toronto Mutual Fire Insurance Co. Act Amt. B. No. 55 (Mr. McCarthy).

1st, 416; 2nd, 472; B. wdn., 1886.

BÉCHARD, Mr.

Insolvency Acts Repeal (B. 3, 1st) 44; Ques. of Privilege, 76.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^o, 104.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Blake) 266.

BÉCHARD, Mr.—Con.

Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction (B. 56, 1^o) 416; on M. for 2^o, 893, 902.

Sudden death of Mr. Holton (*Remarks*) 652.
Tariff B. 102 (Sir S. L. Tilley) in Com., 1852.

Bellechasse Returning Officers, Expenses claimed.

M. for statement (*Mr. Landry*) 1398.

Belle Creek, P. E. I.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Brecken*) 508.

Ques. (*Mr. Brecken*) 785.

Bell Telephone Co. Incomp. B. No. 17
(*Mr. Kilvert*).

1^o, 151; 2^o, 218; in Com., 624; 3^o, 761.

BERGEBON, Mr.

Beauharnois Canal (*Ques.*) 155.

Caughnawaga Ferry-boat, pier or dam at Lachine (*Ques.*) 785.

Beauharnois Canal Paymaster, T. Brossoit (*M. for papers*) 950.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 7 (*Mr. Baby*) on M. for 2^o, 994.

Bergin, Mr.

Return of, 2.

Introduction of, 2.

BERGIN, Mr.

Factory Employment of Women and Children (B. 10, 1^o) 79.

Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 493.

Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (*Mr. Béchard*) on M. for 2^o, 900.

Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Division Cts. (*M. for Ret.*) 1637.

Supply—Canals, 1788.

Bills assented to. See "Royal Assent."

Bills, Public, Notices for. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE, AND PROCEDURE."

BILLS.

Bill (No. 1) *Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.*—(*Sir John A. Macdonald.*) 1^o, 2.

Bill (No. 2) *To repeal the Acts respecting Insolvency now in force in Canada.*—(*Mr. Colby.*)

1^o, 44; 2^o, 102; in Com., 195, 218; rep., 227, 284; in Com., 286; rep., 286; Amt. m. (*Mr. Blake*) 286; Amt. wdn., 288; M. to concur in Amts., 351; Amt. m. (*Mr. Blake*) 351; Amt. wdn., 352; in Com., 352; rep., 352; 3^o, 417.

Bill (No. 3) *To repeal the Acts respecting Insolvency now in force in the Dominion.*—(*Mr. Béchard.*)

1^o, 44.

Bill (No. 4) *To amend the Law regulating the inspection of Petroleum and the products thereof.*—(*Mr. Colby.*)

1^o, 44; 2^o prop. 1645.

Bill (No. 5) *To legalise the marriage with the sister of a deceased wife.*—(*Mr. Girouard Jacques Cartier.*)

1^o, 44; B. wdn., 196.

Bill (No. 6) *To amend the Act respecting the election of Members of the House of Commons.*—(*Mr. Bolduc.*)

1^o, 56; 2^o prop., 227; negatived, 232.

BILLS.—Con.

Bill (No. 7) *To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Inland Revenue.*—(*Mr. Baby.*)

1^o, 56; 2^o, 989; in Com., 1002; 3^o, 1665.

Bill (No. 8) *To amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies to construct works to facilitate the transmission of timber down rivers and streams.*—(*Mr. White, North Renfrew.*)

1^o, 59; B. wdn., 196.

Bill (No. 9) *Respecting the Boundary between the Province of Ontario and the Territories of Canada.*—(*Mr. Mills.*)

1^o, 59.

Bill (No. 10) *To regulate the employment of children, young persons, and women in the workshops and factories of the Dominion of Canada.*—(*Mr. Bergin.*)

1^o, 79.

Bill (No. 11) *To regulate the encumbering of real estate by loans of money or otherwise.*—(*Mr. Orton.*)

1^o, 79; 2^o prop., 953; 2^o, 977; in Com., 1642; Amt. m., 1643; 3^o, 1644.

Bill (No. 12) *To encourage the sale of farm produce.*—(*Mr. Vallée.*)

1^o, 79.

Bill (No. 13) *To repeal the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act and the Acts amending the same.*—(*Mr. Keeler.*)

1^o, 79; 2^o prop., 234; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Blake*) 256; Amt. carried (Y. 148, N. 29) 267.

Bill (No. 14) *To amend the Law with reference to procedure in Criminal Cases, and the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions in relation to persons charged with indictable offences.*—(*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.*)

1^o, 113; 2^o prop., 355; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 364; Deb. adj., 365.

Bill (No. 15) *To fix the rate of interest and to prohibit usury in the Province of Quebec.*—(*Mr. Méthot.*)

1^o, 114.

Bill (No. 16) *To authorise and provide for the winding-up of the Stadacona Bank.*—(*Mr. Vallée.*)

1^o, 151; 2^o, 218; in Com., 1380; 3^o, 1380.

Bill (No. 17) *To incorporate the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.*—(*Mr. Kilvert.*)

1^o, 151; 2^o, 218; in Com., 624; 3^o, 761.

Bill (No. 18) *To make provision for the winding-up of insolvent incorporated Fire or Marine Insurance Companies.*—(*Mr. Ives.*)

1^o, 151; 2^o, 890.

Bill (No. 19) *For the more effectual prevention of crime.*—(*Mr. Blake.*)

1^o, 151; 2^o prop., 417; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Baker*) 419; Amt. carried, 434.

Bill (No. 20) *For instituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.*—(*Mr. McCarthy.*)

1^o, 153.

BILLS.—*Con.*

- Bill (No. 21) *To empower the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to relinquish their charter, and to provide for the winding-up of their affairs.*—(Mr. Casgrain.)
1^o, 180; 2^o, 218; in Com., 1039; 3^o, 1039.
- Bill (No. 22) *Further to amend the Act therein cited, incorporating the Canada Guarantee Company.*—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)
1^o, 180; 2^o, 218; in Com., 584; 3^o, 584.
- Bill (No. 23) *To incorporate the French Atlantic Cable Company.*—(Mr. Cameron, North Victoria.)
1^o, 180; 2^o, 218; in Com., 584; 3^o, 584.
- Bill (No. 24) *To incorporate the Dominion Commercial Travellers' Association.*—(Mr. Gault.)
1^o, 180; 2^o, 218; in Com., 483; 3^o, 483.
- Bill (No. 25) *To authorise the establishment of Superannuation, Provident, and Insurance Funds by the Great Western Railway Company.*—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)
1^o, 180; 2^o, 218; in Com., 625; 3^o, 760.
- Bill (No. 26) *To incorporate the Emerson and Turtle Mountain Railway Company.*—(Mr. Royal.)
1^o, 180; 2^o, 218; B. wdn., 1227.
- Bill (No. 27) *To incorporate the Baptist Union of Canada.*—(Mr. Mackenzie.)
1^o, 180; 2^o, 218; in Com., 484; 3^o, 484.
- Bill (No. 28) *Further to amend an Act respecting the security to be given by officers of Canada.*—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)
1^o, 180; 2^o, 281; in Com., 352; 3^o, 352.
- Bill (No. 29) *To amend the Act intituled an Act to incorporate the Anchor Marine Insurance Company.*—(Mr. Cameron, South Huron.)
1^o, 196; 2^o, 286; in Com., 761; 3^o, 761.
- Bill (No. 30) *To legalise marriage with the sister of a deceased wife.*—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)
1^o, 196; 2^o, prop., 291; Amt. 6 w. h. (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 296; Adj. Deb., 434; Amt. negated (Y. 19, N. 140) 451; 2^o, 451; in Com., 590; Amt. (Mr. Mills) 590; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Williams) 593; Amt. to Amt. negated, 594; Amt. carried, 594; rep., 594; Amt. (Mr. Houde) carried, 952; in Com., 953; rep., 953; concurrence prop., 1381; Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Jones) 1393; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Houde) 1395; Amt. to Amt. negated (Y. 10, N. 130) 1396; Amt. negated (Y. 34, N. 108) 1396; B. concurred in, 1397; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (Mr. Charlton) negated (Y. 40, N. 102) 1397; 3^o, 1397.
- Bill (No. 31) *To incorporate the St. Clair and Lake Erie Navigation Company.*—(Mr. Stephenson.)
1^o, 233; 2^o, 286; in Com., 785; 3^o, 785.
- Bill (No. 32) *Respecting the Montreal Assurance Company.*—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)
1^o, 233; 2^o, 286; in Com., 1893; 3^o, 1893.
- Bill (No. 33) *To amend and consolidate the Act incorporating the Dominion Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of Canada.*—(Mr. McCallum.)
1^o, 233; 2^o, 286; in Com., 761; 3^o, 761.

BILLS.—*Con.*

- Bill (No. 34) *To incorporate the Farmers and Real Property Bank of Canada.*—(Mr. Cameron, North Victoria.)
1^o, 233; 2^o, 286.
- Bill (No. 35) *Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1^o, 233; 2^o, 286; in Com., 625; 3^o, 761.
- Bill (No. 36) *To authorise the Corporation of Emerson, in the Province of Manitoba, to construct a free traffic bridge across the river at Emerson.*—(Mr. Royal.)
1^o, 233; 2^o, 286; in Com., 1641; 3^o, 1641.
- Bill (No. 37) *Further to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1^o, 233; 2^o, 479; in Com., 889; 3^o, 1398.
- Bill (No. 38) *To amend the Act respecting procedure in Criminal Cases, and other matters relating to Criminal Law.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1^o, 233; 2^o, 479; in Com., 596.
- Bill (No. 39) *To incorporate the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.*—(Mr. Scriver.)
1^o, 268; 2^o, 305; B. wdn., 745.
- Bill (No. 40) *To incorporate the Mail Printing Company.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1^o, 268; 2^o, 306; in Com., 761; 3^o, 761.
- Bill (No. 41) *To amend an Act to provide that persons charged with common assault shall be competent as witnesses.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1^o, 268; 2^o, 483; in Com., 600; 3^o, 889.
- Bill (No. 42) *To regulate stockbrokers and suppress gambling in stocks.*—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)
1^o, 269; 2^o, 602.
- Bill (No. 43) *To ensure the better qualification of public servants and the greater efficiency and economy of the Public Service.*—(Mr. Casey.)
1^o, 269.
- Bill (No. 44) *To provide for the salaries of two additional Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
Res. in Com., 114; 1^o, 270; 2^o, 454; in Com., 455; 3^o prop., 933; Amt. (Mr. Blake) negated (Y. 43, N. 98) 933; 3^o, 934.
- Bill (No. 45) *To incorporate the Great Western Telegraph Company of Canada.*—(Mr. Ryan, Marquette.)
1^o, 305; 2^o, 395; in Com., 1470; 3^o, 1470.
- Bill (No. 46) *To incorporate the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railroad and Steamship Company.*—(Mr. Bannerman.)
1^o, 305; 2^o, 395; in Com., 1470; 3^o, 1470.
- Bill (No. 47) *Respecting the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.*—(Mr. Carling.)
1^o, 305; 2^o, 395; in Com., 785; 3^o, 785.
- Bill (No. 48) *To amend the Act respecting Joint Stock Companies to construct works to facilitate the transmission of timber down rivers and streams.*—(Mr. White, North Renfrew.)
1^o, 365; 2^o, 607; in Com., 607; 3^o, 607.

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 49) *To incorporate the Red River and Assiniboine Bridge Company.*—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

1^o, 379; 2^o, 472; in Com., 1641; 3^o, 1641.

Bill (No. 50) *To amend the Act to incorporate the Ontario and Pacific Junction Railway Company.*—(Mr. Williams.)

1^o, 379; 2^o, 472; in Com., 1380; 3^o, 1380.

Bill (No. 51) *To amend the Act 36 Victoria, chapter 108, intituled an Act to grant additional powers to the Quebec and Gulf Ports Steamship Company.*—(Mr. McGreevy.)

1^o, 379; 2^o, 472; in Com. 761; 3^o, 761.

Bill (No. 52) *To repeal Section 2 of a certain Act intituled an Act to amend the Maritime Jurisdiction Act, 1877.*—(Mr. Shaw.)

1^o, 379; 2^o prop., 607; Deb. adj., 608.

Bill (No. 53) *Respecting the Cr  t   Valley Railway Company.*—(Mr. Haggart.)

1^o, 416; 2^o, 584; referred back to Standing Com., 1279; in Com., 1470; 3^o, 1470.

Bill (No. 54) *To incorporate the Canadian Telegraph Company.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)

1^o, 416; 2^o, 472; referred back to Standing Com., 1683; B. wdn., 1852.

Bill (No. 55) *To amend the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 72, intituled an Act respecting the Beaver and Toronto Mutual Fire Insurance Company.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)

1^o, 416; 2^o, 472; B. wdn., 1886.

Bill (No. 56) *To reduce the salaries and allowances of certain public functionaries and officers, and the indemnity to members of the Senate and House of Commons.*—(Mr. B  chard.)

1^o, 416; 2^o prop., 893; Deb. aJj., 904.

Bill (No. 57) *To consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the North-West Territories*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

1^o, 453; 2^o, 1857; in Com., 1915; 3^o, 1915.

Bill (No. 58) *Further to amend the Immigration Act of 1869.*—(Mr. Fleming.)

1^o, 453.

Bill (No. 59) *To repeal the Act to render Members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces now included or which may hereafter be included, within the Dominion of Canada ineligible for sitting or voting in the House of Commons of Canada.*—(Mr. Ouimet.)

1^o, 453.

Bill (No. 60) *To incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.*—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

1^o, 483; 2^o, 590; in Com., 1641; 3^o, 1641.

Bill (No. 61) *To make provision for the winding-up of insolvent incorporated Banks and other Companies.*—(Mr. Ives)

1^o, 483; 2^o, 1230.

Bill (No. 62) *To amend Chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, passed in the 41st year of the Reign of Her Majesty, intituled an Act to provide that persons charged with common assault shall be competent as witnesses.*—(Mr. Ives.)

1^o, 483.

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 63) *To extend the powers of the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway Company, and to further amend the Act incorporating the said Company.*—(Mr. Schultz.)

1^o, 509; 2^o, 590; in Com., 1699; 3^o, 1699.

Bill (No. 64) *To authorise and provide for the winding-up of the Consolidated Bank of Canada.*—(Mr. Gault.)

1^o, 509; 2^o, 625; in Com., 1699; 3^o, 1699.

Bill (No. 65) *To amend the Acts respecting the Montreal Telegraph Company.*—(Mr. Gault.)

1^o, 509; 2^o, 626; in Com. 1470; 3^o, 1470; Sen. Amt. disagreed to, 1893.

Bill (No. 66) *To incorporate the Quebec and Ontario Railway Company.*—(Mr. Cameron, North Victoria.)

1^o, 509; 2^o, 626; B. wdn., 1819.

Bill (No. 67) *To amend the Acts respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.*—(Mr. Fitzsimmons.)

1^o, 568; 2^o, 626; in Com., 1641; Amts. m., 1641; 3^o, 1642.

Bill (No. 68) *To incorporate the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company.*—(Mr. Macdougall.)

1^o, 568; 2^o, 626; in Com., 1470; 3^o, 1470.

Bill (No. 69) *To incorporate the Rapid City and Souris River Colonisation Railway Company.*—(Mr. Bannerman.)

1^o, 568; 2^o, 626.

Bill (No. 70) *Further to amend the Acts therein mentioned respecting the Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. Masson.)

1^o, 583; 2^o, 978; in Com., 982; 3^o, 1661.

Bill (No. 71) *To incorporate the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway.*—(Mr. White, North Renfrew.)

1^o, 594; 2^o, 626; in Com., 1699; 3^o, 1893.

Bill (No. 72) *To extend the corporate character and powers of the Direct United States Cable Company to the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)

1^o, 594; 2^o, 626; B. wdn., 1852.

Bill (No. 73) *To amend an Act respecting the Port Whity Harbour Company.*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

1^o, 608; 2^o, 761; in Com., 1380; 3^o, 1380.

Bill (No. 74) *To incorporate the North-West Colonisation Land Company.*—(Mr. Schultz.)

1^o, 608; 2^o, 952; M. for Com., 1641; Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Charlton) 1641; Deb. adj., 1641; B. wdn., 1699.

Bill (No. 75) *To regulate the floating of cordwood upon the River St. Fran  ois du Lac.*—(Mr. Vanasse.)

1^o, 608.

Bill (No. 76) *To remove doubts as to the true construction of Section 12 of the Northern Railway Company Act, 1877.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)

1^o, 626; 2^o, 761; B. wdn., 1852.

Bill (No. 77) *To facilitate the detention and safe-keeping in certain cases of persons convicted in the North-West Territories or*

BILLS.—*Con.*

District of Keewatin, and sentenced to imprisonment.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)

1°, 657; B. wdn., 1935.

Bill (No. 78) *Respecting the President, Directors and Company of the Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Burpee, St. John.)*

1°, 661; 2°, 761; in Com., 1381; 3°, 1381.

Bill (No. 79) *To incorporate the Souris and Rocky Mountains Railway Company.—(Mr. Boulbee.)*

1°, 691; 2°, 761; in Com., 1699; 3°, 1699.

Bill (No. 80) *To simplify Criminal Procedure in the Province of Quebec, and to dispense with Grand Juries in certain cases.—(Mr. Coursol.)*

1°, 692.

Bill (No. 81) *To confirm the purchase by the Dominion of a portion of the Grand Trunk Railway and the agreement made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada with respect thereto.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)*

1°, 782; 2°, 1359; in Com., 1359; 3°, 1359.

Bill (No. 82) *To prevent fraud in the manufacture and sale of agricultural fertilizers.—(Mr. Landry.)*

1°, 802.

Bill (No. 83) *Further to amend the Act respecting Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)*

1°, 873; 2°, 1665; in Com., 1935; 3°, 1935.

Bill (No. 84) *To amend the General Inspection Act, 1874, and the Act amending it.—(Mr. Baby.)*

Res. in Com., 934; 1°, 935; 2°, 1857; in Com., 1857; 3°, 1857.

Bill (No. 85) *For the amendment of the Law of evidence in certain cases of misdemeanour.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)*

1°, 935.

Bill (No. 86) *To repeal Chapter 40 of 42 Victoria, intituled an Act to amend the Maritime Jurisdiction Act, 1877.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)*

1°, 977.

Bill (No. 87) *To amend Chapter 32 of the Act of 33 Victoria (1870), intituled an Act to empower the Police Court in the City of Halifax to sentence juvenile offenders to be detained in the Halifax Industrial School.—(Mr. Richey.)*

1°, 977.

Bill (No. 88) *For the appointment of a Resident Representative Agent for Canada in the United Kingdom.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)*

1°, 977; 2°, 1857, (Y. 120, N. 48) 1877; Res. in Com., 1878; B. in Com., 1878; 3°, 1878.

Bill (No. 89) *To provide for the equitable distribution of the estates of defaulting debtors.—(Mr. Wallace, South Norfolk.)*

1°, 1002.

Bill (No. 90) *To amend and consolidate the laws respecting Indians.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)*

1°, 1016; 2°, 1989; in Com., 1996; 3° prop., 1997; Amt. (Mr. Casey) 1997; 3°, 1997.

Bill (No. 91) *Respecting Dorchester Penitentiary.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)*

BILLS.—*Con.*

1°, 1016; 2°, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3°, 1669.

Bill (No. 92) *Further to continue in force, for a limited time, the Better Prevention of Crime Act, 1878.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)*

1°, 1016; 2°, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3°, 1669.

Bill (No. 93) *To prevent and punish wrongs to children.—(Mr. Richey.)*

1°, 1038.

Bill (No. 94) *For the final settlement of claims to lands in Manitoba by occupancy, under the Act 33 Victoria, chapter 3.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)*

1°, 1099; 2°, 1359; in Com., 1359; 3°, 1359.

Bill (No. 95) *To amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1879.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)*

1°, 1151; 2°, 1915; in Com., 1922; 3°, 1924.

Bill (No. 96) *To repeal the Act extending the Dominion Lands Act to British Columbia, and to make other provision with respect to certain public lands in that Province.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)*

1°, 1151; 2°, 1857; in Com., 1915; 3°, 1915.

Bill (No. 97) *To provide for the winding-up of Insolvent Banks and Insurance Companies.—(Mr. Abbott.)*

1°, 1228; 2°, 1230.

Bill (No. 98) *Respecting the Ontario Reformatory for Boys.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)*

1°, 1230; 2°, 1666; in Com., 1666; 3°, 1669.

Bill (No. 99) *Respecting the Reformatory for Juvenile Offenders in Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)*

1°, 1230; 2°, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3°, 1669.

Bill (No. 100) *Respecting the Industrial Refuge for Girls of Ontario.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)*

1°, 1230; 2°, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3°, 1669.

Bill (No. 101) *To provide for the distribution of the Assets of Insolvent Traders.—(Mr. Abbott.)*

1°, 1326.

Bill (No. 102) *To amend the Act 42 Victoria, chapter 15, intituled an Act to alter the duties of Customs and Excise.—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)*

1°, 1330; 2°, 1852; in Com., 1852; 3°, 1853.

Bill (No. 103) *To amend the Act intituled an Act respecting offences against the person, and to repeal the Act intituled an Act to provide that persons charged with common assault shall be competent as witnesses.—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)*

1°, 1470; 2°, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3°, 1669.

Bill (No. 104) *To amend the Statute of 41 Victoria, chapter 17, relating to stamps on notes and bills.—(Mr. Cockburn, West Northumberland.)*

1°, 1511.

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 105) *For the relief of Permanent Building Societies and Loan Companies, and to restrict their modes of lending.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
1^o, 1626; 2^o, 1857; in Com., 1857; 3^o, 1857.

Bill (No. 106) *To amend an Act respecting the Harbour of Pictou, in Nova Scotia.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)
1^o, 1627; 2^o, 1854; in Com., 1854; 3^o, 1854.

Bill (No. 107) *To amend the law respecting the removal of obstructions in navigable waters by wrecks.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)
1^o, 1627; 2^o, 1855; in Com., 1913; 3^o, 1915; Sen. Amts. concurred in, 1984.

Bill (No. 108) *For extending the consolidated Act of 1879, respecting duties imposed on promissory notes and bills of exchange, to the whole Dominion.*—(Mr. Baby.)
Res. in Com., 1659; 1^o, 1659; 2^o, 1856; in Com., 1857; 3^o, 1857.

Bill (No. 109) *To authorise the raising of a further sum to enable the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to complete their tidal dock.*—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)
Res. in Com., 1659; 1^o, 1660; 2^o, 1857; in Com., 1857; 3^o, 1857.

Bill (No. 110) *To enable the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to pay a life annuity to the widow of the late Hon. John Young.*—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
Res. in Com., 1660; 1^o, 1661; 2^o, 1857; in Com., 1857; 3^o, 1857.

Bill (No. 111) *To provide for the winding-up of La Banque Ville Marie.*—(Mr. Desjardins.)
1^o, 1665; 2^o, 1699; in Com., 1893; 3^o, 1893.

Bill (No. 112) *To explain and further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.*—(Mr. Bovell.)
1^o, 1688; 2^o, 1956; in Com., 1956; 3^o prop., 1956; Amt. (Mr. Boulbee) 1956; Deb. adj., 1956; Adj. Deb., 1957; Amt. (Mr. Boulbee) carried (Y. 96, N. 73) 1971; Amt. 3 m. h. (Mr. Ross, W. Middlesex) negatived (Y. 54, N. 85) 1972; 3^o, 1973.

Bill (No. 113) *To authorise making certain investigations under oath.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
1^o, 1723; 2^o, 1935; in Com., 1937; 3^o prop., 1957; Amt. (Mr. Blake) 1957; 3^o, 1957.

Bill (No. 114) *Further to amend the Acts respecting Dominion Notes.*—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)
Res. in Com., 1723; 1^o, 1752; 2^o, 1946; in Com., 1946; 3^o, 1946.

Bill (No. 115) *To amend an Act relating to Banks and Banking, and to continue for a limited time the charters of certain Banks to which the said Act applies.*—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)
Res. in Com., 1752; 1^o, 1772; 2^o, 1979; in Com., 1981, 1985; 3^o, 1987.

BILLS.—*Con.*

Bill (No. 116) *To amend the Pilotage Act, 1873.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)
1^o, 1772; 2^o, 1878; in Com., 1878; B. wdn., 2015.

Bill (No. 117) *To repeal the Act 42 Victoria, chapter 5, for granting an annual subsidy towards certain telegraphic communication.*—(Mr. Langevin.)
1^o, 1820; 2^o, 1857; in Com., 1857; 3^o, 1857.

Bill (No. 118) *Respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, and Occidental Railway.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
1^o, 1852; B. wdn., 1998.

Bill (No. 119) *Respecting the Administration of Criminal Justice in the territory in dispute between the Governments of the Province of Ontario and of the Dominion of Canada.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
1^o, 1852; 2^o, 1939; in Com., 1940; 3^o, 1940.

Bill (No. 120) *To amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases, and to authorise the taking of depositions, and to make same evidence in certain cases.*—(Mr. McDonald, Pictou.)
1^o, 1852; 2^o, 1940; in Com., 1940; 3^o, 1940.

Bill (No. 121) *To make better provision respecting the navigation of Canadian waters.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)
Res. in Com., 1886; 1^o, 1886; 2^o, 1998; in Com., 1999; 3^o, 1999.

Bill (No. 122) *To ratify and confirm a certain agreement therein mentioned between the Government of Canada and the Canada Central Railway Company.*—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)
Res. in Com., 1887; 1^o, 1888; 2^o, 1999; in Com., 1999; 3^o, 1999.

Bill (No. 123) *To amend the Act respecting the inspection of Petroleum.*—(Mr. Baby.)
Res. in Com., 1917; 1^o, 1921; 2^o, 1973; in Com., 1975; 3^o, 1975.

Bill (No. 124) *To amend the Acts respecting the Trinity House and Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.*—(Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.)
1^o, 1917; 2^o, 1999; in Com., 1999; 3^o, 1999.

Bill (No. 125) *To confirm a certain Order of the Governor in Council respecting the Graving Dock at Esquimalt.*—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)
Res. in Com., 1921; rep., 1927; Amt. (Mr. Blake) negatived (Y. 42, N. 109) 1933; 1^o, 1934; 2^o, 1999; in Com., 1999, 3^o, 1999.

Bill (No. 126) *For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1880, and the 30th June, 1881, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.*—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)
Res. in Com., 1977; 1^o, 1979; 2^o, 2002; 3^o, 2015.

Bill (No. 127) *Respecting certain Savings Banks in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.*—(Sir Samuel L. Tilley.)

BILLS.—Con.

1^o, 2023; 2^{**}, 2023; in Com., 2023; 3^{**}, 2023.

Blais, L. N., Postmaster at Matane.
M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*) 582.

Blake, Mr.

Return of, 2.
Introduction of, 2.

BLAKE, Mr.

Address, on the, 31.
Pacific Ry. Contracts in B. C. (*Ques.*) 45.
Permanent Representative of Can. in London (*Ques.*) 46.
Parly. Printing Contracts (*Ques.*) 46.
Boundary between Can. and Ont. (*Ques.*) 46, on M. for Com., 70.
C. P. R., Imperial Aid to (*Ques.*) 56.
Premature printing of Public Bs. (*Q. of procedure*) 78.
B. C. Additional Supreme Ct. Judges, on Res., 115, 119, 121; B. 44 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 1^o, 270; on M. for 2^o, 454; on M. for 3^o (*Amt.*) 933.
Relief of the Distress in Ireland, on Res., 128; (*Remarks*) 745.
Prevention of Crime (*B. 19, 1^o*) 151; on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 421, 433.
C. P. R. Land Commission (*Ques.*) 155.
Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 192.
The Member for Lennox, on M. to refer Pet. (Mr. Casey) 196; (*Remarks*) 282.
Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 224, 226; on M. to concur in Amt., 227, 234, 236; (*Amts. m.*) 287, 351.
Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2^o, 229.
Parly. Printing Contract, on M. to instruct Printing Com. to enquire (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 233.
Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2^o, 251, (*Amt. 6 m. h.*) 256.
Common Assaults Defendants Witnesses Act Amt. B. 41 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 1^o, 269; in Com., 601.
Banking and Currency (*remarks*) 284.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on M. for 2^o, 299.
Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right, 346.
B.C. Judges, cases tried before (*M. for statements*) 349.
Private Bs. Pets, on Ms. to extend time, 414, 452, 610.
Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship (*M. for Cor.*) 487, 492.
Immigration Pamphlets, 503, 816.
Criminal Law Amt. B. 38 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 599.
Private Bs. Reps, on M. to extend time (Mr. Langevin) 871.
Extradition (*Res.*) 873, 877.
Supreme and Exchequer Ct. Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 889.
Insolvent Fire and Marine Insurance Cos. winding-up B. 18 (Mr. Ives) on M. for 2^o, 892.
N. W. Mounted Police, 941.

BLAKE, Mr.—Con.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^o, 962.
Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on M. for 2^o, 980; in Com., 982, 985.
Supply—Adm. of Justice (Magistrates' Expenses, N. W. T.) 1009, (Circuit allowances, B. C.) 1010; Police, 1010; Penitentiaries (Kingston) 1010, (St. Vincent de Paul) 1015, (Dorchester) 1017, (Man.) 1023, (B. C.) 1025; Legislation (Sess. Clerks) 1027; Militia (R. Military College) 1366; Rys. (C. P. R.) 1672; Indians (B. C.) 1692, (Grist-mill) 1694; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Justice, Penitentiaries Br.) 1837, (Dept. of Inland Revenue) 1838, (High Commissioner contingencies) 1946, (Civil Service Board) 1947; Public Works and Buildings (Parit. Buildings) 1883; Miscellaneous (Judge Armour's services) 1885, (Compensation to members of N. W. Mounted Police) 1952, (Todd's "Parly. Govt.") 1954; Post Office, 1910; Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Quebec Exhibition) 1947; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 1950.
N. W. T. Criminal Trials Fees, on Res. in Com. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1100.
Insolvent Cos. winding-up B. 97 (Mr. Abbott) on M. for 1^o, 1229.
Precedence of Govt. business, on Res., 1262.
Ways and Means—on Amt. (Mr. Paterson, S. Brant) embossed books, 1327; on Res. in Com., 1977.
C. P. R., on M. for Com. of Supply (*Amt. m.*) 1425.
10th Royals, Toronto, 1632.
Cruelty to Animals Act Amt. B. 83 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2^o, 1666.
Can. Telegraph Co. Incorp. B. 54 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. to recommit (Mr. Macdougall) 1685.
Official Rep. of Debates, 1817.
P. E. I. Judges' Salaries, 1821.
Tariff B. 102 (Sir S. L. Tilley) on M. for 3^o, 1853.
Pictou Harbour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) on M. for 3^o, 1854.
Wrecks Removal B. 107 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) on M. for 2^o, 1855; in Com., 1914; on Sen. Amts., 1984.
Promissory Notes Duties Acts Extension B. 108 (Mr. Baby) on M. for 2^o, 1856.
Can. Resident Agent in United Kingdom B. 88 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2^o, 1869.
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) in Com., 1880.
Can. Waters Navigation B. 121 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) on M. for 1^o, 1887.
Can. Central Ry. Agreement Ratification, on Res. in Com. (Sir S. L. Tilley) 1887.
Concurrence—Dom. lands chargeable to capital, 1892; Militia (conversion of ordnance) 1894; P. O., 1945; British High Commissioner, contingencies (*Amt. m.*) 1975.
Montreal Telegraph Co. Acts Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Gault) on Sen. Amt., 1893.
Mr. Cameron's vote on concurrence, 1902.
Pet. against Mr. Massue, 1916, 1981.
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Acts Amt.

BLAKE, Mr.—Con.
 B. 124 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 1°, 1917.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, on Res. (*Amt. m.*) 1927.
 Investigations under Oath B. 113 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2°, 1935; in Com., 1937.
 Ont. Disputed Territory Criminal Justice B. 119 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2°, 1939.
 Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on 'Amt. 3 m. h. (Mr. Ross, W. Middlesex) 1972.
 Bank Act Amt. B. 115 (Sir S. L. Tilley) in Com., 1981.
 Printing Com.'s Rep., 1982.
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 1982.
 Q. M. O. and O. Ry. B. 118 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on withdrawal of B., 1998.
 Can. Waters Navigation B. 121 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 2°, 1999.
 C.P.R. Land Regulations, in Com. on Res. (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 1999, (*Amt. m.*) 2002.
 Work of the Session, on M. for 2° Supply B., 2012.

BOLDUC, Mr.
 Election Act Amt (*B. 6, 1°**) 56; on M. for 2°, 227.

Bonaventure Breakwater.
 M. for Rep. (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 1399.

Bonaventure, Surveys for Piers.
 M. for Rep. (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 508.

BORDEN, Mr.
 Customs confiscation of Kerosene Oil (*Ques.*) 155.
 Scott's Bay Harbour Works (*Ques.*) 198.
 Supply—Fisheries, 1680.
 Gaspereau Riv. Fisheries (*Ques.*) 1820.

BOULTBEE, Mr.
 B.C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges, 125.
 I.C.R. rolling stock awaiting repair, 146.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 193.
 Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2°, 231.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Blake) 264.
 Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 495.
 Immigration pamphlets, 502.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2°, 589.
 Private Bs. Pets., on M. to extend time, 611.
 Bell Telephone Co. Incorp. B. 17 (Mr. Kilvert) in Com., 624.
 Souris and Rocky Mountains Ry. Co. Incorp. (*B. 79, 1°*) 691.
Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 716.
 Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2°, 898.
 Charges against Mr. Rykert, 1008.
 Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1089.

BOULTBEE, Mr.—Con.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for Com. of Wh., 1280.
 Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1343; Militia (Brig. Majors) 1362; Canals, 1801.
 Hydraulic Lift Lock (*M. for Ad.*) 1399.
 Bank Act Amt., on Res. and Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 1767.
 Civil Service Expenditure, on Res. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1829.
 Can. Resident Agent in United Kingdom B. 88 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1876.
 Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on M. for 3° (*Amt. m.*) 1956; on Adj. Deb., 1960.
 Parly. Printing Contract, on M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2023.

Boundary between Canada and Ontario.
 See "ONTARIO."

BOURBEAU, Mr.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 318.
 Stratford Post-office, 374.
Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 752.
 Eastern Townships Minerals (*Ques.*) 785.
 Canadian Tobacco, pamphlets on (*Ques.*) 785.
 Cultivation of Canadian soil, pamphlets on (*Ques.*) 786
 Post-office Inspectors (*M. for statement*) 939.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2°, 969.
 Man. Ticket Agencies (*Ques.*) 1820.

BOWELL, Mr.
 Trade and Navigation Returns (*presented*) 43.
 Departmental Printing Contracts, 54.
 Debates Com. (*m.*) 79.
 Free admission of coal, 133.
 Financial Rets., 136.
 Customs confiscation of kerosene oil (*Ans.*) 155.
 Kaministiquia River, depth of water in, 167.
 Grain Imports from U. S., 172.
 Toronto Custom-house defalcations, 176.
 Drawback on Indian corn (*Ans.*) 197.
 The Member for Lennox (*Remarks*) 282.
 Halifax Sugar Refinery, materials for construction of (*Ans.*) 307.
 Drawbacks on exported tin plate used in lobster canning, 310, 312.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 330.
 Montreal Custom-house hardware valuer (*Ans.*) 569, 1378
 Immigration pamphlets, 817.
Ways and Means—on Res. 1, item 47, 929; on M. to concur in Res. (saw-logs) 1330.
 N. W. T., collection of Customs duties in (*Ans.*) 936.
 Imports of Tea (*Ans.*) 1371.
 Toronto Custom-house employés, 1377.
 Can. Temperance Act Amt. (*B. 112, 1°**) 1688; on Amt. (Mr. Boultee) to M. for 3°, 1957.
 Supply—Civil Govt (Dept. of Sec. of State) 1838; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1842, 1903; Militia (N. W. T. Militia) 1882, (Conversion of ordnance) 1882.

BOWELL, Mr.—Con.

Concurrence—Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1890.

Printing Com.'s Rep., 1982

Brakemen on Rys., protection of.

Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 1370.

Brazil, Steam communication with.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 821.

BRECKEN, Mr.

P.E.I. claim on Fishery Award (*M. for Ret.*) 129.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 221.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2°, 245.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 321.

Belle Creek, P.E.I. (*M. for Ret.*) 598.

P.E.I. Ry. communication (*Ms. for papers*) 572, 579.

Belle Creek Harbour, P.E.I. (*Ques.*) 785.

Rustico Harbour, P.E.I. (*Ques.*) 786.

Mar. Prov. claims on Fishery Award, 800, 1197.

Freight rates on I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry., 878. *Northern Light* steamer, 886.

Supply—Rys. (I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry.) 1710.

Salaries of P.E.I. Judges (*Remarks*) 1820.

Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on Amt. (Mr. Boulthbee) to M. for 3°, 1970.

B. C. additional Supreme Court Judges B. No. 44 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

Res. in Com., 114; 1°, 270; 2°, 454; in Com., 455; 3° prop., 933; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) negatived (Y. 43, N. 9S) 933; 3°, 934.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

C.P.R. contracts.

Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 45.

Fraser Riv., Lightship on the Sand Heuls.

Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 155.

Cases tried before Judges.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Blake*) 349.

Prov. Penitentiary. Victoria Post-office, etc., charges against local Engineer.

Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 786.

Steam communication with Mar. Provs. via Panama.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 821.

Mail Service between Victoria and Cassiar.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 936.

Appointment of Mr. Trutch.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 937.

Dom. Savings Banks.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 951.

Indian Lands.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Barnard*) 1633.

British Tenant Farmers, Expenses of Visit to Canada.

M. for Statement (*Mr. Oliver*) 178.

BROOKS, Mr.

Supply—Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1845.

Brossoit, Mr., appointment of to Beauharnois Canal.

M. for papers (*Mr. Bergeron*) 950,

BROWN, Mr.

Supply—Public Works (Trent Riv.) 1369.

Bryson, Hardware Valuer, Montreal Custom-house, Successor to.

Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 569.

Buctouche Harbour, N. B.

Ques. (*Mr. Girouard, Kent*) 569.

BUDGET, THE.

Speech of Finance Minister, 509.

For Debate, see "WAYS AND MEANS."

Building Societies and Loan Cos. Relief B. No. 105 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1°, 1626; 2°, 1857; in Com., 1857; 3°, 1857.

BUNSTER, Mr.

Address, on the, 26.

B. C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges, 124, 125.

Stratford Post-office, 368.

The Member for Lennox, on Amt. (Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria) 412.

Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 429.

Mail Contract between Victoria, B. C., and S. Francisco (*Res.*) 496, 498.

Mail Service between Victoria and Cassiar, B.C., 937.

Dom. Savings Banks in B. C., 952.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2°, 967.

Supply—Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 1017; Militia (Brig. Majors) 1361; Public Works and Buildings (Nanaimo P. O.) 1369; Dom. Lands (Outside Service, B. C.) 1849; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1903, (Post-office) 1909.

C. P. R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1469.

C. P. R., commencement of construction in B. C. (*Ques.*) 1627.

Personal Explanation, 1934.

Concurrence—Indians, 1943.

BURNHAM, Mr.

Supply—Canals, 1799.

BURPEE (St. John), Mr.

Importation of tea, 159.

Toronto Custom-house defalcations, 176.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 219, 221; on M. to concur in Amt., 285.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 314.

N. B. Bank (*B. 78, 1***) 661.

Ways and Means—on M. to recommit *Res.*, 1237, 1324.

Toronto Custom-house employés, 1377.

Supply—Ocean and Riv. Service, 1676; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1843, 1903; Miscellaneous (Mr. Miall's services) 1885.

BURPEE (Sunbury), Mr.

N. B. claims against the Dom. (*Ques.*) 198; (*M. for Cor.*) 580.

N. B. cattle trade with G. B. (*M. for Cor.*) 802.

I. C. R. free passes in 1878-9 (*M. for Ret.*) 821.

C.P.R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1622.

Cameron, Mr. M. C., Vote of, on Concurrence.

Ques. of Order, 1901.

CAMERON (N. Victoria), Mr.

Boundary between Ont. and Can. Territories, on M. for Com., 93.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 107.

French Atlantic Cable Co. Incorp. (B. 23, 1°) 180.

Farmers and Real Property Bank Incorp. (B. 34, 1°) 233.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2°, 244, 245.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legislation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on M. for 2°, 294; on Amt. for 6 m. h. (Mr. Jones) 1393.

The Member for Lennox, on M. to refer Pet. (Mr. Casey) 407; (Amt.) 410, 413.

Private Bills Pets., on M. to extend time, 415.

Private Bills (*M. to extend time*) 453.

Que. and Ont. Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 66, 1°) 509.

Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2°, 584.

Northern Ry. Co. Act Interpretation B. 76 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 761.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2°, 974.

Supply—Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1036; Lighthouse and Coast Service, 1679.

Can. Central Ry. Co. Acts Amt. B. 67 (Mr. Fitzsimmons) on M. to concur in B. (Amts.) 1641.

Can. Telegraph Co. Incorp. B. 54 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. to recommit (Mr. Macdougall) 1684.

Investigations under Oath B. 113 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2°, 1937.

CAMERON (S. Huron), Mr.

Expense of missions to England (*M. for Ret.*) 55.

Appointment of Official Assignees (*M. for Ret.*) 151.

Grain Imports from U.S. (*M. for Ret.*) 172.

Ontario N.W. Boundary (*M. for Ret.*) 174.

Insolvencies in 1878 and 1879 (*M. for statement*) 176, 177.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 219.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2°, 241, 245.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 327.

Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right, 340.

Criminal Procedure Law Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) on M. for 2°, 357.

The Member for Lennox, on M. to refer Pet. (Mr. Casey) 399.

Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 430.

Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 488.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 697; on M. to recommit, 1104.

Cruelty to Animals Act Amt. B. 83 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2°, 1665.

Ont. Boys' Reformatory B. 98 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) in Com., 1666.

Vote on concurrence, 1901.

Can. Central Ry. Agreement Ratification B. No. 122 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*).

Res. in Com., 1887; 1°, 1888; 2°, 1999; in Com., 1999; 3°, 1999.

Can. Central Ry. Co. Acts Amt. B. No. 67 (*Mr. Fitzsimmons*).

1°, 568; 2°, 626; in Com., 1641; Amts. m., 1641; 3°, 1642.

Can. Guarantee Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 22 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).

1°, 180; 2°, 218; in Com., 584; 3°, 584.

Can. Guarantee Co.

M. for statements (*Mr. Rochester*) 583.

Ques. (*Mr. Rochester*) 595.

Explanation (*Mr. Rochester*) 1888.

Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 112 (*Mr. Bowell*).

1°, 1688; 2°, 1956; in Com., 1956; 3° prop., 1956; Amt. (*Mr. Boulton*) 1956; Deb. adj., 1956; Adj. Deb., 1957; Amt. (*Mr. Boulton*) carried (Y. 96, N. 73) 1971; Amt. 3 m. h. (*Mr. Ross, West Middlesex*) negatived (Y. 54, N. 85) 1972; 3°, 1973.

Canadian Pacific Railway. See "RAILWAYS."

Can. Public Lands.

Res. prop. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1040; Amt. (*Mr. Domville*) 1083; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1087; Amt. to Amt. carried (Y. 120, N. 40) 1098.

Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 1999; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) negatived (Y. 25, N. 76) 2002.

Can. Representative in London.

Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 46.

Can. Resident Agent in the United Kingdom B. No. 88 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*).

1°, 977; 2°, 1857, (Y. 120, N. 48) 1877; Res. in Com., 1878; B. in Com., 1878; 3°, 1878.

Can. Telegraph Co. Incorp. B. No. 54 (*Mr. McCarthy*).

1°, 416; 2°, 472; referred back to Standing Com., 1683.

Can. Waters Navigation B. No. 121 (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*).

Res. in Com., 1886; 1°, 1886; 2°, 1998; in Com., 1999; 3°, 1999.

Cape Negro Island Harbour.

Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 484.

M. for Papers (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 508.

Carillon Works Contract. See "CONTRACTS."

Carleton (Ont.) Election, Interference of Hon. R. W. Scott.

M. for Com. (*Mr. Rochester*) 1169.

CARLING, Mr.

G. Western and L. Ontario Shore Junction Ry. Co. (B. 47, 1°) 305.

Private Bills Pets., on M. to extend time, 453.

Carnegie P.O., closing of.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillies*) 1398.

CARON, Mr.

Address, on the, 38.

CARON, Mr.—*Con.*

Admission of cattle from U.S. to Can. and from Can. to Eng. (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2^o, 586.
 Militia Annual Drill (*Ques.*) 595.
 Queen's Birthday Review at Quebec (*Ques.*) 596.
 Supply—Militia (Clothing and Ammunition) 1364; Ocean and Riv. Service (Quebec Riv. Police) 1678.
 Mr. Cameron's vote (*point of Order*) 1901.

CARTWRIGHT, Sir Richard J.

Address, on the, 42.
 Exports and Imports (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Receipts and Expenditures (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Tea from China and Japan (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Bank Deposit Account (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Drawback on exported goods (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Expenditure compared with Estimates (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Exports and Imports, by Provinces (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Sugar Imports (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Outstanding 6 per cent. securities (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Dominion Loans, terms of (*M. for Ret.*) 55.
 Dominion Agents in London, money in hands of (*M. for Ret.*) 179.
 Banking and Currency (*remarks*) 283, 284.
 Financial Returns, on M. for Standing Order (Mr. Mackenzie) 288.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 313.
 Receipts and Expenditure charged to Consol. Fund (*M. for Ret.*) 508.
 Ways and Means—Budget Speech (*reply*) 525; on M. to recommit Res., 1309; on Amt. (Mr. Paterson, S. Brant) embossed books, 1327; on M. to concur in Res. (saw-logs) 1330; on Res. in Com., 1978.
 Supply—Penitentiaries (Kingston) 1011; Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1032; Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Public Archives) 1331, (Census) 1331; Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1332; Militia (Ammunition) 1363, (R. Military College) 1366; Rys. (C.P.R. and I.C.R.) 1671, (Windsor Br. Ry.) 1907; Indians (Provisions at Annuity Assemblies) 1694; Canals (Lachine) 1788; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Sec. of State) 1838, (Dept. of Finance) 1838, (Dept. of Postmaster-Genl.) 1840, (Contingencies) 1842; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1842, 1903, (Excise) 1848, 1952; Dom. Lands (Outside Service, B.C.) 1849; Militia (conversion of ordnance) 1882; Public Works and Buildings (Parlt. Buildings) 1884, (Man. Lt.-Gov.'s Residence) 1950; Post-office, 1909; Dom. Lands (Pamphlets) 1913; Unprovided items (1878-9) 1913; Miscellaneous (Superannuation Refunds) 1955.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for Com. of Wh., 1283.
 Imports of tea (*Ques.*) 1371.
 Duties on rifles (*M. for Cor.*) 1398.
 Quebec Tidal Dock completion, in Com. on Res., 1659.
 Dom. Notes Act Amt., on Res., 1725.
 Civil Service Expenditure (*Res.*) 1824.
 Can. Resident Agent in United Kingdom B.

CARTWRIGHT, Mr.—*Con.*

88 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2^o, 1861.
Concurrence—Census, 1888; Immigration, 1889; Lighthouses, 1889; Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1890; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1890; Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 1890; Dom. Lands chargeable to capital, 1891; Parlt. Buildings, 1898; Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1944; Cow Bay Works, payment for, 1976.
 Mr. Cameron's vote on concurrence, 1902.
 Investigations under Oath B. 113 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2^o, 1935.
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 3^o, 1983.
 C. P. R. Land Regulations, in Com. on Res. (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 2000.
 Preservation of Order in the House, on M. for 2^o Supply B., 2014.

Cascumpec Harbour Improvement.

Ques. (Mr. Hackett) 156.

CASEY, Mr.

Address, on the, 37.
 Boundary between Ont. and Can. Territories, on M. for Com., 91.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^o, 106.
 Coal Oil tests (*M. for Repts.*) 135.
 Port Stanley Harbour tolls (*M. for Ret.*) 135
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 185, 187.
 The Member for Lennox (*M. to refer* *Pet.* 196; (*Remarks*) 380; on Adj. Deb., 396.
 Drawback on Indian corn (*Ques.*) 197, (*M. for O. C.*) 333.
 Public Service Reform (B. 43, 1^o) 269.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors (*M. for Ret.*) 313, 332.
 Immigration pamphlets, 502.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. (Mr. Mills) 592; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Williams) 593; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Houde) 1395.
 Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 770.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors (*M. for Rep.*) 806, 807.
 Immigration pamphlets, 814.
 Atlantic Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Albany, N.Y. (*M. for Ret.*) 821.
 I.C.R., carriage of sugar from Halifax, 945.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^o, 960.
 Supply—Penitentiaries (E.C.) 1024; Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1349; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Inland Revenue) 1839, (Civil Service Board) 1946; Collection of Revenues (Weights and Meas. and Gas) 1848.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for Com. of Wh., 1283.
 10th koyals, Toronto (*M. for Ret.*) 1629, 1633.
 Petroleum Inspection Law Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^o, 1654.
 Can. Telegraph Co. Incomp. B. 54 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. to recommit (Mr. Macdougall) 1686.

CASEY, Mr.—*Con.*

- Bank Act Amt., on Res., 1759; on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 1768.
 Civil Service Reform (*Ques.*) 1772.
 Dismissal of Que. Lt.-Gov., on Res. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1785.
 Official Rep. of Debates, 1817.
 Civil Service Expenditure, on Res. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1829.
 Petroleum Inspection Act Amt., in Com. on Res. (Mr. Baby) 1920.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, on Amt. (Mr. Blake) to Res., 1933.
 Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on Amt. (Mr. Boulbee) to M. for 3^d, 1962.
 Indian Laws Amt. B. 90 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2^d, 1996, (*Amt. m.*) 1997.

CASGRAIN, Mr.

- Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Co. wind-up (*B. 21, 1st*) 180.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 184, 192.
 Accident to the Vice-Regal Party, on M. to concur in Address (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 354.
 Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 430.
 I. C. R., Elgin Station (*Ques.*) 595.
Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 839.
 Private Bills Reps., on M. to extend time, 872.
 Commercial Union with U. S. (*Ques.*) 873.
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) in Com., 986.
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 7 (Mr. Baby) on M. for 2^d, 999.
Supply—Penitentiaries (Kingston) 1014; Ocean and Riv. Service (Que. Riv. Police) 1678.
 Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1083.
 Mar. Prov. Claims on Fishery Award, 1222.
 C. P. R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1483.
 Dismissal of Que. Lt.-Gov., on Res. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1786.

Cattle admitted from U.S. to Can., and from Can. to England.

M. for Rets. (*Mr. Caron*, 55.)

Cattle, American, restrictions on importation of.

Ques. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 1040.

Cattle Trade between N. B. and Great Britain.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 802.

Caughnawaga Ferry Boat, Pier at Lachine.

Ques. (*Mr. Bergeron*) 785.

Cedars Canal.

Ques. (*Mr. Mongenais*) 484.

Census, the.

Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 128.

Charlevoix, Tobacco seized in.

M. for statement (*Mr. Perrault*) 508.

CHARLTON, Mr.

Manitoba and N.W.T. Land Sales (*M. for Ret.*) 179.

CHARLTON, Mr.—*Con.*

- Unforeseen expenses, H. of Com. (*M. for statement*) 179.
 Ventilation of the Chamber, 182.
 Miscellaneous expenditure, H. of Com. (*M. for statement*) 508.
Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 845; on Res. 1, item 49, 930; on Res. 3, item 6, 932; on M. to concur in Res. (saw-logs) 1328.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^d, 975.
 Can. Public Lands (*Res. prop.*) 1040, on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to Amt. (Mr. Domville) 1097.
 Sandford Fleming (*Ques.*) 1370.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legislation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. for 6 m. h. (Mr. Jones) 1393; on M. for 3^d (*Amt.*) 1397.
 C. P. R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1553.
 N. W. Colonisation Land Co. Incorp. B. 74 (Mr. Schultz) on M. for Com. (*Amt. 6 m. h.*) 1641.
 Dom. Notes Act Amt., on Res., 1734.

Chateauguay Electoral District.

M. to issue Writ (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 904.
 New Member introduced, 1886.

Chatham and London, Ont., Navigation between.

Ques. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 484.

Chatham, Ont., Govt. Offices in.

Ques. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 569.

Cherry Point Breakwater, Lunenburg, N. S.

Ques. (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 198.

Children Protection B. No. 93 (*Mr. Richey*).

1st, 1038.

Chinese Immigration.

M. for Select Com. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 1740.

Chinese, Pets. in relation to.

M. to print (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 872.

CIMON, Mr.

Que. and Lake St. John Ry. Co., 169.

Civil Service Expenditure.

Res. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 1824; negatived (*Y. 50, N. 127*) 1857.

Civil Service, Inside Division.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Muttart*) 171.

Civil Service Reform Bill. See "Public Service."*Civil Service Reform.*

Ques. (*Mr. Casey*) 1772.

Coal and Coke Imports.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 150.

Coal, Free Admission of.

M. for statement (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 133.

Coal Oil Tests.

M. for Reps. (*Mr. Casey*) 135.

Coal on Govt. Rys. See "CONTRACTS."

Cocagne Public Wharf.

Ques. (*Mr. Girouard, Kent*) 484.

COCKBURN (Muskoka), Mr.

Aid to Ont. Pacific Junction Ry. (*Ques.*) 45.
Georgian Bay Br., C. P. R. (*M. for O. C.*) 46.

C. P. R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (*Mr. Blake*) 1615.

COCKBURN (W. Northumberland), Mr.

Fishery Privileges in the Ottawa Riv. (*M. for Ret.*) 1152, 1162, 1166.

Stamps on notes and bills Act Amt. (*B.* 104, 1^o) 1511.

COLBY, Mr.

Insolvency Acts Repeal (*B.* 2, 1^{**}) 44;
Ques. of procedure, 57, 77; on 2^o, 102;
in Com., 195, 218, 219, 220, 221, 223; on
M. to concur in Amt., 226, 285.

Petroleum Inspection Law Amt. (*B.* 4, 1^o) 44; on M. for 2^o, 1645.

Insurance Companies (*M. for Ret.*) 180.

Ways and Means—on M. to concur in Res. (saw-logs) 1329.

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Baby*) 1917; on M. for 2^o B. 123, 1974.

Panama Canal, on M. for 2^o Supply B., 2002.

Commercial Union with U.S.

Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 873.

Commissioners for the Internal Economy,

H. of Com., appointed.

Mess. from H.E., 59.

COMMITTEES.

Select Standing.

M. for, 3; Com. to prepare Lists. 56;
Lists rep., 79; Rep. concurred in, 79.

Library.

Sel. Com. to assist Mr. Speaker appointed, 79.

Official Report of the Debates.

Sel. Com. to supervise appointed, 79.

Printing.

Mess. to be sent to Sen. to request them to agree to appointment of Joint Committee, 79.

Law and Translation Depts., amalgamation with Senate.

Com. appointed, 781.

Common Assaults Defendants Witnesses Act Amt. B. No. 41 (*Mr. McCarthy*).

1^o, 268; 2^{**}, 483; in Com., 600; 3^{**}, 889.

Common Assaults Defendants Witnesses Act Amt. B. No. 62 (*Mr. Ives*).

1^{**}, 483.

Commons. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."

CONCURRENCE.

Formal vote. 509.

Public Archives, 1888.

Census, 1888.

Immigration, 1889.

Lighthouses, 1889.

Meteorological Observatories, 1890.

Indians (Ont. and Que.), 1890.

St. Anne's Lock and Canal, 1890.

CONCURRENCE,—*Can.*

Collection of Slide and Boom Dues, 1890.

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1890.

Salaries, Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 1890.

Dom. Lands chargeable to capital, 1891.

Dom. Lands outside service, 1894.

Militia (conversion of ordnance) 1894.

I. C. R., 1895.

C. P. R., 1896.

Parl. Buildings, 1198.

Fisheries Commission (*Mr. Miall's services*) 1900.

Indians (*B. C.*) 1940.

" (*Man. and N. W. T.*) 1941.

Post-Office, 1945.

High Commissioner in London, contingencies of, 1975.

Cow Bay Works, payment for, 1976.

Welland Canal, repairs at Port Maitland, 1977.

CONNELL, Mr.

Militia Drill Camps in N. B. (*Ques.*) 306.

Bridge across St. John River (*Ques.*) 1371.

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Baby*) 1920.

Consolidated Bank Winding-up B. No. 64 (*Mr. Gault*).

1^{**}, 509; 2^{**}, 625; in Com., 1699; 3^{**}, 1699.

Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure.

M. for Ret. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 508.

CONTRACTS.

Parliamentary Printing.

Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 46; M. to instruct Printing Com. to enquire (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 233; M. to adopt Rep. of Com. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 1988, 2015; Amt. (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) 2016; Amt. wdn. 2021; Rep. concurred in, 2023.

Carillon Works.

M. to print contract (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 51;
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 55.

Departmental Printing, Printing Paper and Binding.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, West Middlesex*) 54.

Canadian Pacific Ry.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 55; Contracts presented (*Sir C. Tupper*) 55; M. for statement (*Mr. McLennan*) 380; Adj. Deb., 455; Ratification of contract (*Sir C. Tupper*) 2002.

Printing, MacLean, Roger and Co.'s claim for breach of.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 151.

Mails between Victoria, B.C., and San Francisco.

Res. prop. (*Mr. Bunster*) 496; M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 904.

Pele Island Mail Service.

M. for contract (*Mr. Oliver*) 499.

"Sultan" Tugboat.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Snowball*) 508.

Coal for Govt. Ry's.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 942.

Mail between Lévis and St. Joseph de Beauce.

Ques. (*Mr. LaRue*) 1151.

Controverted Elections.

Generally, see "Elections."—Special cases; see the respective Districts.

Cornwall Election.

Judge's Report, 1.

COSTIGAN, Mr.

I. C. R. Employés (*M. for Ret.*) 349.

Rapid de Femme Salmon Hatchery (*M. for Ret.*) 581.

International Bridges over Riv. St. John (*Ques.*) 1152.

Parly. Printing Contract, on Amt. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) to M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2016.

Coteau Bridge.

Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 935.

Coteau du Lac Railway Bridge. See "RAILWAYS."**COURSOL, Mr.**

Montreal Custom-house hardware valuer (*Ques.*) 569; (*M. for Cor.*) 1377.

Criminal Law Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 600.

Sudden death of Mr. Holton (*remarks*) 651.

Criminal Procedure (*Que.*) Simplification (B. 80, 1^o) 692.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 844.

N. W. Mounted Police (*M. for statement*) 977.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (*Mr. Masson*) on M. for 2^o, 982.

Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. No. 53 (*Mr. Haggart*).

1^o, 416; 2^o, 584; referred back to Standing Com., 1279; in Com., 1470; 3^o, 1470.

Crime Prevention Act Continuation B. No. 92 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1^o, 1016; 2^o, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3^o, 1669.

Criminal Law of Evidence Amt. B. No. 120 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1^o, 1852; 2^o, 1940; in Com., 1940; 3^o, 1940.

Criminal Law Procedure Act Amt. B. No. 38 (*Mr. McCarthy*).

1^o, 233; 2^o, 479; in Com., 596.

Criminal Laws, Codification of.

Ques. (*Mr. Perrault*) 306.

Criminal Procedure Law Amt. B. No. 14 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*).

1^o, 113; 2^o prop. 356; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Mousseau*) 364; Deb. adj., 365.

Criminal Procedure (Que.) Simplification B. No. 80 (*Mr. Coursol*).

1^o, 692.

Cross Point Ferry, N. B.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Beauséne*) 1398.

Ques. (*Mr. Haddow*) 1628.

Croucher Island Lighthouse, Margaret's Bay, N. S.

Ques. (*Mr. Daly*) 1040.

Cruelty to Animals Act Amt. B. No. 83 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1^o, 873; 2^o, 1665; in Com., 1935, 3^o, 1935.

Cultivation of the Soil in Canada.

Ques. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 786.

Currency, Fractional.

Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 569.

Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 785.

CURRIER, Mr.

Supply—Penitentiaries (Kingston) 1014; Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Census) 1332.

Fishery Privileges in Ottawa River, 1167.

Ways and Means—on M. to concur in Res. (saw-logs) 1328.

Hull Fire Relief grant, 1670.

Tariff B. 102 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) on M. for 3^o, 1854.

Concurrence—Dom. Lands, 1900.

Custom-house, Montreal, Hardware Valuator.

Ques. (*Mr. Coursol*) 569.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Coursol*) 1377.

Custom-house, Toronto, Employés in.

M. for statement (*Mr. Little*) 1376.

Customs and Excise Duties Act Amt. B. No. 102 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*).

1^o, 1330; 2^o, 1852; in Com. 1852; 3^o, 1853.

Customs confiscation of Kerosene Oil.

Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 155.

Customs Duties in N. W. T., collection of.

Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.

DALY, Mr.

Dismissal of Fishery Officers, 160.

Drawback on Exported Tin Plate used in Lobster Canning, 312.

Mar. Prov. claims on Fishery Award, 793.

Ways and Means—on Res. 2, item 5, 931.

I.C.R., carriage of sugar from Halifax, 944.

Jeddore Rock Lighthouse (*Ques.*) 1040.

Croucher Island Lighthouse (*Ques.*) 1040.

DAWSON, Mr.

Boundary between Ont. and unorganised Territories of Dom. (*M. for Com.*) 59.

Kaministiquia Riv., depth of water in, 164, 165, 166.

Correction of newspaper report, 454.

C.P.R. contracts, 476.

C.P.R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (*Mr. Blake*) 1609.

Can. Central Ry. Co. Acts Amt. B. 67 (*Mr. Fitzsimmons*) on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria*) 1642.

Supply—Public Works (Telegraphs) 1675;

Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1688; N. W.

Mounted Police, 1815.

Indian Laws Amt. B. 90 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2^o, 1995; in Com., 1997.

Debates, Official Report of.

Com. to supervise appointed (*Mr. Bowell*) 79.

Rep. of Com. on new scheme concurred in, 1815.

Rep. of Com. recommending contracts, 1956.

DECOSMOS, Mr.

Address, on the, 30.

C.P.R. route via Peace River Valley or Pine River Pass, 52.

B.C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges, on Res., 121; B. 44 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) on M. for 1^o, 280.

Drawbacks on Exported Tin Plate used in Lobster Canning, 312.

Govt. Life Insurance (*Ques.*) 484.

Mail contract between Victoria, B. C., and S. Francisco, 497; (*M. for Ret.*) 904.

DECOSMOS, Mr.—Con.

- Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. surveys (*M. for Ret.*) 506.
 C.P.R., Location by Marcus Smith (*M. for Ret.*) 506, 507.
 Steam communication between Que. or Mar. Provs. and B.C. via Panama (*M. for Cor.*) 821.
 Steam communication with Brazil (*M. for Cor.*) 821.
 Chinese, Pets. in relation to (*M. to print*) 872.
 Mail Service between Victoria and Cassiar, B.C. (*M. for Ret.*) 936.
 Appointment of Mr. Trutch (*M. for Ret.*) 937.
 Dom. Savings Banks in B.C. (*M. for Ret.*) 951.
 Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1098.
 C.P.R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1491.
 Indian Lands in B.C., 1635.
 Chinese Immigration (*M. for Sel. Com.*) 1640.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, on Res., 1924.
 C.P.R., Esquimalt-Nanaimo section, on M. for 2^o Supply B., 2008.

Departmental Printing. See "CONTRACTS."

DESJARDINS, Mr.

- Montreal River Police (*M. for Ret.*) 178.
 Montreal Examining Warehouse (*M. for statement*) 178.
 Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2^o, 229.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Blake) 265.
 Stratford Post-office, 372.
 Supply—Militia (Drill Sheds) 1366; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1842; Miscellaneous (Todd's "Parly. Govt.") 1964.
 Ville Marie Bank Winding-up (*B. 111, 1^o*) 1665.
 Pet. against Mr. Massue (*Adj. m.*) 1916.

Direct United States Cable Co. Corporate Powers Extension to Can. B. No. 72 (*Mr. McCarthy*).
 1^o, 594; 2^o, 626.

Dismissals and Appointments since Feb., 1879.
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 178.

Distress in Ireland. See "IRELAND."

Distribution of Defaulting Debtors' Estates B. No. 89 (*Mr. Wallace, S. Norfolk*).
 1^o, 1002.

DIVISIONS.

- Boundary between Ont. and Can. Territories.*
 M. for Com. (*Mr. Dawson*) carried (*Y. 123, N. 52*) 101.
Election Act Amt. B. No. 6 (*Mr. Bolduc*).
 M. for 2^o negatived (*Y. 69, N. 71*) 232.
Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. No. 13 (*Mr. Keeler*).
 On M. for 2^o, Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Blake*) carried (*Y. 148, N. 29*) 267.

DIVISIONS.—Con.

- Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legislation B. No. 30* (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).
 On M. for 2^o, Amt. 6 w. h. (*Mr. Thompson, Haldimand*) negatived (*Y. 19, N. 140*) 451; on M. for Conc. and Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Jones*) Amt. to Amt (*Mr. Houde*) negatived (*Y. 10, N. 130*) 1396; Amt. (*Mr. Jones*) negatived (*Y. 34, N. 108*) 1396; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) negatived (*Y. 40, N. 102*) 1397.
Fishery Award, Mar. Provs. claims on.
 Res. prop. (*Mr. MacDonnell, Inverness*) 787; M. to adj. Deb. (*Mr. Richey*) carried (*Y. 111, N. 48*) 801; Amt. (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) carried (*Y. 126, N. 30*) 1226.
B.C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges B. No. 44 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).
 On M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) negatived (*Y. 43, N. 96*) 933.
Mortgage Regulation B. No. 11 (*Mr. Orton*).
 M. for 2^o carried (*Y. 67, N. 60*) 977.
Canadian Public Lands.
 On Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) and Amt. (*Mr. Domville*), Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) carried (*Y. 120, N. 40*) 1098.
Canadian Pacific Railway.
 On M. to go into Com. of Supply, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) negatived (*Y. 49, N. 131*) 1626.
Dismissal of the late Lieut.-Governor of Quebec.
 On M. to go into Com. of Supply, Amt. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) negatived (*Y. 49, N. 119*) 1787.
Civil Service Expenditure.
 On M. to go into Com. of Supply, Amt. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) negatived (*Y. 50, N. 127*) 1837.
Canadian Representative Agent in the United Kingdom B. No. 88 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*).
 M. for 2^o carried (*Y. 120, N. 48*) 1877.
Halifax Fisheries Commission, Further payment to E. Miall.
 M. to concur in Res. from Com. of Supply carried (*Y. 103, N. 44*) 1901.
Esquimalt Graving Dock.
 On Res. (*Sir S. L. Tilley*), Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) negatived (*Y. 42, N. 109*) 1933.
Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 112 (*Mr. Bouvell*).
 On M. for 3^o, Amt. (*Mr. Boulbee*) carried (*Y. 96, N. 73*) 1971; Amt. 3 m. h. (*Mr. Ross, W. Middlesex*) negatived (*Y. 54, N. 85*) 1972.
High Commissioner of Can. in London, Contingent Expenses of.
 On M. to concur in Res. from Com. of Supply, Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) negatived (*Y. 48, N. 114*) 1976.
Can. Pacific Railway, Land Regulations.
 On M. to concur in Res. from Com. of Wh., Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) negatived (*Y. 25, N. 76*) 2002.

Dom. Agents in London, money in hands of.

M. for Ret. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 179.

Dom. Commercial Travellers' Association Incorp. B. No. 24 (*Mr. Gault*).

1*, 180; 2*, 218; in Com., 483; 3*, 483.

Dom. Dam, Devil Lake.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jones*) 570.

Dom. Grange Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 33 (*Mr. McCallum*).

1*, 233; 2*, 286; in Com., 761; 3*, 761.

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 95 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*).

1*, 1151; 2*, 1915; in Com., 1982; 3*, 1984.

Dom. Lands Act Extension to B.C. Act, Repeal B. No. 96 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*).

1*, 1151; 2*, 1857; in Com., 1915; 3*, 1915.

Dom. Notes Acts Amt. B. No. 114 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*).

Res. in Com., 1723; 1*, 1752; 2*, 1946; in Com., 1946; 3*, 1946.

DOMVILLE, Mr.

I. C. R. rolling stock awaiting repair, 144.

Dismissal of D. H. Waterbury (*Ques.*) 155.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (*Mr. Colby*) in Com., 219.

Parlt. grounds, claim of C. Vaux (*M. for papers*) 308.

Line of steamers to Panama (*Ques.*) 484.

Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 589.

Fish Inspection, on Res. in Com. (*Mr. Baby*) 659.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 692; on Res. 2, item 5, 930; item 9, 931, 932.

Supply—Legislation (Extra clerks) 1034; Militia (Brig. Majors) 1361.

Can. Public Lands, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) (*Amt. m.*) 1083.

Queen's Birthday Review in Quebec (*Ques.*) 1151.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 1218.

Sugar Imports (*M. for statement*) 1399.

Iron ore exports from Ont. (*M. for statement*) 1399.

Salaries of Judges, P. E. I., 1821.

Bank Act Amt. B. 115 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1979.

Parly. Printing contract, on M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2022.

Dorchester Penitentiary.

Ques. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 198.

Dorchester Penitentiary B. No. 91 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1*, 1016; 2*, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3*, 1669.

DOULL, Mr.

Fish Inspection, 659.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 751.

Wrecks Removal Law Amt. B. 107 (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.*) on Sen. Amts., 1985.

Drawback on Exported Goods.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fleming*) 55.

Drawback on Ship Materials.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 150.

DREW, Mr.

Supply of lumber to the Welland Canal, 176.

C. P. R. Telegraph (*M. for Ret.*) 501.

Hudson's Bay Co., amounts paid to (*M. for Ret.*) 508.

Hudson's Bay Co. claims for losses in Red Riv. Insurrection (*M. for Cor.*) 508.

Applications for Timber Limits in Man., Keewaydin and N. W. T. (*M. for Ret.*) 508.

Private Bs. (*M. to extend time*) 611.

N. W. T., purchase of supplies from Hudson's Bay Co. (*M. for instructions*) 821.

Hudson's Bay Co. and lands on Hudson's Bay (*M. for Cor.*) 821.

N. W. T., shooting of cattle at Prince Albert (*M. for papers*) 1398.

Dual Representation Abolition Act Repeal B. No. 59 (*Mr. Ouimet*).

1*, 453.

DUGAS, Mr.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 7 (*Mr. Baby*) on M. for 2°, 996.

DUMONT, Mr.

Ry. Stations in St. André, St. Hélène, and St. Denis (*Ques.*) 1627.

Duties on Rifles.

M. for Cor. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 1398.

Easter Adjournment.

Res. (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) 781.

Eastern Townships Minerals.

Ques. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 785.

Election Act Amt. B. No. 6 (*Mr. Bolduc*).

1*, 56; 2° prop., 227; negated (*Y. 69, N. 71*) 232.

Elections.

Res. that introduction on certificate shall not form precedent (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 45; (*Mr. Langevin*) 112.

ELLIOTT, Mr.

Port Credit Harbour repair (*Ques.*) 306.

Concurrence—Indians, Man. and N. W. T., 1945.

Emerson and Turtle Mountain Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 26 (*Mr. Royal*).

1*, 180; 2*, 218; B. wdn., 1227.

Emerson Free Traffic Bridge B. No. 36 (*Mr. Royal*).

1*, 233; 2*, 286; in Com., 1641; 3*, 1641.

Encouragement of Sale of Farm Produce B. No. 12 (*Mr. Vallée*).

1*, 79.

England, Canadian Permanent Representative in.

Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 46.

England, Expenses of missions to, between 1874 and 1878.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 178.

England, Expenses of missions to, since Nov., 1878.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, S. Huron*) 55.

Esquimalt Graving Dock.

Communication (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) 1815.

Esquimalt Graving Dock B. No. 125

(*Sir S. L. Tilley*).

Res. in Com., 1921; rep., 1927; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) negatived (*Y. 42, N. 109*) 1933; 1^o*, 1934; 2^o*, 1999; in Com., 1999; 3^o*, 1999.

Established Church in Canada.

Ques. (*Mr. Skinner*) 1039.

Evelyn P.O. and London, Ont., Mails between.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 504.

Evidence Law Amt. B. No. 85 (*Mr.*

Kirkpatrick).

1^o*, 935.

Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Guthrie*) 334.

Expenditure and Receipts charged to Consolidated Fund.

M. for Ret. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 508.

Expenditures and Appropriations.

M. for Ret. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 55.

Exported Goods, drawback on.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Fleming*) 55.

Exported Tin Plate used in Lobster Canning, Drawbacks on.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Ogden*) 309.

Export of Hemlock Bark to U. S.

M. for statement (*Mr. Landry*) 179.

Export of Iron Ore from Ont.

M. for statement (*Mr. Domville*) 1399.

Exports and Imports by Provinces.

M. for Ret. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 55.

Exports and Imports during last half of 1879 and 1880.

M. for Ret. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 55.

Extradition of Fugitive Criminals.

Res. (*Mr. Blake*) 873.

Factory employment of Women and Children Regulation B. No. 10

(*Mr. Bergin*).

1^o*, 79.

Farmers and Real Property Bank Incorp. B. No. 34 (*Mr. Cameron, N.*

Victoria).

1^o*, 233; 2^o*, 286.

*Farm Produce, B. to encourage sale of. See "Encouragement."***FARROW, Mr.**

Time of taking the Census (*Ques.*) 128.

Stratford Post-office, 367.

Fractional Currency (*Ques.*) 569.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 918.

Upper Can. Land Improvement Fund, 949.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2^o, 975.

Actions for seduction (*M. for Ret*) 1659.

Ferry between Cross Point and Campbellton, N. B.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 1398.

Ques. (*Mr Haddow*) 1628.

Financial Returns.

M. for Standing Order (*Mr Mackenzie*) 136; Adj. Deb., 288; M. wdn., 291.

FISET, Mr.

Rimouski Pier (*Ques.*) 154.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (*Mr. Keeler*) on M. for 2^o, 247.

Brewery at Battleford, N.W.T. (*M. for Cor.*) 496.

Matane Postmaster (*M. for Cor.*) 582.

Matane Wharf (*Ques.*) 786; (*M. for statement*) 1398.

Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1350; Collection of Revenues (I.C.R.) 1956.

Fisheries on Gaspereaux Riv., N.S.

Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 1820.

Fishery Award, claim of P.E.I.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Brecken*) 129.

Fishery Award, claims of Mar. Provs.

Res. prop. (*Mr. MacDonnell, Inverness*) 787; Adj. Deb., 978, 1171; M. to adj. Deb. (*Mr. Weldon*) negatived, 1206.

Fishery, Lobster, Mar. Provs.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 133.

Fishery Officers in Inverness, Dismissal of.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. MacDonnell, Inverness*) 159.

Fishing Privileges on the Ottawa Riv.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northumberland*) 1152.

Fish Inspection.

Res. in Com. (*Mr. Baby*) 657.

FITZSIMMONS, Mr.

Stratford Post-office, 367.

Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 491. Can. Central Ry. Co. Acts Amt. (*B. 67, 1^o**) 568.

FLEMING, Mr.

Dutiable goods in Post-offices (*M. for instructions to Postmasters*) 179.

Newspaper advertisements and subscriptions (*M. for statement*) 179.

Prohibition of immigrants' landing (*M. for O.C.*) 198.

Ry. Statistics (*remarks*) 417.

Immigration Act Amt. (*B. 58, 1^o*) 453.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 912.

Indian Laws Amt. B. 90 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2^o, 1992.

FLYNN, Mr.

Fourché Harbour Fog Bell (*Ques.*) 484.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 791, 1214.

Grand Riv. Falls (*M. for papers*) 887.

Petroleum Inspection Law Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 1651.

Wrecks Removal B. 107 (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*) on M. for 2^o, 1856.

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Baby*) 1918.

Fort Frances Lock.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Plumb*) 1372.

FORTIN, Mr.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 1220.

Fourché Harbour Fog Bell.
 Ques. (*Mr. Flynn*) 484.

Fractional Currency.
 Ques. (*Mr. Farrow*) 569.
 Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 785.

France and Spain, Negotiations with.
 M. for Instructions to Commissioners (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 53.

Fraser River, B.C. See "BRITISH COLUMBIA."

Free admission of Coal.
 M. for statement (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 133.

French Atlantic Cable Co. Incorp.
B. No. 23 (*Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria*).
 1st, 180; 2nd, 218; in Com., 584; 3rd, 584.

FULTON, Mr.
 Mr. Cameron's vote on concurrence, 1902.

Gaol. See "Jail."

Garrett, Mrs., compensation for Rebellion losses in Man.
 Ques. (*Mr. Wallace, W. York*) 1628.

Gaspereaux Riv. Fisheries, N.S.
 Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 1820.

GAULT, Mr.
 Address, on the, 42.
 Dom. Commercial Travellers' Association Incorp. (*B. 24, 1st*), 180.
 Prohibition of immigrants' landing, 215.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (*Mr. Colby*) in Com., 221.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. 6 w. h. (*Mr. Thompson, Haldimand*) 441; on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Jones*) 1393.
 Consolidated Bank winding-up (*B. 64, 1st*), 509.
 Montreal Telegraph Co. Acts Amt. (*B. 65, 1st*) 569; on Sen. Amt., 1894.
 Sudden death of *Mr. Holton*, 652.
 Relief of distress in Ireland, 744.
 Welland Canal, opening of navigation, 784.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2nd, 969.
 Supply—Penitentiaries (*St. Vincent de Paul*) 1015; Legislation (*Debates*) 1037.
 Ways and Means—on M. to recommit Res., 1295.

General Inspection Acts Amt. B. No. 84 (*Mr. Baby*).
 Res. in Com., 934; 1st, 935; 2nd, 1857; in Com., 1857; 3rd, 1857.

GEOFFRION, Mr.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 186.

Georgian Bay Branch. See "RAILWAYS."

GIGAULT, Mr.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (*Mr. Colby*) in Com., 222.
 Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 684.
 Yamaaka Riv. Navigation (*M. for Rep.*) 804.

GILLIES, Mr.

Wellington, Grey and Bruce Ry. Mail Service (*Ques.*) 785.
 Carnegie P.O., closing of (*M. for Cor.*) 1398.
 Mail Service in Bruce (*M. for Cor.*) 1639.
 Supply—Post Office, 1911.

GILLMOR, Mr.

Fish Inspection, 658.
 Ways and Means—on M. to recommit Res., 1145.
 Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 1224.
 Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1353; Fisheries, 1679.
 Grant in relief of N.B. Indians (*M. for statement*) 1398.
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 116 (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*) on M. for 1st, 1773.

GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier), Mr.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation (*B. 5, 1st*) 44.
 Ques. of Procedure—Insolvency Repeal Bs. 57.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2nd, 103; in Com., 223, 224, 225.
 Can. Guarantee Co. Incorp. Act Amt. (*B. 22, 1st*) 180.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation (*B. 30, 1st*) 196; on M. for 2nd, 291; on Amt. 6 w. h. (*Mr. Thompson, Haldimand*) 437, 445; on Amt. (*Mr. Houde*) 953; on M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 1381.
 Montreal Assurance Co. (*B. 32, 1st*) 233.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (*Mr. Keeler*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Blake*) 256.
 Stock-brokers Regulation (*B. 42, 1st*) 269; on M. for 2nd, 602.
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 7 (*Mr. Baby*) on M. for 2nd, 998; in Com. (*Amt. m.*) 1002.
 Supply—Canals, 1802.
 Montreal Telegraph Co. Acts Amt. B. 65 (*Mr. Gault*) on Sen. Amt., 1893.

GIROUARD (Kent), Mr.

Cecagne Public Wharf (*Ques.*) 484.
 Buctouche Harbour (*Ques.*) 569.
 Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 1224.
 "Glendon" and "Northern Light" Steamers.
 M. for Ret. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 803.
 Govt. Bank Inspection.
 Res. wdn. (*Mr. Orton*) 803.
 Govt. Business to have precedence on Mondays.
 Res. (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 1262.
 Govt. Business to have precedence on Thursdays.
 Res. (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 657.
 Govt. Business to have precedence on Wednesdays.
 Res. (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 1772.
 Govt. Life Insurance.
 Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 484.
 Govt. Officials, Expenses in England, between 1874 and 1878.
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) 178.

Governor-General and Princess Louise, Accident to.

Remarks (*Mr. Mackenzie and Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 112; Mess. from Sen. with Ad. to H.E., 307; Ad. agreed to, 352; Mess. from H.E. with reply to Ad., 483.

Governor-General. See "MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Grain Imports from the U.S.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, S. Huron*) 172.

Grain Imports.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 150.

Grain in Bond, Importation of.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 151.

Grand Anse Breakwater, N.B.

M. for papers (*Mr. Anglin*) 947.

GRANDBOIS, MR.

Employés on Riv. du Loup Br., I.C.R. (*M. for Ret.*) 55.

Survey of Trois Pistoles for construction of Wharf (*M. for Rep.*) 179.

Fish Inspection, on Res. in Com. (*Mr. Baby*) 661.

Grand Riv. Falls, Richmond, N.S.

M. for papers (*Mr. Flynn*) 887.

Grand Trunk Railway. See "RAILWAYS."

Great North-Western Telegraph Co. Incorp. B. No. 45 (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*).

1^{**}, 305; 2^{**}, 395; in Com., 1470; 3^{**}, 1470.

Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junction Ry. Co. B. No. 47 (*Mr. Carling*).

1^{**}, 305; 2^{**}, 395; in Com., 785; 3^{**}, 785.

Great Western Railway Provident Funds B. No. 25 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*).

1^{**}, 180; 2^{**}, 218; in Com., 625; 3^{**}, 760.

Great Western Railway. See "RAILWAYS."

Grosse Isle, Employés at Quarantine Station.

M. for statement (*Mr. Landry*) 1398.

Grosse Isle, leasing of arable land.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Landry*) 1398.

GUNN, MR.

Official Assignees' Rets. (*Ques.*) 873.

Ways and Means—on M. to recommit Res., 1250.

GUTHRIE, MR.

Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right (*M. for Ret.*) 334, 343.

Common Assaults Defendants Witnesses Act Amt. B. 41 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 601.

Insolvent Fire and Marine Insurance. Cos. winding-up B. 18 (*Mr. Ives*) on M. for 2^{**}, 893.

Criminal Evidence Law Amt. B. 120 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) in Com., 1940.

Bank Act Amt. B. 115 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) on M. for 2^{**}, 1079; in Com., 1981.

Guysborough, N.S., aid to distressed fishermen.

Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1039.

Guysborough, N.S., Brennan's Cove Surveys.

M. for Reps. (*Mr. Ogden*) 1398.

Guysborough, N.S., Indian Harbour Surveys.

M. for Reps. (*Mr. Ogden*) 1398.

Guysborough, N.S., New Harbour Surveys.

M. for Reps. (*Mr. Ogden*) 1398.

Guysborough, N.S., Riv. St. Mary's Surveys.

M. for Reps. (*Mr. Ogden*) 1398.

Guysborough, N.S., St. Francis Harbour Surveys.

M. for Reps. (*Mr. Ogden*) 1398.

HACKETT, MR.

P.E.I. claim on Fishery Award, 131.

Casumpec Harbour Improvement (*Ques.*) 156. Campbellton Br. Ry., P.E.I. (*M. for papers*) 307.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 325.

Prince Co., P.E.I., Harbour Surveys (*M. for Reps.*) 508.

P.E.I. Ry. communication, 575.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 796, 1206.

Freight rates on I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. (*M. for Ret.*) 877.

Northern Light steamer (*M. for statement*) 883.

Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (*Mr. Bowell*) on Amt. (*Mr. Boulbee*) to M. for 3^{**}, 1964.

HADDOW, MR.

Cross Point Ferry (*Ques.*) 1628.

Supply—Rys. (I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry.) 1719.

HAGGART, MR.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (*Mr. Keeler*) on M. for 2^{**}, 248.

Northern Ry. Co. by-laws fixing tolls (*M. for Ret.*) 348.

Credit Valley Ry. Co. (*B. 53, 1^o**) 416, 1279, (*M. to refer back to Sel. Com.*) 1283.

Dom. Dam, Devil Lake, on M. for Ret. (*Mr. Jones*) 572.

Precedence of Govt. business, on Res., 1262.

Halifax Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. No. 87 (*Mr. Richey*).

1^{**}, 977.

Halifax Sugar Refinery, Materials for construction of.

Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 307.

Harbour Commissions.

Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 1371.

HAY, MR.

Toronto Harbour Improvement (*Ques.*) 380.

Hemlock Bark Exports to U. S.

M. for statement (*Mr. Landry*) 179.

Herring Fishery Licenses in Mar. Provs.

Ques. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 1039.

Herring, Smoked, Inspection of

Ques. (*Mr. Longley*) 306.

HESSON, Mr.

- Stratford Post-office and Custom-house (*Ques.*) 80; (*M. for papers.*) 365, 368, 373.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^o, 109.
 Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 492.
Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 775.
 Immigration pamphlets, 820.
 Upper Can. Land Improvement Fund (*M. for Ret.*) 948.
Supply—Legislation (Extra clerks) 1036; Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1343; Public Works and Buildings (Stratford P.O.) 1368.
 Protection to brakemen on Rys. (*Ques.*) 1370.
 Early Printing contract, on M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2022.

HOLTON, Mr.

- Ques. of Procedure*—Insolvency Repeal Bs., 57.
 Boundary between Ont. and unorganised Territories of Dom., on M. for Com., 64, 92.
Ques. of Procedure—Notice for Public Bs., 79.
 Montmorceny Election, introduction of Member, 111.
 Dismissal of A. Cauchon from Montreal Canal Office (*M. for Ret.*) 150.
 Relief of the distress in Ireland, on M. for Address, 181.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 186, 189, 191.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 220; on M. to concur in Amt., 226; on Amt. (Mr. Blake) 287.
 Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2^o, 228.
 The Member for Lennox, on Amt. (Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria) 413.
 Private Bs. Pets., on M. to extend time, 415.
 Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 427.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2^o, 538.
 Bell Telephone Co. Incorpor. B. 17 (Mr. Kilvert) in Com., 625.

Holton, Mr., Sudden death of.

Remarks and Adj. of House, 649; M. to adj. for funeral (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 657.

Holton, Mr. E.

Introduction of, 1886.

Hooper, Mr., Pet. against. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."**HOOPER, Mr.**

The Member for Lennox, on M. to refer Pet. (Mr. Casey) (*Statement*) 395.

HOUDE, Mr.

- The Address (*seconded*) 9.
 Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2^o, 231.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on M. for 2^o (*Adj. of Deb. m.*) 305; on Amt. 6 w. h. (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 434, (*Amt. m.*) 953; on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Jones) (*Amt. m.*) 1395.

HOUDE, Mr.—Con.

Marine and Fisheries Dept. Reps., cost of (*Ques.*) 1627.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

[For *Ques. of "ORDER, PRIVILEGE OR PROCEDURE,"* see that subject.]

Meeting, 1.

Summoned to the Senate, 1, 977, 1851, 2024.

Vacancies in Representation announced, 1.

New Members returned, 2.

New Members introduced, 2, 45, 107, 1886.

Speech from the Throne rep., 2.

M. for Select Standing Coms., 3.

Statement of Accountant, 4.

Librarian's Rep., 4.

Address, m. 4; sec., 9; agreed to, 43; H. E.'s reply, 113.

Res. introduction of members on certificate of Returning Officer not to form precedent, 45, 112.

Commissioners for the management of the Internal Economy appointed by Mess., 59.
 Unforeseen Expenses, statement m. for (*Mr. Charlton*) 179.

Ventilation of the Chamber, Remarks, 182.

The Member for Lennox. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

Miscellaneous Expenditure, statement m. for (*Mr. Charlton*) 508.

Audit of Expenditure, Res. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 595, 1326.

Sudden death of Mr. Holton, Adj. of House, 649; M. to adj. for funeral (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 657.

Adj. for Easter, Res. (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) 781.

Chateaugay vacant seat, M. to issue writ (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 904.

Carleton Election, Interference of Hon. R. W. Scott. See "Carleton."

Resignation by Mr. Mackenzie of Opposition Leadership, announcement (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1815.

The Member of Richelieu. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

Preservation of Order, Remarks, 2014.

Adj. for Ascension Day, Res. (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 2015.

Returns to Orders of the House, Remarks (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 2015.

Indemnity of certain Members, Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2023.

Prorogation, 2026.

Hudson's Bay Co., amounts paid to.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Drew*) 508.

Hudson's Bay Co. and lands on Hudson's Bay.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Drew*) 821.

Hudson's Bay Co. claims for losses in Red River Insurrection.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Drew*) 508.

Hudson's Bay Co. claims.

Remarks (*Mr. Schultz*) 1934.

Hudson's Bay Co., purchase of supplies from.

M. for instructions (*Mr. Drew*) 821.

Hull Fire, Relief of sufferers by.

Mess. from H.E., 1669; Res. for grant in Com., 1669; concurred in, 1670.

HUNTINGTON, Mr.

- Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2°, 972.
 Supply—Legislation (Extra clks.) 1027; Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1336; Militia (Brig. Majors) 1363; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Postmaster-Genl.) 1840; Post Office, 1910.
 Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1097.
 Dismissal of Que. Lt.-Gov., on Res. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1785.
 P. E. I. Judges' salaries, 1823.
 Civil Service Expenditure, on Res. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1836.
 Can. Resident Agent in United Kingdom B. 88 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2° 1874.
 Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on Amt. (Mr. Boulbee) to M. for 3°, 1970.

Huron and Ont. Ship Canal.

Ques. (Mr. Strange) 416.

HURTEAU, Mr.

- L'Assomption Riv. Navigation (Ques.) 306.
Hydraulic Lift Lock.
 M. for Ad. (Mr. Boulbee) 1399.
Immigrants' landing, Prohibition of.
 M. for O. C. (Mr. Fleming) 198; agreed to, 234.
Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 58 (Mr. Fleming).
 1°, 453.
Immigration and Colonisation Pamphlets.
 M. for statement (Mr. Trow) 501.
 M. for copies (Mr. Trow) 808.
 Remarks in explanation (Mr. Trow) 1038.
Immigration of British Tenant Farmers.
 Ques. (Mr. Stephenson) 1152.
Immigration of Chinese.
 M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. DeCosmos) 1640.
Importation of Amer. cattle, restrictions on.
 Ques. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1040.
Importation of Tea.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon) 151.
 M. for statement (Mr. White, Cardwell) 158.
 Ques. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1371.
Import duties paid at York Factory and in N. W. T.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Schultz) 1399.
Import of Undressed Skins.
 M. for statement (Mr. Landry) 179.
Imports and Exports by Provinces.
 M. for Ret. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 55.
Imports and Exports during last half of 1879 and 1880.
 M. for Ret. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 55.
Imports of Coal and Coke.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon) 150.
Imports of Grain from the U. S.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, S. Huron) 172.

Imports of Grain in Bond.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Mackenzie) 151.

Imports of Grain.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon) 150.

Imports of Sugar.

M. for Ret. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 55.
 M. for statement (Mr. White, Cardwell) 180.
 M. for statement (Mr. Domville) 1389.

Indian Corn, Drawback on.

Ques. (Mr. Casey) 197.
 M. for O. C. (Mr. Casey) 333.

Indian Laws Consolidation B. No. 90 (Sir John A. Macdonald).

1°, 1016; 2°, 1989; in Com., 1996; 3° prop., 1997; Amt. (Mr. Casey) 1997; 3°, 1997.

INDIANS.

Treaties at Forts Carlton and Pitt.

M. for O. in C: (Mr. White, Cardwell) 179.

Treaty No. 1 and Yellow Quill's Band.

M. for Ret. (Mr. White, Cardwell) 179.

Treaty No 7, Payments under.

M. for statement (Mr. Mills) 179.

Treaties 4 and 6, Payment of annuities under.

M. for statement (Mr. Mills) 308.

Appointment of Instructors.

M. for O. C. (Mr. Mills) 348.
 M. for statement (Mr. Mills) 348.

N. B. Commissioners and Lands.

M. for statement (Mr. Snowball) 822.

N. B., Grant in relief.

M. for statement (Mr. Gillmor) 1398.

B. C., Allotment of Lands.

M. for Ret. (Mr. Barnard) 1633.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. No. 7 (Mr. Baby).

1°, 56; 2°, 989; in Com., 1002; 3°, 1665.

Inland Revenue.

M. for O. C. (Mr. Paterson, S. Brant) 349.

Insolvencies in 1878 and 1879.

M. for statement (Mr. Cameron, S. Huron) 176.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. No. 3 (Mr. Béchard).

1°, 44.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. No. 2 (Mr. Colby).

1°, 44; 2°, 102; in Com., 195, 218; Rep., 227, 284; in Com., 286; rep., 286; Amt. m. (Mr. Blake) 286; Amt. wdn., 286; M. to concur in Amts., 351; Amt. m. (Mr. Blake) 351; Amt. wdn., 352; in Com., 352; rep., 352; 3°, 417.

Insolvent Companies Winding-up B. No. 61 (Mr. Ives).

1°, 483; 2°, 1230.

Insolvent Companies Winding-up B. No. 97 (Mr. Abbott).

1°, 1228; 2°, 1230.

Insolvent Fire and Marine Insurance Cos. Winding-up B. No. 18 (Mr. Ives).

1°, 151; 2°, 890.

Insolvent Traders' Assets Distribution B. No. 101 (*Mr. Abbott*).
1*, 1326.

Insurance Companies.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Colby*) 180.

Insurance, Government Life

Ques. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 484.

Intercolonial Railway. See "RAILWAYS."

Introduction of New Members.

See "HOUSE OF COMMONS,"—also, *Names.*

Investigations under Oath B. No. 113 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1*, 1723; 2*, 1935; in Com., 1937; 3* prop., 1957; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1957; 3*, 1957.

Inverness, Dismissal of Fishery Officers.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. MacDonnell, Inverness*) 159.

Ireland, Relief of the Distress in.

Paragraph in Ad., 36; Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 56; Mess. from H. E., 59; Vote of Credit, 125; M. for Ad. (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 181; Address to H. E., 181; Mess. from Senate agreeing to Ad., 307; Remarks, 744; M. to refer Pet. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 745; Mess. from H. E., 2023.

Iron Ore, Exports of, from Ont.

M. for statement (*Mr. Domville*) 1399.

IVES, Mr.

Insolvent Fire and Marine Insurance Cos.

Winding-up (B. 18, 1**) 151; on M. for 2*, 890.

The Member for Lennox, 406.

*Insolvent Cos. Winding-up (B. 61, 1**) 483.*

*Common Assaults Defendants Witnesses Act Amt. (B. 62, 1**) 483.*

Common Assaults Defts. Witnesses Act Amt. B. 41 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 602.

Ways and Means—on Res. 1, item 47, 927, 928.

Insolvent Cos. Winding-up B. 97 (Mr. Abbott) on M. for 1, 1228.*

Jail Accommodation in Keewatin. See "Keewatin."

Jeddore Harbour Dredging.

M. for Cor. and Repts. (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 379.

Jeddore Rock Light-house, N. S.

Ques. (*Mr. Daly*) 1040.

JONES, Mr.

Address, on the, 36.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. 6 w. h. (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 440; on Amt. (Mr. Mills) 590; in Com., 594, 952; on M. to concur (Amt. m.) 1392.

Immigration pamphlets, 502.

Dom. Dam, Devil Lake (M. for Ret.) 570, 572.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister (M. to print a Pet.) 610.

Bell Telephone Co. Incorp. B. 17 (Mr. Kilvert) in Com., 625.

Freight rates on I. C. R. and P. E. I. Ry., 878.

Dom. Lands in N. W., 883.

Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 86 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2, 899.*

JONES, Mr.—Con.

Ways and Means—on Res. 1, item 47, 928.

Supply—Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 1023; Militia (Ammunition) 1365; Ocean and Riv. Service, 1677; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1843.

Toronto Custom-house employés, 1377.

Official Rep. of Debates, 1816.

Parly. Printing Contract, on Amt. (Mr. Paterson, Essex) to M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2017.

Jordan Bay Breakwater, Shelburne Co., N. S.

Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 785.

Kaministiquia Riv., Depth of Water.

M. for Rep. (*Mr. Plumb*) 161.

Kamouraska District Judges.

M. for statement (*Mr. Landry*) 1398.

KAULBACH, Mr.

Cherry Point Breakwater, Lunenburg (Ques.) 198.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2, 240.*

Petit Rivière Breakwater (M. for Rep.) 377.

Porter's Lake channel to the sea (M. for Cor. and Repts.) 379.

Three Fathom Harbour Breakwater (M. for Cor. and Repts.) 379.

Jeddore Harbour Dredging (M. for Cor. and Repts.) 379.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. (Mr. Mills) 590.

Geological Surveys in Shelburne, Queen's, and Lunenburg Cos., N. S., 950.

Mar. Provs. Claims on Fishery Award, 1203.

KEELER, Mr.

Supreme Ct. Judgments and Expenses (M. for Ret.) 55.

Murray Canal (M. for Repts.) 58.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal (B. 13, 1) 79; on M. for 2*, 234.*

Trent River Navigation Works (M. for O. C.) 156; (M. for Repts.) 937.

Fractional Currency (Ques.) 785.

Superannuation Fund (Ques.) 873.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. (M. for statement) 950.

Supply—Canals, 1793.

Keewatin, conflicts of magisterial jurisdiction.

Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 1039.

Keewatin, Jail accommodation.

Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 569.

Kerosene Oil, Customs confiscation.

Ques. (*Mr. Borden*) 155.

KILLAM, Mr.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 316.

Mar. Provs. Claims on Fishery Award, 792, 1171, 1222, 1227.

Northern Light steamer, 886.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2, 972.*

Insolvent Cos. Winding-up B. 97 (Mr. Abbott) on M. for 1, 1230.*

Ways and Means—on M. to recommit Res., 1230; in Com., 1326.

KILLAM, Mr.—Con.

- Petroleum Inspection Law Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^o, 1656.
 Wrecks Removal B. 107 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) on M. for 2^o, 1856.
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) in Com., 1879.
 Supply—Rys. (Windsor Br. Ry.) 1907.

KILVERT, Mr.

- Bell Telephone Co. Incorpor. (B. 17, 1^{**}) 151 : in Com., 624.

KING, Mr.

- Ways and Means*—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 686.
 Supply—Ocean and Riv. Service (Mail Subsidies—Brazil) 1676.

Kingston Dry Dock.

- M. for Ret. (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 378.

KIRKPATRICK, Mr.

- Claim of MacLean, Roger & Co. for breach of Printing Contract (M. for Ret.) 151.
 Public Accounts (M. to refer) 151.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 183, 184, 186.
 The Member for Lennox (*remarks*) 281; on M. to refer Pet. (Mr. Casey) 397.
 Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right, 342.
 Kingston Dry Dock (M. for Ret.) 378.
 Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 494.
 Immigration pamphlets, 5u3.
 Bridge over St. John Riv. for Ry. purposes (M. for papers) 594.
 Audit of Parly Accounts (*Res*) 594 610, 1326.
 Common Assaults Defts. Witnesses Act Amt. B. 41 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. to go into Com., 601.
 Port Whrtby Harbour Co. Act Amt. (B. 73, 1^{**}) 608.
 Evidence Law Amt. (B. 85, 1^{**}) 935.
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) in Com., 984.
 Credit Valley Ry Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. to refer back to Sel. Com., 1283.
 Supply—Militia (Brig. Majors) 1362, (R. Military College) 1367; Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1811.
 Criminal Evidence Law Amt. B. 120 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) in Com., 1949.

KRANZ, Mr.

- Weight and Meas. Inspectors, 317.
 Stratford Post-office, 369.
 Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1353.
 Naturalisation Laws (*Ques.*) 1371.

Lachine, pier at, for Caughnawaga ferry-boat.

- Ques.* (Mr. Bergeron) 785.

Lambton County Ct. Judge.

- Ques.* (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) 1982.

Lanaudiers Postmaster, Dismissal of.

- M. for papers (Mr. Laurier) 1399.

LANDRY, Mr.

- Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co., 170.
 I.C.R. employés (M. for Ret.) 177.
 Import of undressed skins (M. for statement) 179.

LANDRY, Mr.—Con.

- Export of hemlock bark to U. S. (M. for statement) 179.
 Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2^o, 227.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Blake) 266.
 New Ry. Station-houses in Prov. of Quebec (*Ques.*) 307.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. 6 w. h. (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 446.
 Correction of Newspaper Report; 454.
 Railway Stations in Montmagny (*Ques.*) 484.
 I.C.R. Br. at Lévis (M. for Ret.) 485.
 Railway Stations in Lévis, Bellechasse and Montmagny (M. for Ret.) 505.
 I.C.R. Riv. du Loup Br. workmen (M. for statement) 508.
 Agricultural Fertilisers Fraudulent Sale Prevention (B. 82, 1^{**}) 802.
 Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^o, 895, 903.
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 7 (M. Baby) on M. for 2^o, 999.
 Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1358.
 St. Thomas Floating Light (M. for papers) 1398.
 Grosse Isle arable land, leasing of (M. for Cor.) 1398.
 Judges appointed in Kamouraska District (M. for statement) 1398.
 Bellechasse Returning Officers, expenses claimed (M. for statement) 1398.
 Grosse Isle Quarantine Station employés (M. for statement) 1399.

Lands of Canada. See "Canadian Public Lands."**LANE, Mr.**

- Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 224.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^o, 960.
 Wrecks Removal B. 107 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 2^o, 1855.

LANGÉVIN, Mr.

- Public Works Rep. (*presented*) 44.
 Montmorency Election, introduction of Member (*Res.*) 111.
 Port Stanley Harbour tolls, 136.
 Rimouski Pier (*Ans.*) 154.
 Port Hood Wharf repairs (*Ans.*) 155.
 Casumpeck Harbour improvement (*Ans.*) 156.
 Ventilation of the Chamber, 182.
 Cherry Point Breakwater, Lunenburg (*Ans.*) 198.
 Dredging at mouth of Red Riv. (*Ans.*) 198.
 Scott's Bay Harbour works (*Ans.*) 198.
 Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2^o, 230.
 Bay Fortune Breakwater, P. E. I. (*Ans.*) 234.
 Souris Works, P. E. I. (*Ans.*) 234.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2^o, 247; on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Blake) 265.
 Stony Island Breakwater, N.S. (*Ans.*) 306.
 Roche Bay Pier, N.B. (*Ans.*) 306.

LANGEVIN, Mr.—*Con.*

- L'Assomption Riv. Navigation (*Ans.*) 306.
 Port Credit Harbour repair (*Ans.*) 306.
 Parl. Grounds, claim of C. Vaux, 309.
 Accident to the Vice-Regal Party, on M. to concur in Ad. (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 354.
 Toronto Harbour improvement (*Ans.*) 380.
 Philipsburgh Breakwater (*Ans.*) 380.
 Private Bills Pets., on M. to extend time, 415.
 Man. Prov. Buildings (*Ans.*) 416.
 Man., extension of limits (*Ans.*) 416.
 Cocagne Public Wharf, N. B. (*Ans.*) 484.
 Navigation between London and Chatham, Ont. (*Ans.*) 484.
 Chatham, Ont., Govt. Offices (*Ans.*) 569.
 Matane Postmaster, 582.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legislation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. (Mr. Mills) 591; on Rep. of Com., 953.
 Sudden death of Mr. Holton, 651.
 Jordan Bay Breakwater, N.S. (*Ans.*) 785.
 Caughnawaga Ferry-boat, pier at Lachine (*Ans.*) 785.
 Belle Creek Harbour, P.E.I. (*Ans.*) 785.
 Rustico Harbour, P.E.I., (*Ans.*) 786.
 B. C. Penitentiary, etc., charges against B. W. Pearse (*Ans.*) 786.
 Matane Wharf (*Ans.*) 786.
 American Ry. Decoy Agents (*Ans.*) 786.
 Govt. Lands at Sorel (*Ans.*) 786.
 Baie St. Paul Wharf (*Ans.*) 787.
 Yamaska Riv. navigation, 806.
 Private Bills Reps. (*Ms. to extend time*) 870, 871, 1449.
 Freight rates on I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry., 878.
 P.O. Inspectors, 939.
 Shippegan Gully Channel, N.B., 947.
 Aid to distressed fishermen in Guysborough, N.S. (*Ans.*) 1039.
 Mail contract in Lévis (*Ans.*) 1152.
 International bridges over St. John Riv., N. B. (*Ans.*) 1152.
 St. Maurice Riv. improvement (*Ans.*) 1152.
 Emerson and Turtle Mountain Ry. Co. Incomp. B. 26 (Mr. Royal) on M. to withdraw B. 1227.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for Com. of Wh., 1279.
 Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1354; Militia (R. Military College) 1367; Public Works and Buildings (E. Block, Parl. Buildings) 1367, (Telegraphs) 1367, (Stratford P. O.) 1368, (Quebec Citadel Cliff) 1368, (Woodstock P. O.), 1368, (Nanaimo P. O.) 1369, (Govt. Workshops, Ottawa) 1369, (Riv. Trent) 1369, (Assiniboine Riv.) 1369, (Dredging) 1370, (Telegraphs) 1674, (Parl. Buildings) 1883, (Man. Lt.-Gov.'s Residence) 1950, (Toronto Harbour) 1950, (Shippegan Harbour) 1951, (Tignish Breakwater) 1951, (Miscellaneous) 1953; Light-house and Coast Service, (Fraser Riv., B.C.) 1679; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Rys. and Canals) 1840.
 Harbour Commissions, revocation of (*Ans.*) 1371.
 C.P.R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1474.
 Ry. stations in Prov. of Que. (*Ans.*) 1627.
 Dismissal of St. Romuald Postmaster (*Ans.*) 1628.

LANGEVIN, Mr.—*Con.*

- Quebec Tidal Dock completion, in Com. on Res., 1659.
 Can. Telegraph Co. Incomp. B. 54 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. to recommit (Mr. Macdougall) 1685.
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 1^o, 1773.
 Telegraph Subsidy Act Repeal (*B.* 117 1**) 1820.
 Concurrence—Parl. Buildings, 1898; Cow Bay works, payment for, 1976.
 LARUE, Mr.
 Mail Contract in Lévis (*Ques.*) 1151.
 Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1357.
 Dismissal of St. Romuald Postmaster (*Ques.*) 1628.
L'Assomption River Navigation.
Ques. (Mr. Hurteau) 306.
 LAURIER, Mr.
 Dangerous cliff in Champlain-street, Quebec (*M. for Cor.*) 179.
 Sudden death of Mr. Holton, 650.
 Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 7 (Mr. Baby) on M. for 2^o, 993.
 Dismissal of G. T. Tremblay, postmaster at St. John's, Que. (*M. for Cor.*) 1399.
 Dismissal of F. X. Dulac, postmaster at L'Anaudiers (*M. for papers*) 1399.
 Dismissal of Que. Lt.-Gov., on Res. (Mr. Mackenzie) 1782.
 I. C. R., stock on Lévis and Kennebec Ry. (*Ques.*) 1820.
 Pet. against Mr. Massue, 1916, 1981.
 Village post-offices (*Ques.*) 1982.
Law and Translation Departments, Amalgamation of.
 Com. appointed, 781.
Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship.
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Blake) 487.
Lennox, the Member for. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
Letellier, Hon. Luc. See "QUEBEC."
Lévis, Mail Contract in.
Ques. (Mr. LaRue) 1151.
Library of Parliament. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
 LITTLE, Mr.
 Toronto Custom-house employés (*M. for statement*) 1376.
Loans, Dominion, terms on which negotiated.
 M. for Ret. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 55.
Lobster Canning, Drawbacks on Exported Tin Plate.
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Ogden) 309.
Lobster Fishery in N. S. and Gulf of St. Lawrence.
Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 1039.
Lockport Harbour Buoy, N.S.
Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 1039.
London and Chatham, Ont., Navigation between.
Ques. (Mr. Stephenson) 484.

*London and Evelyn Post-offices, Ont.,**Mails between.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 504.*London, Canadian Permanent Representative in.*Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 46.

LONGLEY, Mr.

I.C.R., rolling stock awaiting repair, 149.

Inspection of smoked herring (*Ques.*) 306.Fish Inspection, on Res. in Com. (*Mr. Baby*) 657, 659.Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (*Mr. Béchard*) on M. for 2°, 897.B. C. Judges B. 44 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) on Amt. to 3° (*Mr. Blake*) 933.Wassall's bridge patent (*M. for papers*) 949.Supply—Penitentiaries (*St. Vincent de Paul*) 1017; *Rys.* (I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry.) 1711.*Ways and Means*—On M. to recommit Res., 1252.Petroleum Inspection Law Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2°, 1656.Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (*Mr. Masson*) on M. for 3°, 1664.Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (*Mr. Bowell*) on Amt. (*Mr. Boulton*) to M. for 3°, 1965.*Mail Contract between Victoria, B.C., and San Francisco.*Res. prop. (*Mr. Bunster*) 496.M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 904.*Mail Contract in Lévis.*Ques. (*Mr. LaRue*) 1151.**Mail Printing Co. Incorp. B. No. 40**(*Mr. McCarthy*).

1°, 268; 2°, 306; in Com., 761; 3°, 761.

*Mail Service between London and Evelyn Post-Offices.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Oliver*) 504.*Mail Service between Victoria and Cassiar, B. C.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 936.*Mail Service in Bruce.*M. for Cor. (*Mr. Gillies*) 1639.*Mail Service on Wellington, Grey and Bruce Ry.*Ques. (*Mr. Gillies*) 785.*Mail Service to Pelee Island.*M. for contract (*Mr. Oliver*) 499.

MANITOBA.

*Allotments to Minors.*Ques. (*Mr. Schultz*) 80.*Land Sales.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 156.M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 179.*Advertising Land Regulations.*M. for statement (*Mr. Mills*) 179.*Squatters on C. P. R. Reserve.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 349.*Provincial Buildings.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 416.*Extension of Prov. Limits.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 416.*Applications for Timber Limits.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Drew*) 508.

MANITOBA.—Con.

*Land Patents.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 873.*Dominion Land Settlement.*M. for O. C. (*Mr. Schultz*) 880.*Land Warrants.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.*Crown Timber Permits.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.*C. P. R. trains, running of.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.*Protection of Settlers.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 1040.*Disputed Land Claims, Trial of.*M. for Reps. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 1398.*Land Allotments.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 1628.*Ticket Agencies for, in Can.*Ques. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 1820.**Man. Lands Claims Settlement B.**No. 94 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*).

1°, 1099; 2°, 1359; in Com., 1359; 3°, 1359.

Man. S. Western Colonisation Ry. Co. Incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 63(*Mr. Schultz*).

1°, 509; 2°, 590; in Com., 1699; 3°, 1699.

*Marine and Fisheries Dept. Rep., cost of.*Ques. (*Mr. Tassé*) 1370.Ques. (*Mr. Houde*) 1627.**Mar. Jurisdiction Act Amt. Act Amt. B. No. 52** (*Mr. Shaw*).

1°, 379; 2° prop., 607; Deb. adj., 608.

Mar. Jurisdiction Act Amt. Act B. No. 86 (*Mr. Patterson, Esq.*).

1°, 977.

Mar. Provs. claims to Fishery Award.
See "Fishery Award."*Mar. Provs., Freight Rates to and from.*M. for statement (*Mr. Snowball*) 498.*Mar. Provs., Herring Fishery Licenses.*Ques. (*Sir. A. J. Smith*) 1039.*Mar. Provs. Lobster Fishery.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 133.**Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. No. 5** (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).

1°, 44; B. wdn. 196.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. No. 30 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).

1°, 196; 2° prop., 291; Amt. 6 w. h.

(*Mr. Thompson, Haldimand*) 296; Adj.Deb., 434; Amt. negated (*Y. 19, N. 140*)451; 2°, 451; in Com., 590; Amt. (*Mr.**Mills*) 590; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr. Wil-**liams*) 593; Amt. to Amt. negated, 594;Amt. carried, 594; rep., 594; Amt. (*Mr.**Houde*) carried, 952; in Com., 953; rep.,

953; concurrence prop., 1381; Amt. 6 m.

h. (*Mr. Jones*) 1393; Amt. to Amt. (*Mr.**Houde*) 1395; Amt. to Amt. negated (*Y.**10, N. 130*) 1396; Amt. negated (*Y. 34,**N. 108*) 1396; B. concurred in, 1397; onM. for 3°, Amt. (*Mr. Charlton*) negated(*Y. 40, N. 102*) 1397; 3°, 1397.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.

M. to print a Pet. (*Mr. Jones*) 610.

MASSON, Mr.

Militia Rep. (*presented*) 44.

Montmorency Election, introduction of Member, 112.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (*Mr. Keeler*) on M. for 2°, 247.

N.B. Militia drill camps (*Ans.*) 306.

Q. M. O. and O. Ry., 379.

Freight Rates to and from Mar. Provs., 498.

Immigration pamphlets, 503.

Militia Acts Amt. (B. 70, 1**) 583; on M. for 2°, 978; in Com., 985; on M. for 3°, 1661.

Militia annual drill (*Ans.*) 595.

Queen's Birthday Review at Quebec (*Ans.*) 596.

Militia Orders and "The Established Church" (*Ans.*) 1039.

Supply—Militia (Brig.-Majors) 1361, (Ammunition) 1363, (Clothing) 1364, (Drill Sheds) 1366, (R. Military College) 1366, (Military Schools) 1367, (Guard at Rideau Hall) 1367.

10th Royals, Toronto, 1629.

Toronto Field Battery, 1639.

Concurrence—Militia (conversion of ordnance) 1894; Dempster gratuity (*struck out*) 1895.

Massue, Mr., Pet. against. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."**MASSUE, Mr.**

Statement in reference to Pet., 1981.

Masters and Mates on Inland Waters.

Remarks (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*) 1917.

Matane Postmaster.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Fiset*) 582.

Matane Wharf.

Ques. (*Mr. Fiset*) 786.

M. for statement (*Mr. Fiset*) 1398.

Members, Return or Introduction of. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS,"—also *Names.***MERNER, Mr.**

G.T.R., uniform freight rates (*Ques.*) 198.

Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1349

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Commanding attendance of Commons in Senate Chamber, 1, 977, 1851.

Transmitting O. C. containing cause assigned for removal of late Lt.-Gov. of Quebec; 45.

Recommending grant (\$100,000) for relief of distress in Ireland, 59.

Appointing Commissioners for management of Internal Economy, H. of Com., 59.

Acknowledging with thanks the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, 113.

Transmitting Reply to Joint Address of both Houses on the occasion of the accident to the Vice-Regal Party, 483.

Transmitting Estimates for 1880-81, 483.

Transmitting Supplementary Estimates for 1879-80, 483.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.—Con.

Recommending grant in aid of sufferers by fire in Hull, 1669.

Transmitting Supplementary Estimates for 1880-81, 1915.

Transmitting further Supplementary Estimates for 1879-80, 1915.

Transmitting despatch and Cor. in reference to vote for the relief of distress in Ireland, 2023.

METHOT, Mr.

Usury Prohibition (*Que.*) (B. 15, 1**) 114.

Stratford Post office, 371.

Military or Police County Warrants.

Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.

Militia Acts Amt. B No. 70 (*Mr. Masson*).

1*, 583; 2°, 978; in Com., 982; 3°, 1661.

Militia Annual Drill.

Ques. (*Mr. Caron*) 595.

Militia Orders and "The Established Church."

Ques. (*Mr. Skinner*) 1039.

Militia Review at Quebec on Queen's Birthday.

Ques. (*Mr. Caron*) 596.

MILLS, Mr.

Address, on the, 37, 39, 41.

N.W.T., importation of cattle (*Res. prop.*) 54.

Ont. and Can. Territories Boundary (B. 9, 1**) 59.

Boundary between Ont. and Unorganised Territories of Dom., on M. for Com. (*point of Order*) 64, 66.

B.C. Additional Supreme Ct. Judges, on Res., 120

Financial Rets., on M. for Standing Order, 136.

Man. and N.W.T. Land Regulations, advertising (*M. for statement*) 179.

Payments under Indian Treaty No. 7 (*M. for statement*) 179.

Relief of the distress in Ireland, 181.

Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 185, 186.

Prohibition of immigrants' landing, on M. for O. C. (*Mr. Fleming*) 203.

Election Act Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Bolduc*) on M. for 2°, 230.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (*Mr. Keeler*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Blake*) 262.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (*Mr. Colby*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 286.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on M. for 2°, 296; in Com. (*Amt.*) 590.

Payment of annuities under Indian Treaties 4 and 6 (*M. for statement*) 308.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 314.

Indian Instructors (*Ms. for O. C. and statement*) 348.

The Member for Lennox, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria*) 413.

Criminal Law Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 479, 482; in Com., 596.

Senate expenditure (*M. for statement*) 495.

MILLS, Mr.—Con.

- Mail contract between Victoria, B. C., and S. Francisco, 497.
 Immigration pamphlets, 503.
 Riv. du Loup Br. Purchase Confirmation B. 81 (Sir C. Tupper) on M. for 1°, 782.
 Ways and Means, reception of Rep., on Ques. of procedure, 926.
 N. W. Mounted Police, 941.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2°, 958.
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on M. for 2°, 979; in Com., 983.
 Supply—Penitentiaries (Kingston) 1014; Indians (N.B.) 1690, (B.C.) 1690, (Provisions at annuity assemblies) 1697, (Schools) 1698; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Inland Revenue) 1838.
 Ways and Means—on M. to recommit Res., 1295.
 Indian Lands in B.C., 1634.
 Ont. Boys' Reformatory B. 98 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) in Com., 1668.
 Dom. Notes Act Amt., in Com. on Res. 1749.
 Civil Service expenditure, on Res. (Sir. R. J. Cartwright) 1832.
 Tariff B. 102 (Sir S. L. Tilley) on M. for 3°, 1853.
 Wrecks Removal B. 107 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 2°, 1855.
 Concurrence—Public Archives, 1888; Meteorological observatories, 1890; Dom. Lands chargeable to capital, 1893; Dom. Lands, outside service, 1894; Indians, B.C., 1940; Indians, Man. and N.W.T., 1941.
 Investigations under oath B. 113 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2°, 1936.
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 95 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 1983.
 Indian Laws Amt. B. 90 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1992.
 C.P.R. Land Regulations, in Com. on Res. (Sir J. A. Macdonald) 2001.
Minerals in Eastern Townships.
 Ques. (Mr. Bourbeau) 785.
Miramichi River, nets seized on.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Snowball) 821.
Miramichi, Steam Dredge at.
 M. for statement (Mr. Snowball) 821.
Miscellaneous Expenditure, H. of Com.
 M. for statement (Mr. Charlton) 508.
MONGENAIS, Mr.
 Cedars Canal (Ques.) 484.
Montmorency Election.
 Judge's Report, 1; Announcement of Certificate of Ret., 111; Member introduced, 111; Res., introduction on certificate of Returning Officer not to form precedent, 112.
MONTPLAISIR, Mr.
 St. Maurice Riv. improvement (Ques.) 1152.
Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 39 (Mr. Scriver).
 1°, 263; 2°, 305; B. wdn., 745.
Montreal Assurance Co. B. No. 32 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier).
 1°, 233; 2°, 286; in Com., 1893; 3°, 1893.

- Montreal Canal Office, Dismissal of A. Cauchon.*
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Holton) 150.
Montreal Custom-house, Dismissal of O. Allard.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Vanasse) 508.
Montreal Custom-house, Hardware valuer.
 Ques. (Mr. Coursol) 569.
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Coursol) 1377.
Montreal, Employment of Troops in, on 12th July, 1878.
 Remarks, 987.
Montreal Examining Warehouse.
 M. for statement (Mr. Desjardins) 178.
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Acts Amt. B. No. 124 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.).
 1°, 1917; 2°, 1999; in Com., 1999; 3°, 1999.
Montreal River Police.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Desjardins) 178.
Montreal Telegraph Co. Acts Amt. B. No. 65 (Mr. Gaultt).
 1°, 509; 2°, 626; in Com., 1470; 3°, 1470; Sen. Amt. disagreed to, 1893.
Mortgage Regulation B. No. 11 (Mr. Orton).
 1°, 79; 2° prop., 953; 2°, 977; in Com., 1642; Amts. m., 1643; 3°, 1644.
Mount Pleasant, appointment of Postmaster at.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Williams) 1227.
MOUSSEAU, Mr.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2°, 247.
 Criminal Procedure Law Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) on M. for 2° (Amt. 6 m. h.) 362.
 Stratford Post-office, 372.
 Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 425.
 Veterans (M. for statement) 508.
 Sudden death of Mr. Holton, 654.
 Pet. against Mr. Massue, 1915.
 Supply—Legislation (Books for Library) 1947.
Murray Canal.
 M. for Repr. (Mr. Keeler) 53.
MUTTART, Mr.
 Civil Service, Inside Division (M. for Ret.) 171.
 Bay Fortune Breakwater, P.E.I. (Ques.) 234.
 Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 795, 1200.
 Freight Rates on P. E. I. Ry. (M. for papers) 879.
 Northern Light steamer, 883.
 P. E. I. Ry. (Ques.) 1523.
 Supply—Post-office, 1912.
MCCALLUM, Mr.
 Dom. Grange Incorp. Act Amt. (B. 33, 1°) 233.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 329.
 Mar. Jurisdiction Act Amt. Act. Amt. B. 52 (Mr. Shaw) on M. for 2°, 608.
 Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 661; on M. to concur in Res. (sawlogs) 1329.

MCCALLUM, Mr.—Con.

10th Royals, Toronto, 1631.
Dom. Notes Act Amt., on Res., 1746.
Supply—Canals, 1796, (Welland) 1809.
Masters and Mates on Inland Waters, 1917.

MCCARTHY, Mr.

Boundary between Ont. and Can. Territories, on M. for Com., 96.
Ry. Commissioners Court (B. 20, 1°) 153, 154.
Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 183, 184, 186, 190.
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co. (B. 35, 1°*) 233.
Supreme and Exchequer Ct. Act. Amt. (B. 37, 1°) 223; in Com., 889.
Criminal Law Amt. (B. 38, 1°*) 233; on M. for 2°, 480; in Com., 599.
Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Blake) 259.
Mail Printing Co. Incorp. (B. 40, 1°*) 268.
Common Assaults Defendants Witnesses Act Amt. (B. 41, 1°) 268; in Com., 601.
Can. Telegraph Co. Incorp. (B. 54, 1°*) 416.
Beaver and Toronto Mutual Fire Insurance Co. Act Amt. (B. 55, 1°*) 416.
Direct U.S. Cable Co. Corporate Powers Extension to Can. (B. 72, 1°*) 594.
Northern Ry. Co. Act (M. to introduce Interpretation B.) 609.
Northern Ry. Co. Act Interpretation (B. 76, 1°*) 626; on M. for 2°, 761.

MCCUAIG, Mr.

Murray Canal, on M. for Repr. (Amt.) 58.
Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 108; in Com., 222.
Stratford Post-office, 370.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. 6 w.h. (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 441.
Relief of the distress in Ireland, 745.
Trent Waters Canal Surveys, 933.
Supply—Canals, 1795.
Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on Amt. 3 m.h. (Mr. Ross, W. Middlesex) 1972.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.

Oaths of Office (B. 1°*) 2.
Sel. Standing Coms. (m.) 3; Com. to strike (m.) 56.
Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 4, 44, 182, 183, 185, 188.
Address, on the, 23.
Argenteuil Election, introduction of Member (Res.) 45.
Permanent Representative of Can. in London (Ans.) 46.
Parly. Printing contracts (Ans.) 46.
Boundary between Can. and Ont. (Ans.) 46; on M. for Com., 64, 73.
Relief of the distress in Ireland (Ans.) 56; (Res.) 126, 123; (M. for Ad.) 180, 181; (remarks) 745.
C.P.R., Imperial aid to (Ans.) 56.
Notices for Public Bs., 79.
Library Com. (m) 79.
Printing Com. (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 79.
Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 1°, 80; on M. for 2°. 239.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—Con.

Sable Island, Telegraphic communication with (Ans.) 80.
Stratford Post-office and Custom-house (Ans.) 80.
Allotments to minors in Man. (Ans.) 89.
Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 106; in Com., 221; on Amt. (Mr. Blake) 286.
Accident to the Vice-Regal Party, 112; (M. to concur in Ad.) 353.
B.C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges, on Res., 118.
Financial Returns, on M. for Standing Order, 136, 289, 290.
C.P.R. Land Commission (Ans.) 155.
Man. and N.W.T. land sales, on M. for Ret., 158.
The Member for Lennox, on M. to refer Pet. (Mr. Casey) 197; (remarks) 281, 380; on Amt. (Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria) 413.
Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2°, 228.
Parly. Printing contract (M. to instruct Printing Com. to enquire) 233.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on M. to adj. Deb. on 2°, 305; on Amt. (Mr. Mills) 590; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Williams) 593.
Timber Transmission, Tariff of Tolls, on M. to refer Res. to Com. of Wh. (Mr. White, N. Renfrew) 313.
Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 319, 329.
Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right, 335.
Public Officers' Security B. 28 (Sir S. L. Tilley) in Com., 352.
Stratford Post-office, 369.
Private Bs. Pets., on Ms. to extend time, 452, 611.
Private Bs., on Ms. to extend time, 453, 611.
N.W.T. Acts Consolidation (B. 57, 1°*) 453.
Panama, line of steamers to (Ans.) 484.
Govt. Life Insurance (Ans.) 484.
Cape Negro Island Harbour, N.S. (Ans.) 484.
Shelburne Harbour Fog Whistle (Ans.) 484.
Fourché Harbour Fog Bell (Ans.) 484.
Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 490.
Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2°, 590.
Audit of Parly. Accounts, 595, 1326.
Criminal Law Amt. B. 38 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 597.
Northern Ry. Co. Act., on M. to introduce Interpretation B. (Mr. McCarthy) 609.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, on M. to print a Pet. (Mr. Jones) 610.
Sudden death of Mr. Holton (remarks) 649; (M. to adj. for funeral) 657.
Govt. Business to have precedence on Thursdays (Res.) 657.
Fish Inspection, on Res. in Com. (Mr. Baby) 660.
Northern Ry. Co. Act Interpretation B. 76 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 761.
Private Bs. Repr., on M. to extend time 871.
Chinese, Pets. in relation to, on M. to print, 872.
Superannuation Fund (Ans.) 873.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—*Con.*
 Commercial Union with U.S. (*Ans.*) 873.
 Man. Land patents (*Ans.*) 873.
 Extradition, on Res. (Mr. Blake) 876.
 Military or Police Bounty Land warrants (*Ans.*) 936.
 Crown Timber permits in Man. (*Ans.*) 936.
 Appointment of Mr. Trutch in B.C., 937.
 N. W. Mounted Police, 941.
 Can. Resident Agent in United Kingdom (*B.* 88, 1**) 977; on M. for 2°, 1857, 1872.
 Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 978, ^{v. 23} (*Amt.*) 1183.
 Militia Acts *Amt.* B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on M. for 2°, 980; in Com., 982; on reception of Rep. of Com., 987.
 Charges against Mr. Rykert, 1008.
Supply—Adm. of Justice (Magistrates' Expenses, N. W. T.) 1009; Penitentiaries (Kingston) 1012; Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1029, (Library) 1038; Public Works and Buildings (Nanaimo P.O.) 1369; Ocean and Riv. Service (Mail Subsidies, Brazil) 1675; Geological Survey (Removal of Museum) 1688; Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1688, (N.B.) 1690, (B.C.) 1690, (Grist Mill) 1694, (Provisions at annuity assemblies) 1696, (Schools) 1698, (Man. and N. W.) 1811, 1946; N. W. Mounted Police, 1813; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Interior) 1838, (Dept. of Inland Revenue) 1839; Dom. Lands (Outside Service, B. C.) 1849, (Man.) 1952; Public Works and Buildings (Geological Museum) 1884; Miscellaneous (Relief of Distress in Ireland) 1886, (Compensation to members of N. W. Mounted Police) 1952, (Indian curiosities) 1955, (Superannuation Refunds) 1955.
 Indian Laws Consolidation (*B.* 90, 1**) 1016; on M. for 2°, 1989; in Com., 1997.
 Trust and Loan Co. (*remarks*) 1038.
 Protection of Man. settlers (*Ans.*) 1040.
 Can. Public Lands, on Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1051).
 Man. Lands Claims Settlement (*B.* 94, 1* 1099 (Vol. ii).
 N. W. T. Criminals Trials Fees (*Res. in Com.*) 1099 (Vol. ii).
Ways and Means—on M. to recommit Res., 1130; on *Amt.* (Mr. Paterson, S. Brant) embossed books 1327.
 Queen's Birthday Review at Quebec (*Ans.*) 1151.
 Dom. Lands Act *Amt.* (*B.* 95, 1**) 1151; on M. for 3°, 1982.
 Dom. Lands Act Extension to B.C. Act Repeal (*B.* 96, 1**) 1151.
 Immigration of British Tenant Farmers (*Ans.*) 1152.
 Fishery Privileges in Ottawa Riv., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Cockburn, W. Northumberland) on point of Order, 1162, 1164.
 Insolvent Cos. Winding-up B. 97 (Mr. Abbott) on M. for 1°, 1229.
 Govt. business to have precedence on Mondays (*Res.*) 1262.
 Protection to brakemen on Rys. (*Ans.*) 1370.
 Sandford Fleming (*Ans.*) 1370.
 Naturalisation Laws (*Ans.*) 1371.
 Bridge across St. John Riv., N.B. (*Ans.*) 1371.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—*Con.*
 C. P. R., commencement of construction in B. C. (*Ans.*) 1627.
 Mar. Land allotments (*Ans.*) 1628.
 Compensation to Mrs. Garret for Rebellion losses in Man. (*Ans.*) 1628.
 10th Royals, Toronto, 1630, 1632.
 Indian Lands in B. C., 1636.
 N. W. Mounted Police Force, 1638.
 Chinese Immigration, on M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. DeCosmos) 1641.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orten) on *Amt.* (Mr. Orten) 1643.
 Mrs. John Young Annuity (*Res. in Com.*) 1660, (*B.* 116, 1**) 1661.
 Hull Fire Relief grant (*M. for Com.*) 1669; in Com., 1669.
 Can. Telegraph Co. Incorp. B. 54 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. to recommit (Mr. Macdougall) 1688.
 Dom. Notes Act *Amt.*, in Com. on Res., 1751.
 Govt. business to have precedence on Wednesdays (*Res.*) 1772.
 Civil Service Reform (*Ans.*) 1772.
 Mr. Mackenzie's resignation of Opposition Leadership, 1815.
 P. E. I. Judges' salaries, 1821.
 Wrecks Removal B. 107 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) on M. for 2°, 1855; on Sen. *Amts.*, 1984.
 Pilotage Act *Amt.* B. 116 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) in Com., 1880.
Concurrence—Dom. Lands chargeable to capital, 1891; Parlt. Buildings, 1899; Dom. Lands, 1900; Indians, B. C., 1940; Indians, Man. and N. W. T., 1941.
 Mr. Cameron's vote on Concurrence, 1902.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, on *Amt.* (Mr. Blake) to Res., 1928.
 Investigations under Oath B. 113 (Mr. McDonald, Pictou) on M. for 2°, 1936; in Com., 1938.
 Official Rep. of Debates, 1956.
 Pet. against Mr. Massue, 1981.
 Can. Waters Navigation B. 121 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P. E. I.) on M. for 2°, 1999.
 Panama Canal, on M. for 2° Supply B., 2007.
 Session's work, on M. for 2° Supply B., 2012.
 Preservation of order in the House, on M. for 2° Supply B., 2014.
 Parly. Printing contract, on *Amt.* (Mr. Paterson, Essex) to M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2016, 2022.
 Close of the Session, 2023.
 MACDONALD (King's, P. E. I.,) Mr.
 Souris Works, P. E. I. (*Quest.*) 234.
 P. E. I. Ry. communication, 578.
 Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 1201.
 Petroleum Inspection Law *Amt.* B. 4 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 1658.
 Petroleum Inspection Act *Amt.*, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Baby) 1921.
 National Policy, Pet. against, on M. for 2° Supply B., 2011.
 McDONALD (Pictou), Mr.
 Penitentiaries Rep. (*presented*) 44.
 Constitutionality of Temperance Act, 1878 (*Ans.*) 45.

McDONALD (Pictou) Mr.—Con.
 Boundary between Can. Territories and Ont., 67.
 B.C. additional Supreme Ct Judges (*Res.*) 114.
 Dismissal of D. H. Waterbury (*Ans.*) 155.
 Dorchester Penitentiary (*Ans.*) 198.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2°, 236.
 B.C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges (*B.* 44, 1°) 270, 275; on Amt. to 3° (Mr. Blake) 933.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. to concur in Amt., 285; on Amt. (Mr. Blake) 351.
 Codification of Criminal Laws (*Ans.*) 306.
 Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right, 338, 346, 347.
 Criminal Procedure Law Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) on M. for 2°, 361.
 Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m, h, (Mr. Baker) 419, 429.
 Criminal Law Amt. B. 38 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 481.
 Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 487.
 Keewatin Jail Accommodation (*Ans.*) 569.
 N.W.T. and Keewatin Prisoners' safe-keeping (*B.* 77, 1°) 657.
 Amalgamation of Sen. and H. of Com. Law and Translation Depts. (*M. to appoint Com.*) 781.
 Cruelty to Animals Act Amt. (*B.* 83, 1°) 873; on M. for 2°, 1665.
 Official Assignees' Rets. (*Ans.*) 873.
 Supreme and Exchequer Ct. Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 890.
 Insolvent Fire and Marine Insurance Cos. winding-up B. 18 (Mr. Ives) on M. for 2°, 892.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts., 950.
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) in Com., 983.
 Supply—Adm. of Justice (Magistrates' Expenses, N. W. T.) 1009, (Circuit allowances, B.C.) 1010; Police, 1010; Penitentiaries, (Kingston) 1010, (St. Vincent de Paul) 1015, (Dorchester) 1017; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Justice, Penitentiaries Br.) 1837.
 Dorchester Penitentiary (*B.* 91, 1°) 1016.
 Better Prevention of Crime Act continuation (*B.* 92, 1°) 1016.
 Conflicts of magisterial jurisdiction in Keewatin (*Ans.*) 1040.
 Mar. Provs. Claims on Fishery Award, 1210.
 Ont. Boys' Reformatory (*B.* 98, 1°) 1230; on M. for 2°, 1666; in Com. 1668.
 P.E.I. Juvenile Offenders' Reformatory (*B.* 99, 1°) 1230.
 Ont. Girls' Industrial Refuge (*B.* 100, 1°) 1230.
 Offence against the Person Act Amt. (*B.* 103, 1°) 1470.
 Building Societies and Loan Cos. Relief (*B.* 105, 1°) 1626.
 Investigations under Oath (*B.* 113, 1°) 1723; on M. for 2°, 1935; in Com., 1937.
 Pictou Harbour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 3°, 1854.
 Wrecks Removal B. 107 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 2°, 1856; in Com., 1915.
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) in Com., 1878.
 Q. M. O. and O. Ry. (*B.* 118, 1°) 1852; on withdrawal of B., 1998.

McDONALD (Pictou) Mr.—Con.
 Ont. Disputed Territory Criminal Justice (*B.* 119, 1°) 1852; on M. for 2°, 1939.
 Criminal Evidence Law Amt. (*B.* 120, 1°) 1852; on M. for 2°, 1940; in Com., 1940.
 Lambton County Ct. Judge (*Ans.*) 1982.
Macdonell, John A., Breach of Privilege Case. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."
Macdonell, Mr.
 Return of, 2; Introduction of, 2.
MACDONELL (N. Lanark), Mr.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 193.
 Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 50 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2°, 901.
 Junior Judge of Stormont, Dundas and Gengarry (*M. for Cor.*) 977.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for Com. of Wh., 1279.
 Supply—Canals, 1805.
 Parly. Printing contract, on M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2021.
MACDONNELL (Inverness), Mr.
 Address, on the, 40.
 Accidents on I.C.R. (*M. for Ret.*) 58.
 Boundary between Ont. and Can. Territories, on M. for Com., 95.
 Criminal Procedure Law Amendment B. 14 (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) on M. for 1°, 114.
 I.C.R. rolling stock awaiting repair, 145.
 Port Hood Wharf repairs (*Ques.*) 155.
 Dismissal of Fishery Officers in Inverness (*M. for Ret.*) 159, 161.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 225.
 Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 2°, 244.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors for N. S. (*Ques.*) 306.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 318.
 Fishery Award, claims of the Mar. Provs. (*Res.*) 787, 797.
MACDOUGALL, Mr.
 Boundary between Ont. and Can. Territories, on M. for Com., 85.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 185.
 The Member for Lennox, on Amt. (Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria) 413.
 Nelson Valley Ry. and Transportation Co. Incorp. (*B.* 68, 1°) 568.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2°, 588; on M. for Com. of Wh., 1260.
 Sudden death of Mr. Holton, 656.
 N.W. Mounted Police, 940.
 Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1095.
 Fishery privileges on Ottawa Riv., 1169.
 C.P.R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1598.
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on M. for 3°, 1663.
 Can. Telegraph Co. Incorp. B. 54 (Mr. McCarthy) (*M. to recomit to Standing Com.*) 1683.

McGREEVY, Mr.

Quebec and Gulf Ports Steamship Co. Act
Amt. (B. 51, 1^o) 379.

McINNES, Mr.

Lightship on the Sand Heads, Fraser River,
B.C. (Ques.) 155.

Stratford Post-office, 371.

B.C. Penitentiary, charges against B. W.
Pearse (Ques.) 786.

Supply—Penitentiaries (B.C.) 1024.

C.P.R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply
(Mr. Blake) 1485.

McISAAC, Mr.

Free admission of Can. cattle into New-
foundland (Ques.) 569.

P.E.I. Ry. communication, 573.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 1188.

*MacLean, Roger & Co.'s claim for breach
of Printing Contract.* See "CONTRACTS."

MCKAY, Mr.

I.C.R. employés at Moncton, 139.

I.C.R. rolling stock awaiting repair, 146.

Supply—Fisheries, 1680; Rys. (I.C.R. and
P.E.I. Ry.) 1721.

MACKENZIE, Mr.

Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case,
4, 184, 186, 188.

Address, on the, 15, 36, 37, 42.

Removal of the late Lt.-Gov. of Quebec, 45.

Coteau du Lac Ry. Bridge (*M. for Reprs.*) 47,
50.

Carillon Works contract (*M. to print*) 51; (*M.
for Ret.*) 55.

C.P.R. route via Peace River Valley or Pine
River Pass (*M. for Reprs.*) 51, 52.

Negotiations with France and Spain (*M. for
instructions to Commissioners*) 53.

C.P.R. tenders and contracts (*M. for Ret.*) 55.

Relief of the distress in Ireland (Ques.) 56;
on Res., 126; on M. for Ad., 180.

Ques. of Procedure—Insolvency Repeal Bills,
56, 57.

Boundary between Ont. and Can. Territories,
on M. for Com., 80.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (*Mr. Colby*) on
M. for 2^o, 105.

Montmorency Election, introduction of Mem-
ber, 111, 112.

Accident to the Vice-Regal Party, 112; on
M. to concur in Ad. (*sec.*) 353.

Free admission of coal, 133.

Financial Returns (*M. for Standing Order*)
136 290.

I.C.R. rolling-stock awaiting repair, 143.

Importation of grain in bond (*M. for Ret.*)
151.

Railway Commissioners Court B. 20 (*Mr.
McCarthy*) on M. for 1^o, 154.

Kaministiquia River, depth of water in, 164,
165, 166, 167.

Baptist Union Incorp. (B. 27, 1^o) 180.

Prohibition of immigrants' landing, 206,
215.

The Member for Lennox, 281.

Banking and Currency (Ques.) 282, (*remarks*)
284.

Parlt. Grounds, claim of C. Vaux, 309.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 314, 325.

Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right, 335, 345.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.

Stratford Post-office, 373.

Q.M.O. and O. Ry. (*M. for Cor.*) 378.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors (*M. for Ret.*)
379.

C.P.R. contracts, on M. for statement (*Mr.
McLennan*) 392, 455.

Railway statistics, 417.

Private Bs. Pets., on Ms. to extend time, 452,
610.

Leeds and Grenville County Judgeship, 487.

Mails between London and Evelyn P.O., 505.

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. surveys, 506, 507.

C.P.R. location by Marcus Smith, 506, 507.

Supply—on formal vote, 509; Arts, Agricul-
ture and Statistics (Census) 1332; Immi-
gration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1332,

1881, (Quarantine) 1949; Militia (Cloth-
ing) 1363, (R. Military College) 1366;

Public Works and Buildings (Tele-
graphs) 1367, (Ottawa P.O.) 1368,

(Woodstock P.O.) 1368; Railways (C.P.R.
and I.C.R.) 1670, (I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry.)

1706, (Windsor Br. Ry.) 1906; Geological
Survey (Removal of Museum) 1688;

Canals, 1802; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Inland
Revenue) 1839; Dom. Lands (Outside Ser-
vice, B.C.) 1849; Public Works and Build-
ings (Parlt. Buildings) 1883, (Geological
Museum) 1884; Miscellaneous (Mr. Miall's
services, Judge Armour's services) 1885;

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Quebec
Exhibition) 1948.

Ways and Means—on the Budget, 559; on
M. to receive Rep. of Com., 611; on Ques.

of procedure, 926; on Res. 1, items 7 and 18,
927; item 47, 928, 929; on Res. 2, item 5,
931; on M. to recommit, 1104, 1324.

Printing of a Parly. paper (*remarks*) 569.

Dom. Dam, Devil Lake, 571.

Audit of Parly. accounts, 595.

Stock Brokers' Regulation B. 42 (Mr. Gir-
ouard, Jacques Cartier) on M. for 2^o, 606.

Northern Ry. Co. Act, on M. to introduce
Interpretation B. (Mr. McCarthy) 609.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, on
M. to print a Pet. (Mr. Jones) 610.

Sudden death of Mr. Holton (*remarks*) 650.

Fish Inspection, on Res. in Com., 660.

Riv. du Loup Br. Purchase Confirmation B.
81 (Sir C. Tupper) on M. for 1^o, 782.

Welland Canal, opening of navigation (Ques.)
783.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 797,
978.

Immigration pamphlets, 810.

Chinese, Pets. in relation to, 872.

Chateaugay Electoral District (*M. to issue
writ*) 904.

Appointment of Mr. Trutch in B.C., 937.

Trent Waters Canal surveys, 938.

N.W. Mounted Police, 942.

I.C.R., supply of nut-locks, 943.

I.C.R., carriage of sugar from Halifax, 944.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on M.
for 2^o, 978; in Com., 985; on reception of
Rep. of Com., 987.

Charges against Mr. Rykert, 1008.

Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. White,
Cardwell) to Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res.
(Mr. Charlton) 1090.

Fishery privileges in Ottawa Riv., on M. for

MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.

- Ret. (Mr. Cockburn, W. Northumberland) on point of Order, 1162, 1164.
 Interference of Hon. R. W. Scott in Carleton Election, on M. for Com., 1169.
 Emerson and Turtle Mountain Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 26 (Mr. Royal) on M. to withdraw Bill, 1227.
 Precedence of Govt. business, on Res., 1262.
 Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for Com. of Wh., 1279.
 Prov. legislation (*M. for Ret.*) 1399.
 Expropriation of Jas. Taylor's property for C.P.R. (*M. for Ret.*) 1399.
 C.P.R. on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1518.
 10th Royals, Toronto, 1631.
 Indian Lands in B.C., 1636.
 Chinese immigration, on M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. DeCosmos) 1640.
 Quebec Tidal Dock completion, in Com. on Res., 1659.
 Hull fire relief grant, in Com., 1669.
 Can. Telegraph Co. Incorp. B. 54 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. to recommit (Mr. Macdougall) 1684.
 Dismissal of Que. Lt.-Gov. (*Res.*) 1774.
 Use of guaranteed bonds as security in Bank Act (*Ques.*) 1788.
 Resignation of Opposition Leadership (*announcement*) 1815.
 Can. Resident Agent in United Kingdom B. 88 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2^o, 1865.
Concurrence—Dom. Lands chargeable to Capital, 1892; Parl. Buildings, 1898; Payment to Mr. Miall, 1900; Cow Bay works, payment for, 1977.
 Montreal Telegraph Co. Acts Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Gault) on Sen. Amt., 1894.
 Mr. Cameron's vote on Concurrence, 1902.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, on Res., 1922; on Amt. (Mr. Blake) 1930.
 Official Rep. of Debates, 1956.

Mackenzie, Mr., Resignation of Opposition Leadership.

Announcement (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1815.

McLENNAN, Mr.

- Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 109.
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 183.
 C.P.R. contracts (*M. for statement*) 389, 478.
 Mar. Jurisdiction Act Amt. Act Amt. B. 52 (*Mr. Shaw*) on M. for 2^o, 607.
 I.C.R. carriage of sugar from Halifax, 945.
Supply—Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1032.
 Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1092.
 C.P.R., on Amt. to M. for Com. of Supply (Mr. Blake) 1606.
 Bank Act Amt., on Res., 1763; on M. for 2^o B. 115, 1980.
Concurrence—Welland Canal, 1977.

McLeod, Mr.

- Return of, 2.
 Introduction of, 2.

MACMILLAN, Mr.

- Northern Ry. Co. Act Interpretation B. 76 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2^o, 761.
 Petroleum Inspection Law Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^o, 1652.
 Claim of Mrs. Wood (*M. for papers*) 1659.
 Mr. Cameron's vote on Concurrence, 1902.

MCQUADE, Mr.

- Supply*—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1351.
National Policy, Pet. against.
 Remarks (*Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.*) 2011.

Naturalisation Laws.

Ques. (*Mr. Kranz*) 1371.

Negro Point Breakwater.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 150.

Nelson Valley Ry. and Transportation Co. Incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. Macdougall).

1^o, 568; 2^o, 626; in Com., 1470; 3^o, 1470.

New Brunswick Bank President, Directors and Co. B. No. 78 (Mr. Burpee, St. John).

1^o, 661; 2^o, 761; in Com., 1381; 3^o, 1381.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Claims against the Dominion.

Ques. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 198.

M. for Com. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 580.

Militia Drill Camps.

Ques. (*Mr. Connell*) 306.

Cattle Trade with Great Britain.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 892.

Indian Commissioners and Lands.

M. for statement (*Mr. Snowball*) 822.

International Bridges over St. John River.

Ques. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1152.

Indian Relief Grant.

M. for statement (*Mr. Gillmor*) 1398.

Newfoundland, free admission of Canadian Cattle.

Ques. (*Mr. McIsaac*) 569.

Newspaper Advertisements and Subscriptions.

M. for statement (*Mr. Fleming*) 179.

Newspaper Reports, Incorrect.

Corrections, 454.

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co. B. No. 35 (Mr. McCarthy).

1^o, 233; 2^o, 286; in Com., 625; 3^o, 761.

"Northern Light" and "Glendon" Steamers.

M. for Ret. (*Sir A. J. Smith*) 803.

"Northern Light" Steamer.

M. for statement (*Mr. Hackett*) 883.

Northern Ry. Co. Act Interpretation B. No. 76 (Mr. McCarthy).

1^o, 626; 2^o, 761.

N. W. Colonisation Land Co. Incorp. B. No. 74 (Mr. Schultz).

1^o, 608; 2^o, 952; M. for Com., 1641; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1641; Deb. adj., 1641; B. wdn., 1699.

N. W. Territories Acts Consolidation**B. No. 57** (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*).

1*, 453; 2*, 1857; in Com., 1915; 3*, 1915.

N. W. Territories and Keewatin Prisoners Safe-keeping B. No. 77(*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1*, 657; B. wdn., 1935.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.*Importation of Cattle.*Res. proposed (*Mr. Mills*) 54.*Land Sales.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 156.M. for Ret. (*Mr. Charlton*) 179.*Advertising Land Regulations.*M. for statement (*Mr. Mills*) 179.*Application for Timber Limits.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Drew*) 508.*Hudson's Bay Co., purchase of supplies from.*M. for instructions (*Mr. Drew*) 821.*Dominion Land Settlement.*M. for O.C. (*Mr. Schultz*) 880.*Land Warrants.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.*Collection of Customs Duties.*Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.*N. W. Mounted Police.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 940.M. for statement (*Mr. Courso*) 977.M. for Ret. (*Mr. Royal*) 1637.*Criminal Trials Fees.*Res. (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) considered in Com. of Wh., 1099.*Supplies for Police and Indians.*M. for tenders (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 1398.*Import duties.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Schultz*) 1399.**NOVA SCOTIA.***Weights and Meas. Inspectors.*Ques. (*Mr. MacDonnell, Inverness*) 306.*Lobster Fishery.*Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 1039.**O'CONNOR, Mr.**Postmaster-General's Rep. (*presented*) 43.

Exchequer Ct., Pets. of Right, 344.

Stratford Post-office, 373.

Mail contract between Victoria, B.C., and S. Francisco, 497.

Pele Island Mail service, 500.

Mails between London and Evelyn P.O., 505.

Mail service on Wellington, Grey and Bruce Ry. (*Ans.*) 785.*Supply*—Civil Govt. (Dept. of Postmaster-Genl.) 1839; Collection of Revenues (P.O.) 1909.

Mr. Cameron's vote on concurrence, 1902.

Concurrence—Post Office, 1946.Village post-offices (*Ans.*) 1982.**Offences against the Person Act Amt. B. No. 103** (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1*, 1470; 2*, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3*, 1669.

*Official Assignees, Appointments of.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cameron, S. Huron*) 151.*Official Assignees' Returns.*Ques. (*Mr. Gunn*) 873.**OGDEN, Mr.**Drawbacks on exported tin plate used in lobster canning (*M. for Cor.*) 309.*Northern Light* steamer, 886.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 1195.

Ways and Means—on M. to recommit Res., 1260.St. Francis Harbour surveys (*M. for Reps.*) 1398.New Harbour surveys (*M. for Reps.*) 1398.Riv. St. Mary's surveys (*M. for Reps.*) 1398.Indian Harbour surveys (*M. for Reps.*) 1398.Brennan's Cove surveys (*M. for Reps.*) 1398.**OLIVER, Mr.**Credit Valley Ry., right of way in Toronto (*M. for Ret.*) 150.Weights and Meas. Inspectors' Superannuation Money refund (*Ques.*) 155.Expenses of visit of British Tenant Farmers to Canada (*M. for statement*) 178.Dismissals, Superannuations, Transfers and Appointments since Feb., 1879 (*M. for Ret.*) 178.Weights and Meas. Inspectors' Superannuation Fund (*M. for statement*) 348.Wright's Contract for Pelee Island Mail Service (*M. for contract*) 499.Mails between London and Evelyn P.O. (*M. for Ret.*) 504.Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2*, 586; on M. for Com. of Wh., 1283.*Ways and Means*—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 668.

Dom. Lands in N.W., 882.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 3* (*Amt.*) 1644.**Ont. and Can. Territories Boundary****B. No. 9** (*Mr. Mills*).

1*, 59.

Ont. and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.**Incorp. Act. Amt. B. No. 50** (*Mr. Williams*).

1*, 379; 2*, 472; in Com., 1380; 3* 1380.

Ont. and Que. Savings Banks B. No. 127 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*).

1*, 2023; 2*, 2023; in Com., 2023; 3*, 2023.

Ont. Disputed Territory Criminal Justice B. No. 119 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1*, 1832; 2*, 1939; in Com., 1940; 3*, 1940.

Ont. Industrial Refuge for Girls B. No. 100 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1*, 1230; 2*, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3*, 1669.

Ont. Reformatory for Boys B. No. 98 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1*, 1230; 2*, 1666; in Com., 1666; 3*, 1669.

ONTARIO.*Boundary between Ont. and unorganised Territories of Canada.*Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 46. M. for Com. (*Mr. Dawson*), 59; Deb. adj., 76; adj. Deb., 80; M. agreed to (*Y. 128, N. 52*) 101; M.

ONTARIO.—*Con.*

for Copy of Award (*Mr. Cameron S. Huron*) 174; M. for Ret. of Legal Expenses of Commission and Arbitration (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 180.

Export of Iron Ore.

M. for statement (*Mr. Domville*) 1399.

Ontario, South Riding, Election.

Supreme Ct. Judgment, 4.

Opening of Parliament. See "PARLIAMENT."

Opposition Leadership, Resignation of Mr. Mackenzie.

Announcement (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1815.

ORDER, PRIVILEGE, AND PROCEDURE, QUESTIONS OF.

ORDER.

Motion for Com. on Ont. Boundary objected to (*Mr. Mills*) as B. to define boundary has passed 1°. Ruled in order (*Mr. Speaker*) 64.

Northern Ry. Co. B., not printed. Ruled out of Order (*Mr. Speaker*) 609.

Mr. Cameron's Vote objected to (*Mr. Caron*) as Member not in the House when question was put. *Mr. Cameron* states he heard the question put. Ruled that vote must be recorded (*Mr. Speaker*) 1902.

PRIVILEGE.

Macdonell, John A., Remarks (*Mr. Mackenzie* and *Sir John A. Macdonald*) 4; Order for attendance made, 44; hearing and determination of the case, 182.

Hooper, Edmund, Member for Lennox. M. to refer Pet. (*Mr. Casey*) 196; Debate adj., 197; Remarks, 281, 380; Adj. Deb., 395; Amt. not to refer (*Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria*) 410; Amt. carried, 414.

Sproule, Mr., Seat in the House. Remarks, 349.

Massue, Louis H., Member for Richelieu, Pet. against. Remarks (*Mr. Mousseau* and others) 1915; Statement (*Mr. Massue*) 1981; Pet. wdn., 1982.

PROCEDURE.

Bills, Insolvency Acts Repeal (*Messrs. Colby and Béchard*). Ques. as to reprinted B. being handed to Mr. Speaker on 1°; Discussion, 56, 77.

Public Bills, Printing before introduction objected to (*Mr. Blake*); objection sustained and rule to be enforced (*Mr. Speaker*) 78.

Public Bills, Notices for introduction should appear on Notice Paper (*Mr. Holton*); orders to that effect to be given (*Mr. Speaker*) 79; new rule to be observed (*Mr. Speaker*) 112.

Documents Read. Ruled that Members reading them must be prepared to lay them on the Table (*Mr. Speaker*) 1165.

Petition against Mr. Massue. Ruled no discussion on presentation of Pets. without motion (*Mr. Speaker*) 1915.

ORTON, Mr.

Mortgage Regulation (*B. 11, 1***) 79; on M. for 2°, 953, 974; on Rep. of Com. (*Amt.*) 1643.

Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 195.

Election Act Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Bolduc*) on M. for 2°, 231.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 739.

Govt. Bank Inspection (*Res. wdn.*) 803.

Trust and Loan Co. (*correction*) 1038.

Supply—Indians (*B. C.*) 1693.

Parly. Printing Contract, on Amt. (*Mr. Paterson, Essex*) to M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2020.

Ottawa River Fishing Privileges.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northumberland*) 1152.

OUMET, Mr.

Dual Representation Abolition Act Amt. (*B. 59, 1***) 453.

Dismissal of Que. Lt. Gov., on Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1781.

Supply—Harbours and Rivs. (*Ont.*) 1950; Miscellaneous (*Todd's "Parly. Govt."*) 1954.

Panama Canal.

Remarks (*Mr. Colby*) 2002.

Panama, Line of Steamers to.

Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 484.

Paris Exposition, 1878, Expense to Can.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 977.

Parliament, 4th, Session 2nd, 1880, 43 Victoria.

Meeting, 1; Opening, 2; Speech from the Throne, 2; Bills Assented to, 977, 1851, 2024; Prorogation, 2026.

Parliamentary Printing Contract. See "CONTRACTS."

Parliament Grounds, claim of Calvert Vaux.

M. for papers (*Mr. Domville*) 308.

PATERSON (S. Brant), Mr.

Address, on the, 43.

Toronto Custom-house defalcations (*M. for statement*) 176.

Prohibition of immigrants' landing, 210.

Inland Revenue (*M. for O. C.*) 349.

Immigration pamphlets, 502, 819.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 724; on Res. 1, item 7, 926; on M. to receive Rep. of Com. with Amts. (*Amt. to transfer Embossed Books to Free List*) 1326.

Supply—Indians (*Man. and N. W. T.*) 1810.

Concurrence—Indians, *Man. and N. W. T.*, 1943.

Indian Laws Amt. B. 90 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1989; in Com., 1996.

PATTERSON (Essex), Mr.

Maritime Jurisdiction Act Repeal (*B. 86, 1***) 977.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 7 (*Mr. Baby*) on M. for 2°, 997.

Restrictions on importation of Amer. cattle (*Ques.*) 1040.

PATTERSON (Essex), Mr.—*Con.*

Fishery privileges on Ottawa Riv., 1161.

Parly. printing contract, on M. to concur in Rep. of Com. (*Amt.*) 2016, (*wdn.*) 2021.

Pearse, B. W., charges against.

Ques. (*Mr. McInnes*) 786.

Pelee Island Mail Service.

M. for contract (*Mr. Oliver*) 499.

PERRAULT, Mr.

Codification of Criminal Laws (*Ques.*) 306.

Tobacco seized in Charlevoix (*M. for statement*) 508.

Baie St. Paul Pier, surveys for (*M. for Rep.*) 508.

Baie St. Paul Pier and Wharf (*Ques.*) 787.

Petitions of Right. See "Exchequer Court."

Petit Rivière Breakwater.

M. for Rep. (*Mr. Kaulback*) 377.

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B.

No. 123 (*Mr. Baby*).

Res. in Com., 1917; 1^o*, 1921; 2^o, 1973; in Com., 1975; 3^o*, 1975.

Petroleum Inspection Law Amt. B.

No. 4 (*Mr. Colby*).

1^o, 44; 2^o prop., 1645.

Philipsburgh Breakwater.

Ques. (*Mr. Baker*) 380.

Pictou Harbour Act Amt. B. No.

106 (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*).

1^o, 1627; 2^o*, 1854; in Com., 1854; 3^o, 1854.

Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 116 (*Mr.*

Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.).

1^o, 1772; 2^o*, 1878; in Com., 1878; B. *wdn.*, 2015.

PLATT, Mr.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2^o, 957.

PLUMB, Mr.

Address, on the, 38.

Kaministiquia Riv., depth of water in (*M. for Rep.*) 161.

Vessels with cargoes for Fort William Terminal, C.P.R. (*M. for Ret.*) 178.

Ventilation of the Chamber, 182.

Prohibition of immigrants' landing, 211.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (*Mr. Keeler*) on M. for 2^o, 243.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 317.

Mr. Sproule's seat in the House, 350.

Prevention of Crime B. 19 (*Mr. Blake*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Baker*) 424.

C.P.R. contracts, 460.

Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2^o, 589.

Sudden death of Mr. Holton, 653.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 859.

Private Bills Reps., on M. to extend time (*Mr. Langevin*) 872.

Northern Light steamer, 887.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2^o, 965.

Inland Revenue Acts Consolidation B. 7 (*Mr. Baby*) on M. for 2^o, 997.

Supply—Penitentiaries (*Man.*) 1023; Immi-

PLUMB, Mr.—*Con.*

gration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1333; Lighthouse and Coast Service, 1678; Fisheries, 1682.

Can. Public Lands, on Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1061.

Fort Frances Lock (*M. for Ret.*) 1372.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Jones*) 1393.

C.P.R., on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. of Supply, 1538.

Petroleum Inspection Law Amt. B. 4 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2^o, 1657.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (*Mr. Masson*) on M. for 3^o 1662.

Bank Act Amt., on Res., 1754.

Official Rep. of Debates, 1818.

Civil Service expenditure, on Res. (*Sir. R. J. Cartwright*) 1836.

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Baby*) 1920.

Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (*Mr. Bowell*) on Amt. (*Mr. Boulton*) to M. for 3^o, 1963.

Close of the Session, 2023.

Police or Military Bounty Warrants.

Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. In-

corp. B. No. 71 (*Mr. White, N. Ren-*

frey). 1^o*, 594; 2^o*, 626; in Com., 1699; 3^o*, 1893.

POPE (Compton), Mr.

N.W.T., importation of cattle, on Res., 54.

Prohibition of immigrants' landing, 200.

St. Boniface, Man., Emigration Agent (*Ans.*) 416.

Immigration pamphlets, 501; on M. for copies (*Mr. Trow*) 813, 817.

Eastern Townships minerals (*Ans.*) 785.

Cultivation of Canadian soil, pamphlets on (*Ans.*) 786.

Restrictions on importation of Amer. cattle (*Ans.*) 1040.

Supply—Arts, Agriculture and Statistics

(Public Archives) 1331, (Patent Record)

1331, (Census) 1331, (Quebec Exhibition)

1948; Immigration and Quarantine (Immi-

gration) 1332, 1948, (Quarantine) 1949.

Concurrence—Public Archives, 1888; Census,

1888; Immigration, 1889.

POPE, (Queen's, P.E.I.), Mr.

Marine and Fisheries Rep. (*presented*) 44.

Mar. Provs. lobster fishery, 134.

Lightship on the Sand Heads, Fraser River, B.C. (*Ans.*) 155.

Dismissal of Fishery Officers in Inverness,

160.

Shelburne Harbour, Light at Sand Point (*Ans.*) 197.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 329, 331.

Shelburne Harbour Lighthouses, 333.

Shelburne Harbour, Light at Surf Point, 376.

Port Stanley Lighthouse (*Ans.*) 380.

Buctouche Harbour, N.B. (*Ans.*) 569.

Northern Light steamer, 885.

Herring fishery licenses in Mar. Provs. (*Ans.*) 1039.

POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.), Mr.—*Con.*
 N.S. lobster fishery (*Ans.*) 1039.
 Lockport Harbour buoy, N.S. (*Ans.*) 1039.
 Jeddore Rock Lighthouse, N.S. (*Ans.*) 1040.
 Croucher Island Lighthouse, Margaret's Bay,
 N.S. (*Ans.*) 1040.
 Fishery privileges on Ottawa Riv., 1165.
 Cost of Marine and Fisheries Dept. Rep.
 (*Ans.*) 1370, 1627
 Pictou Harbour Act Amt. (*B.* 106, 1°) 1627 ;
 on M. for 3°, 1854.
 Wrecks Removal Law Amt. (*B.* 107; 1°)
 1627; on M. for 2°, 1856; in Com., 1913 ;
 on Sen. Amts., 1984.
 Case of Timothy Sullivan, 1639.
 Supply—Ocean and River Service (Dom.
 Steamers) 1675, 1951, (Water Police) 1677;
 Fisheries, 1680; Steamboat Inspection,
 1682; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Marine and
 Fisheries) 1840; Collection of Revenues
 (Customs) 1904.
 Pilotage Act Amt. (*B.* 116, 1°) 1772; in
 Com., 1879.
 Gaspereaux Riv. fisheries, N.S. (*Ans.*) 1820.
 Can. Waters Navigation (*Res. in Com.*) 1886,
 (*B.* 121, 1°) 1886, on M. for 2°, 1998.
 Concurrence—Lighthouses, 1889; payment
 to Mr. Miall, 1901.
 Montreal Harbour Commissioners Acts Amt.
 (*B.* 124, 1°) 1917.
 Masters and Mates on Inland Waters, 1917.
Port Credit Harbour Repair.
 Ques. (*Mr. Elliott*) 306.
Porter's Lake Channel to the Sea.
 M. for Cor. and Reps. (*Mr. Kaulbach*) 379.
Port Hood Wharf Repairs.
 Ques. (*Mr. MacDonnell, Inverness*) 155.
Portneuf Election.
 Judge's Certificate, 196.
Port Stanley Harbour Tolls.
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 135.
Port Stanley Lighthouse.
 Ques. (*Mr. Arkell*) 380.
Port Whitby Harbour Co. Act Amt.
B. No. 73 (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*).
 1°, 608; 2°, 761; in Com., 1380; 3°, 1380.
Postmaster at Mount Pleasant. See
 "Mount Pleasant."
Post-office Dismissal—D. H. Waterbury.
 Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 155.
Post-office Inspectors.
 M. for statement (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 939.
Post-offices, Dutiable Goods in.
 M. for instructions to Postmasters (*Mr.*
Fleming) 179.
Post-offices in Incorporated Towns.
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 178.
Post-offices in Villages.
 Ques. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1982.
Prevention of Crime B. No. 19 (*Mr.*
Blake).
 1°, 151; 2° prop., 417; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr.*
Baker) 419; Amt. carried, 434.

Prince Albert, N.W.T., Shooting of Cat-
tle at.

M. for papers (*Mr. Drew*) 1398.

Prince County, P.E.I., Harbour Surveys.

M. for Reps. (*Mr. Hackett*) 508.

P. E. I. Reformatory for Juvenile
Offenders B. No. 99 (*Mr. McDonald,*
Pictou).

1°*, 1230, 2°*, 1669; in Com., 1669; 3°*,
 1669.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Claim on Fishery Award.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Brecken*) 129.

Salaries of Supreme Ct. Judges.

Remarks (*Mr. Brecken and others*) 1820.

Printing Committee's Report.

Remarks, 1982.

Printing, Confidential, Expenditure in
1878.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, W. Middlesex*) 151.

Printing Contracts. See "CONTRACTS."

Printing of a Parliamentary Paper.

Remarks, 568.

Private Bills Petitions.

Ms. to extend time (*Mr. Robinson*) 151, 414,
 451, 509.

Private Bills, Reception of.

Ms. to extend time (*Mr. Robinson*) 232, (*Mr.*
Cameron, N. Victoria) 453, (*Mr. Drew*)
 611.

Private Bills Reports.

Ms. to extend time (*Mr. Langevin*) 870,
 1449.

Privilege, Ques. of. See "ORDER, PRIVI-
 LEGE AND PROCEDURE."

Promissory Notes Duties Act Extension
B. No. 108 (*Mr. Baby*).

Res in Com., 1659; 1°*, 1659; 2°, 1856; in
 Com.; 1857; 3°*, 1857.

Prorogation of Parliament. See "PAR-
 LIAMENT."

Provincial Legislation.

M. for O. C., etc. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1399.

Public Accounts.

Presented (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) 43.

M. to refer to Stand. Com. (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*)
 151.

Public Bills, notices for. See "ORDER,
 PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

Public Functionaries' Salaries Re-
duction B. No. 56 (*Mr. Becharde*).

1°, 416; 2° prop., 893; Deb. adj., 904.

Public Lands of Canada. See "Can.
 Public Lands."

Public Officers' Security Act Amt. B.
No. 28 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*).

1°*, 180, 2°*, 281; in Com., 352; 3°*, 352.

Public Service Reform B. No. 43
 (*Mr. Casey*).

1°, 269.

Quebec and Gulf Ports Steamship Co. Act Amt. B. No. 51 (*Mr. McGreevy*).

1*, 379; 2*, 472; in Com., 761; 3*, 761.

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co. See "RAILWAYS."**Que. and Ont. Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 66** (*Mr. Cameron, N. Victoria*).

1*, 509; 2*, 626; B. wdn., 1819.

Quebec, Dangerous Cliff in Champlain-street.M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 179.**Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Ry. B. No. 118** (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*).

1*, 1852; B. wdn., 1998.

Quebec Review on Queen's Birthday.Ques. (*Mr. Caron*) 596.Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 1151.**Quebec Tidal Dock Completion B. No. 109** (*Sir S. L. Tilley*).

Res. in Com., 1659; 1*, 1660; 2*, 1857; in Com., 1857; 3*, 1857.

QUEBEC.

Removal of the late Lieut.-Governor.

Order in Council submitted by Message, 45.

Res. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1774, negatived (Y. 49, N. 119) 1787.**Rails, Old, sold by Govt.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 151.**Railway Commissioners Court B. No. 20** (*Mr. McCarthy*).

1*, 153.

RAILWAYS.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

British Columbia Contracts.Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 45.**Georgian Bay Branch.**M. for O. C. (*Mr. Cockburn, Muskoka*) 46.**Route via Peace River Valley or Pine River Pass.**M. for Reps. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 51.**Tenders for Works since Jan., 1879.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 55.**Contracts.**Presented (*Sir C. Tupper*) 55.M. for statement (*Mr. McLeman*) 380; Adj. Deb., 455.**Imperial Aid.**Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 56.**Land Commission.**Ques. (*Mr. Blake*) 155.**Fort William Terminus, Cargoes for.**M. for Ret. *Mr. Plumb* 178.**Employés and Supplies, Expenditure for.**M. for statement (*Mr. Trow*) 179.**Squatters on Reserve in Man.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 349.**Telegraph.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Drew*) 501.M. for Ret. (*Mr. Schultz*) 1399.RAILWAYS.—*Con.***Location by Mr. Marcus Smith.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 506, Amt. (*Sir C. Tupper*) 507.**Trains, running of, at St. Boniface, Man.**Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 936.**Sale of Public Lands for.** See 'Can. Public Lands.'**Payments for Lands expropriated for.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 1398.**Expropriation of James Taylor's property.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 1399.**Govt. Policy.**Statement (*Sir C. Tupper*) 1399; Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) 1425, negatived (Y. 49, N. 131) 1626.**Commencement of Construction in B.C.**Ques. (*Mr. Bunster*) 1627.**Ratification of Contract.**Res. (*Sir C. Tupper*) 2002.**Esquimalt-Nanaimo Section.**Remarks (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 2008.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Employés between Riv. du Loup and Chaudière.M. for Ret. (*Mr. Grandbois*) 55.**Accidents on.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. MacDonnell, Inverness*) 58.**Dismissals and Appointments.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 136.**Employés at Moncton.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 139.**Rolling Stock awaiting Repair.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 140.**Employés.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 177.M. for Ret. (*Mr. Costigan*) 349.**Connection at Quebec.**Ques. (*Mr. Vallée*) 198.**Branch at Lévis.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Landry*) 485.**Riv. du Loup Branch Workmen.**M. for statement (*Mr. Landry*) 508.**Elgin Station.**Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 595.**Free Passes in 1878-9.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 821.**Freight Rates.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hackett*) 877.**Nut-locks, Cost of.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 943.**Sugar carried from Halifax.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 944.**Lumber, Purchase of.**M. for Ret. (*Mr. Anglin*) 1227.**Discussion in Com. of Supply, 1699.****Stock on Lévis and Kennebec Ry.**Ques. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1820.

GENERAL.

Ontario Pacific Junction Railway, aid to.Ques. (*Mr. Cockburn, Muskoka*) 45.**Coteau du Lac Railway Bridge.**M. for Reps. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 47.

RAILWAYS.—Con.

Credit Valley Railway, Right of Way in Toronto.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Oliver) 150.

Quebec and Lake St. John.
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Vallée) 167.

Grand Trunk, Uniform Freight Rates.
 Ques. (Mr. Merner) 198.

Campbellton Branch, P.E.I.
 M. for papers (Mr. Hackett) 307.

New Station Houses in Prov. of Quebec.
 Ques. (Mr. Landry) 307.
 Ques. (Mr. Dumont) 1627.

Northern.
 M. for By-laws regulating tolls (Mr. Haggart) 348.
 M. for leave to introduce Interpretation B. (Mr. McCarthy) 609.

Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental.
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Mackenzie) 378.

Statistics.
 Remarks, 417.

Stations in Montmagny.
 Ques. (Mr. Landry) 484.

Freight Rates to and from the Mar. Provs.
 M. for statement (Mr. Snowball) 498.

Stations in Lévis, Bellechasse and Montmagny.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Landry) 505.

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Surveys.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. DeCosmos) 506.

Prince Edward Island Ry. Communication.
 Ms. for papers (Mr. Brecken) 572, 579.
 Ques. (Sir A. J. Smith) 596.

Wellington Grey and Bruce, Mail Service.
 Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 785.

Freight Rates on I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry.
 M. for comparative statement (Mr. Hackett) 877.

Freight Rates on P.E.I. Ry.
 M. for papers (Mr. Muttart) 879.

Coal Contracts for Govt. Rys.
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 942.

Protection of Brakemen.
 Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 1370.

P.E.I. Ry.
 Ques. (Mr. Muttart) 1628.

Rapid City and Souris River Colonisation Ry. Co. Incorp. B. No. 69
 (Mr. Bannerman).
 1*, 568; 2*, 626.

Rapid de Femme Salmon Hatchery.
 M. for Rets. (Mr. Costigan) 581.

Real Estate Encumbrances Regulation Bill. See "Mortgage."

Receipts and Expenditure charged to consolidated Fund.
 M. for Ret. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 508.

Receipts and Expenditure for last half of 1879 and 1880.
 M. for Ret. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 55.

Receipts and Expenditures under Weights and Measures Act.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Ross, West Middlesex) 151.

Red River and Assiniboine Bridge Co. Incorp. B. No. 49 (Mr. White, Cardwell).
 1*, 379; 2*, 472; in Com., 1641; 3* 1641.

Red River, Bridge at Winnipeg.
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Schultz) 594.

Red River, Dredging at Mouth of.
 Ques. (Mr. Schultz) 198.

Relief of the Distress in Ireland. See "Ireland."

Reporting Debates. See "Debates."

Return of New Members. See "HOUSE OF COMMONS,"—also Names.

Richelieu Elections.
 Judge's Rep., 44; Remarks on Pet., 1915.

Richelieu, Member for, Pet. against. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

RICHEY, Mr.
 The Address (moved) 4.
 Bell Telephone Co. Incorp. B. 17 (Mr. Kilvert) in Com., 624.
 Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award (Adj. of Deb. m.) 791; on Adj. Deb., 978, 1171.
 Halifax Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 87, 1**) 978.
 Children Protection (B. 93, 1**) 1038.

Rifles, Duties on.
 M. for Cor. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1398.

Rimouski Pier.
 Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 154.

Riviere du Loup Br. Purchase Confirmation B. No. 81 (Sir C. Tupper).
 1°, 782; 2*, 1359; in Com., 1359; 3*, 1359.

ROBERTSON (Hamilton), Mr.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2°, 110.
 Criminal Procedure Law Amendment (B. 14, 1°) 113; on M. for 2°, 355.
 Expense of sending Government Officials to England (M. for Ret.) 178.
 G. W. R. Provident Funds (B. 25, 1**) 180.
 Private Ba. Pets., on M. to extend time, 452.
 S. Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co. (B. 60, 1**) 483.
 Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 673, 756.
 Dom. Lands in N. W., 880.
 Lambton County Ct. Judge (Ques.) 1982.

ROBERTSON (Shelburne), Mr.
 Sable Island, telegraphic communication with (Ques.) 80.
 Free admission of coal (M. for statement) 133.
 Mar. Provs. lobster fishery (M. for Ret.) 133.
 I.C.R. rolling-stock awaiting repair, 147.
 Shelburne District Official Assignee (M. Ret.) 151.
 Dismissal of Fishery Officers, 160.
 Strong Island Breakwater, N.S. (M. for Rep.) 180; (Ques.) 306.
 Shelburne Harbour, Light at Sand Point (Ques.) 197; (M. for Ret.) 379.

ROBERTSON (Shelburne) Mr.—Con.

- Halifax Sugar Refinery, materials for construction of (*Ques.*) 307.
Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 323.
Shelburne Harbour Light-houses (*M. for statement*) 333.
Shelburne Harbour, Light at Surf Point (*Ms. for Ret.*) 375, 376, 379.
Cape Negro Island Breakwater (*Ques.*) 484 ; (*M. for papers*) 508.
Shelburne Harbour fog whistle (*Ques.*) 484, (*M. for Cor.*) 498.
Jordan Bay Breakwater (*Ques.*) 785.
Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 793, 1200.
Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (Mr. Béchard) 900.
Ways and Means—on Res. 2, item 5, 930; on M. to recommit Res., 1257.
Govt. Ry. coal contracts (*M. for Cor.*) 942.
Geological survey of Shelburne, Queen's and Lunenburg Counties, N.S. (*M. for Cor.*) 950.
Lobster fishery in N.S. (*Ques.*) 1039.
Lockport Harbour buoy (*Ques.*) 1039.
Aid to distressed fishermen in Guysborough (*Ques.*) 1039.
Can. Waters Navigation B. 121 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) on M. for 2^d, 1998.

ROBINSON, Mr.

- Pets. for Private Bs. (*Ms. to extend time*) 151, 414, 451, 509, 610.
Charges against Armstrong, Inspector of Leather, Toronto (*M. for papers*) 594.
Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Weldon) to M. for 3^d, 1644.
Parly printing contract, on Amt. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) to M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2019.

Roche Bay Pier.

- Ques.* (*Mr. Rogers*) 306.

ROCHESTER, Mr.

- Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 224, 225.
Dom. Dam, Devil Lake, 571.
Can. Guarantee Co. (*M. for statements*) 583, (*Ques.*) 595, (*explanation*) 1888.
Interference of Hon. R. W. Scott in Carleton Election (*M. for Com.*) 1169.
Mr. Cameron's vote on Concurrence, 1902.

ROGERS, Mr.

- Roche Bay Pier, N.B. (*Ques.*) 306.

Rondeau Harbour.

- Ms. for Ret.* (*Mr. Stephenson*) 179.

ROSS, (Dundas), Mr.

- Williamsburgh Canal, depth of water (*M. for Ret.*) 174.
Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (*Mr. Colby*) in Com., 222.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. 6 w. h. (Mr. Thompson, Haldimand) 445.
Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^d, 970.
Bank Act Amt., on Res., 1762.
Supply—Canals, 1797.

ROSS (W. Middlesex), Mr.

- Constitutionality of Temperance Act, 1878 (*Ques.*) 45.
Departmental printing and binding contracts (*M. for Ret.*) 54.
Expenditure under Weights and Meas. Act (*M. for Ret.*) 151.
Confidential printing expenditure (*M. for Ret.*) 151.
Election Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Bolduc) on M. for 2^d, 230.
Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 315, 1807.
Welland Canal, Secs. 33 and 34, tenders for (*M. for Ret.*) 349.
St. Anne's works, Ottawa Riv., tenders for (*M. for Ret.*) 349.
Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 429.
Printing of a Parly. paper, 568.
Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 638; on M. to recommit, 1115.
Immigration pamphlets, 815.
Dom. Lands in N. W., 882.
Charges against Mr. Rykert, 1007.
Supply—Legislation (Library) 1037; Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Census) 1332; Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1332.
Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on M. for 3^d, 1661.
Official Rep. of Debates, 1819.
Tariff B. 102 (Sir S. L. Tilley) on M. for 3^d, 1853.
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt., in Com. on Res. (Mr. Baby) 1919.
Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on Amt. (Mr. Boulbee) to M. for 3^d, 1958, (*Amt. 3 m. h.*) 1972.
Royal Assent to Bills, 977, 1851, 2024.
Royal, Mr.
Return of, 2.
Introduction of, 2.
ROYAL, Mr.
Emerson and Turtle Mountain Ry. Co. Incorp. (*B. 26, 1st*), 180; (*B. udn.*) 1227.
Emerson Free Traffic Bridge (*B. 36, 1st*) 233.
Stratford Post-office, 375.
Man. Prov. Buildings (*Ques.*) 416.
Extension of limits of Man. (*Ques.*) 416.
St. Boniface Emigration Agent (*Ques.*) 416.
Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 426.
Keewatin jail accommodation (*Ques.*) 569.
Man. land patents (*Ques.*) 873.
Military or Police Bounty land warrants (*Ques.*) 936.
Crown timber permits in Man. (*Ques.*) 936.
Collection of Customs duties in N.W.T. (*Ques.*) 936.
C.P.R., running of trains at St. Boniface (*Ques.*) 936.
Supply—Penitentiaries (Man.) 1024; Indians, (Man. and N.W.) 1812; N.W. Mounted Police, 1814; Miscellaneous (Todd's "Parly. Govt.") 1954.
Conflicts of magisterial jurisdiction in Keewatin (*Ques.*) 1039.
Protection of Man. settlers (*Ques.*) 1040.
Man. land allotments (*Ques.*) 1628.
N.W. Mounted Police Force (*M. for Ret.*) 1637.

- ROYAL, Mr.—Con.**
Concurrence—Indians, Man. and N.W.T. 1942.
- Rustico, P.E.I., Harbour.*
Ques. (Mr. Brecken) 786.
- RYAN (Marquette), Mr.**
 N.W.T., importation of cattle, on Res., 54.
 G. W. Telegraph Co. Incorp. (B. 45, 1st*) 305.
 Squatters on C.P.R. Reserve in Man. (M. for Ret.) 349.
 C.P.R. contracts, 472.
 Relief of the distress in Ireland (M. to refer Pet.) 745.
 Disputed land claims in Man. (M. for Rep.) 1398.
 Settlement in St. Peter Parish, Man. (M. for Ret.) 1398.
 C.P.R., payments for expropriated lands (M. for Ret.) 1398.
 Mounted Police and Indian supplies (M. for tenders) 1398.
- RYAN (Montreal Centre), Mr.**
Ways and Means—on M. to re-commit Res., 1235.
Supply—Ocean and Riv. Service (Montreal Water Police) 1678; Canals, 1800; Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1843.
- RYKERT, Mr.**
Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 622, 626.
 Charges made in Ont. Legislature (explanation) 1002.
Supply—Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Quebec Exhibition) 1948.
Rykert, Mr., Charges against, in Ont. Legislature.
 Explanation and Remarks (Mr. Rykert and others) 1002.
- RYMAL, Mr.**
 Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 193.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 318.
 Mr. Sproule's seat in the House, 351.
 Private Bills Pets., on M. to extend time, 452.
Supply—Quebec Exhibition, 1948.
- Sable Island, Telegraphic Communication with.*
Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 80.
- Salmon Hatchery, Rapid de Femme, N.B.*
 M. for Rets. (Mr. Costigan) 581.
- Sandford Fleming, Mr.*
Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1370.
- Savings Banks Bill.* See "Ontario."
- SCHULTZ, Mr.**
 Allotment to minors in Man. (Ques.) 80.
 Dredging at mouth of Red River (Ques.) 198.
 Man. S. W. Colonisation Ry. Co. Incorp. Act Amt. (B. 63, 1st*) 509.
 Bridge over the Red Riv. at Winnipeg (M. for Cor.) 594.
 N. W. Colonisation Land Co. Incorp. (B. 74, 1st*) 608.
 Dom. Lands in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for O. C.) 880, 883.
- SCHULTZ, Mr.—Con.**
Supply—Public Works and Buildings (Red Riv.) 1370; Indians (Provisions at Annuity Assemblies) 1694; Miscellaneous (N.W.T.) 1809.
 Telegraph lines between Red Riv. and Battleford (M. for Ret.) 1399.
 Amounts paid at York Factory (M. for Ret.) 1399.
 C.P.R., on Amt. (Mr. Blake) to M. for Com. of Supply, 1624.
 Hudson's Bay Co.'s claims, 1934.
Concurrence—Indians, Man. and N. W. T., 1945.
- Scott's Bay Harbour Works.*
Ques. (Mr. Borden) 198.
- SCRIVER, Mr.**
 Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co. Incorp. (B. 39, 1st*) 268.
 Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res. (Mr. Charlton) 1087.
 Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on M. for 3rd, 1663.
Supply—Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1688.
 Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Baby) on M. for 2nd, 1973.
Securities (6 per cent.) outstanding.
 M. for Ret. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 55.
Seduction, Actions for.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Farrow) 1659.
Select Standing Committees. See "COMMITTEES."
Senate Expenditure.
 M. for statement (Mr. Mills) 495.
 Res. (Mr. Kirkpatrick) 594, 610.
- SHAW, Mr.**
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on Amt. (Mr. Blake) 287.
 Criminal Procedure Law Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) on M. for 2nd, 360.
 Maritime Jurisdiction Act Amt. Act Amt. (B. 52, 1st) 379.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2nd, 971.
- Shelburne Harbour Fog Whistle.*
Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 484.
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 498.
- Shelburne Harbour, Light at Sand Point.*
Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 197.
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 379.
- Shelburne Harbour, Light at Surf Point.*
 M. for Rets. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 375, 379.
- Shelburne Harbour Light-houses.*
 M. for statement (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 333.
- Shelburne Official Assignee, Resignation of.*
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 151.
- Shelburne, Queen's and Lunenburg, N.S., Geological Surveys in.*
 M. for Cor. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 950.
- Ship Materials, Drawback on.*
 M. for Ret. (Mr. Weidon) 150.

*Shippegan Gully Channel, N.B.*M. for papers (*Mr. Anglin*) 945.

SKINNER, Mr.

Militia Orders and "The Established Church" (*Ques.*) 1039.*Skins, undressed, imports of.*M. for statement (*Mr. Landry*) 179.

SMITH (Selkirk), Mr.

Immigration pamphlets, 811, 817, 821.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (*Mr. Orton*) on M. for 2°, 976.Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to Amt. (*Mr. Domville*) to Res. (*Mr. Charlton*) 1092.*Supply*—Public Works and Buildings (*Assiniboine Riv.*) 1369. (*Man. Lieut.-Gov's Residence*) 1950, (*Miscellaneous*) 1953; *Rys.* (*C.P.R.*) 1671; *Indians* (provisions at annuity assemblies) 1697; *Collection of Revenues* (*Customs*) 1847; *Dom. Lands*, 1850.Esquimalt Graving Dock, on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to Res., 1933.Bank Act Amt. B. 115 (*Sir S. L. Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 1980.

SMITH, Sir Albert J.

Dorchester, N.B., Penitentiary (*Ques.*) 198.Exchequer Ct., *Pets. of Right*, 344.P.E.I. Ry. communication 577; (*Ques.*) 596.Criminal Law Amt. B. 38 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 600.Riv. du Loup Br. Purchase Confirmation B. 81 (*Sir C. Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 782.*Glendon and Northern Light* steamers (*M. for Ret.*) 803.*Northern Light* steamer, 885.

I.C.R., carriage of sugar from Halifax, 945.

Supply—Penitentiaries (*Dorchester*) 1022.Herring fishery licenses in *Mar. Provs.* (*Ques.*) 1039.*Ways and Means*—on M. to recommit Res., 1122.Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for Com. of Wh., 1279.Can. Waters Navigation B. 121 (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*) on M. for 1°, 1886.

SNOWBALL, Mr.

I.C.R. rolling-stock awaiting repair, 145,150.

Drawbacks on exported tin plate used in lobster canning, 311.

Freight rates to and from *Mar. Provs.* (*M. for statement*) 498.*Sultan* tug-boat, contract with (*M. for Ret.*) 508.Nets seized on the *Miramichi Riv.* (*M. for Ret.*) 821.Steam dredge at *Miramichi* (*M. for statement*) 821.Indian Commissioners and Revenue in N.B. (*M. for statement*) 822.Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (*Mr. Béchard*) 899.*Ways and Means*—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 904.Case of Timothy Sullivan (*M. for papers*) 1638.*Supply*—*Rys.* (*I.C.R.* and *P.E.I. Ry.*) 1721.

Sorel, Govt. Lands at.

Ques. (*Mr. Vanasse*) 786.

Souris and Rocky Mountains Ry.

Co. Incorp. B. No. 79 (*Mr. Boulbez*). 1°, 691; 2°, 761; in Com., 1699; 3°, 1699.*Souris Works, P.E.I.**Ques.* (*Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.*) 234.

South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.

Incorp. B. No. 60 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*).

1°, 483; 2°, 590; in Com., 1641; 3°, 1641.

*Spain and France, Negotiations with.*M. for Instructions to Commissioners (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 53.

SPEAKER, Mr.

Controverted Elections, Judges' Reps., 1, 44, 196.

Vacancies, announcement of, 1.

New Members, 2, 45, 111, 1886.

Speech from the Throne (*rep.*) 2.Macdonell, J. A., breach of privilege case, 44. *Ques.* of Procedure—*Insolvency Repeal Bs.*, 56, 57.

Boundary between Can. Territories and Ont., on M. for Com.; ruled, that M. is in Order, 64.

Printing of Public Bs. before introduction, 78. Printing notices for Public Bs. in Order Paper, 79, 112.

Parliamentary expressions, 164.

Northern Ry. Co. Act Interpretation B.: ruled out of Order because not printed, 609.

Relief of the distress in Ireland, on M. to refer Pet. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*): Pet. ruled unobjectionable, 745.Riv. du Loup Br. Purchase Confirmation B. 81 (*Sir C. Tupper*): ruled that B. need not be founded on Res., 782.*Supply*—*Legislation* (*Extra Clerks*) 1026.*Ways and Means*, on Reception of Rep.: ruled carried and further Deb. to be confined to items, 1261.

Fishery Privileges on Ottawa Riv., on M. for Ret.: ruled that documents read by Members must be laid on the Table, 1165.

Audit of H. of Com. Accounts by Auditor-General, 1326.

Mr. Cameron's vote, on point of Order (*Mr. Caron*): ruled that, the Member having stated that he heard the question, his name must be registered, 1902.Pet. against *Mr. Massue*: ruled no debate on presentation of a Pet. unless M. to be made, 1915.

Speech from the Throne, 2.

For the Address, etc., see "Address."

SPROULE, Mr.

Insolvency Acts Repeal Bill 2 (*Mr. Colby*) on M. for 2°, 106.Prohibition of immigrants' landing, on M. for O.C. (*Mr. Fleming*) 206.Mr. Sproule's seat in the House (*remarks*) 349.Bell Telephone Co. Incorp. B. 17 (*Mr. Kilvert*) in Com., 624.*Ways and Means*—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 678.Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 953.

SPROULE, Mr.—Con.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^o, 958; on Amt. 6 m.h. (Mr. Welton) to M. for 3^o, 1644.
 Civil Service expenditure, on Res. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1831.
Supply—Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1846.
 Wrecks Removal B. 107 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) in Com., 1914.

Sproule, Mr., Seat in the House. See "ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE."

Stadacona Bank Winding-up B. No. 16 (*Mr. Vallée*).
 1^o, 151; 2^o, 218; in Com., 1380; 3^o, 1380.

Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company Winding-up B. No. 21 (*Mr. Casgrain*).
 1^o, 180; 2^o, 218; in Com.; 1039; 3^o, 1039.

Stamps on Notes and Bills Act Amt. B. No. 104 (*Mr. Cockburn, W. Northumberland*).
 1^o, 1511.

STEPHENSON, Mr.
 Two Creeks Harbour of Refuge (*M. for Ret.*) 128.
 Post-offices in incorporated towns (*M. for Ret.*) 178.
 Rondeau Harbour (*Ms. for Ret.*) 179.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 225.
 St. Clair and Lake Erie Navigation Co. Incorp. (B. 31, 1^o*) 233.
 Stratford Post-office, on M. for papers (Mr. Hesson) 373.
 Navigation between London and [Chatham, Ont. (*Ques.*) 484.
 Printing of a Parly. paper, 568.
 Chatham, Ont., Govt. Offices (*Ques.*) 569.
 N. W. Mounted Police (*M. for Ret.*) 940.
 Expense in connection with Canadian exhibit at Paris Exposition (*M. for Ret.*) 977.
 Immigration of British tenant farmers (*Ques.*) 1152.
 Official Rep. of Debates (*M. to concur in Rep. of Com.*) 1815, (*Rep. presented*) 1956.
 Parly. printing contract (*M. to concur in Rep. of Com.*) 2015; on Amt. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 2018.

Stock Brokers Regulation B. No. 42 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*).
 1^o, 269; 2^o, 602.

Stony Island Breakwater.
 M. for Rep. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 180.
Ques. (*Mr. Robertson, Shelburne*) 306.

Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry County Ct. Junior Judge.
 M. for Cor. (*Mr. Macdonell, N. Lanark*) 977.

Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry Division Cts.
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. Bergin*) 1637.

STRANGE, Mr.
 Huron and Ont. ship canal (*Ques.*) 416.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on M. to receive Rep. of Com. of Wh., 952.
Supply—Militia (Brig. Majors) 1359.

Stratford Post-office and Custom-house.
Ques. (*Mr. Hesson*) 80.
 M. for papers (*Mr. Hesson*) 365.

Sugar Imports.
 M. for Ret. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 55.
 M. for statement (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 180.
 M. for statement (*Mr. Domville*) 1899.

Sullivan, Timothy, case of.
 M. for papers (*Mr. Snowball*) 1638.

"*Sultan*" *Trug-boat.*
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. Snowball*) 508.

Superannuation Fund.
Ques. (*Mr. Keeler*) 873.

Superannuation Money, refund of, to Inspectors of Weights and Measures.
Ques. (*Mr. Oliver*) 155.

SUPPLY.
 [Only subjects which caused remark or discussion are noted under this head.]
 Resolution for Committee, 43.
Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 268.
 Mess. from H. E. transmitting Estimates for 1880-81, and Supplementary Estimates for 1879-80, 483; referred to Com., 483; Mess. from H. E. transmitting Supplementary Estimates for 1880-81, and further Supplementary Estimates for 1879-80, 1915; referred to Com., 1915.

COMMITTEE :—
 Formal vote before Budget, 509.
Charges of Management, 1837.

Civil Government :
 Dept. of Justice, Penitentiaries Br., 1837.
 Dept. of Secretary of State, 1838.
 Dept. of Interior, 1838.
 Dept. of Finance, 1838.
 Dept. of Inland Revenue, 1838.
 Dept. of Postmaster General, 1839.
 Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, 1840.
 Dept. of Railways and Canals, 1840.
 Departmental Contingencies, 1842.
 High Commissioner in London, contingencies, 1946.
 Civil Service Board, 1946.

Administration of Justice :
 Travelling Expenses of Stipendiary Magistrates, N. W. T., 1009.
 Circuit Allowances, B. C., 1010.

Police, 1010.

Penitentiaries :
 Kingston, 1010.
 St. Vincent de Paul, 1015.
 Dorchester, 1017.
 Manitoba, 1023.
 British Columbia, 1024.

Legislation :
 H. of Com. Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, etc., 1025.
 H. of Com. Debates, 1037.
 Salaries and Contingencies of Library, 1037.
 Books for Library, 1947.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics :
 Care of Public Archives, 1331.
 Patent Record, 1331.
 The Census, 1331.
 Quebec Exhibition, 1947.

SUPPLY.—*Con.**Immigration and Quarantine :*

Immigration, 1332, 1881, 1948.

Quarantine, 1948.

*Pensions, 1359.**Militia :**Ordinary—*

Salaries of Brigade Majors, 1359.

Ammunition, etc., 1363.

Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, 1365.

Extraordinary—

Royal Military College, 1366.

Military Schools, 1367.

Guard at Rideau Hall, 1367.

N. W. T. Militia, 1882.

Conversion of Ordnance, 1882.

*Railways and Canals chargeable to Capital :**Intercolonial Railway—*

Line between Rivière du Loup and Hadlow, 1670.

Milner Land Arbitration, 1949.

Canadian Pacific Railway, 1671.

B. C., Emory's Bar to Savona's Ferry, 1626.

Lachine Canal, 1788.

Carillon Lock and Canal, 1806.

Grenville, 1807.

Miscellaneous, 1808.

Railways and Canals chargeable to Income :

Welland Canal, 1809.

Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Capital :

Public Buildings, Ottawa, 1367, 1883.

Telegraph lines for lower River and Gulf of St. Lawrence, 1367.

*Public Works and Buildings chargeable to Income :**Public Buildings—*

Ontario, 1368, 1884.

Quebec, 1368.

N. Brunswick, 1368.

Manitoba (Lieut.-Governor's Residence) 1950.

B. Columbia, 1369.

Rents, Repairs, etc. (Public Workshops) 1369.

Harbours and Rivers—

Ontario, 1369, 1950.

Manitoba, 1369.

N. Brunswick, 1951.

P. E. Island, 1951.

Dredging, 1370.

Telegraphs, 1674.

Ocean and River Service :

Dominion Steamers, 1675, 1951.

Mail Subsidies, 1675.

Light-house and Coast Service :

Light-houses and Fog-alarms, 1678.

*Fisheries, 1679.**Scientific Institutions, 1682.**Marine Hospitals for sick and distressed seamen, 1682.**Steamboat Inspection, 1682.**Inspection of Insurance Companies, 1683.**Geological Survey :*

Transfer of Museum from Montreal to Ottawa, 1688.

Indians :

Ontario and Quebec, 1688.

New Brunswick, 1690.

SUPPLY.—*Con.*

British Columbia, 1690.

Manitoba and the North-West—

Agricultural implements, etc., 1810.

Grist Mill, 1694.

Provisions for Indians at annuity payments, etc., 1694.

School Teachers and Buildings, 1698.

Surveys of Indian Reserves, 1812.

Wages of Farmers and their assistants, 1812.

Buildings for Commissioner, 1813.

Farms and Surveys, 1946.

*N. W. Mounted Police, 1813,**Miscellaneous :*

Expense of Govt. in N. W. T., 1809.

E. Miall's services at Fishery Commission, 1885.

Judge Armour's services re Ont. Boundary, 1885.

Relief of distress in Ireland, 1886.

Compensation to members of N. W.

Mounted Police, 1952.

Todd's "Parliamentary Govt.," 1954.

Indian curiosities, 1955.

Superannuation refunds, 1955.

Collection of Revenues :

Customs, 1842, 1903.

Excise, 1848, 1952.

Culling Timber, 1848.

Weights and Meas. and Gas, 1848.

Inspection of Staples, 1848.

Adulteration of Food, 1848.

Minor Revenues, 1848.

Railways—

I. C. R., 1699, 1955.

Windsor Br. Ry., 1906.

Canals, 1809, 1953.

Public Works—

Maintenance and Repairs, 1809.

Miscellaneous, 1953.

Post Office, 1843, 1909.

Dom. Lands chargeable to Capital, 1849.

Dom. Lands—

Manitoba, 1952.

B. C., outside service, 1849.

Pamphlets, 1913.

*Unprovided items of 1878-9, 1913.**Concurrence. See "CONCURRENCE."***Supply B. No. 126** (*Sir S. L. Tilley*).

Res. in Com., 1977; 1**, 1979; 2*, 2002; 3**, 2015.

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act**Amt. B. No. 37** (*Mr. McCarthy*).

1*, 233; 2**, 479; in Com., 889; 3**, 1398.

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts**Repeal B. No. 13** (*Mr. Keeler*).1*, 179; 2* prop., 234; Amt. 6 m. h. (*Mr. Blake*) 256, carried (*Y. 148, N. 29*) 267.*Supreme and Exchequer Cts.*M. for statement (*Mr. Keeler*) 950.*Supreme Court.*M. for number of judgments and expenses (*Mr. Keeler*) 55.*St. Anne's Works, Ottawa River, Tenders for.*M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross; W. Middlesex*) 349.

St. Boniface, Man., Emigration Agent.
Ques. (*Mr. Royal*) 416.

St. Charles de Caplan P.O.
M. for Pet. (*Mr. Beauchesne*) 1398.

St. Clair and Lake Erie Navigation Co. Incomp. B. No. 31 (*Mr. Stephenson*)
1** , 233 ; 2** , 286 ; in Com., 785 ; 3** , 785.

St. Francis River Survey.
M. for Rep. (*Mr. Vallée*) 179.

St. Francois du Lac Riv. Floating of Cordwood Regulation B. No. 75 (*Mr. Vanasse*).
1** , 608.

St. Hyacinthe Election.
Judge's certificate, 1.

St. John, N.B., Negro Point Breakwater.
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 150.

St. John Riv., N.B., Bridge across.
Ques. (*Mr. Connell*) 1371.

St. John Riv., N.B., Bridging of.
M. for papers (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) 594.

St. John Riv., N.B., International Bridges over.
Ques. (*Mr. Costigan*) 1152.

St. John's Postmaster, City of Quebec, Dismissal of.
M. for Cor. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1399.

St. Maurice Riv. Improvement.
Ques. (*Mr. Montplaisir*) 1152.

St. Peter Parish, Man., Patents in Settlement Belt.
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ryan, Marquette*) 1398.

St. Romuald Postmaster, Dismissal of.
Ques. (*Mr. LaRue*) 1623.

St. Thomas, Montmagny, Floating Light.
M. for papers (*Mr. Landry*) 1398.

Tariff, The. See "WAYS AND MEANS."

TASSÉ, Mr.
Sudden death of Mr. Holton, 654.
American Ry. decoy agents (*Ques.*) 786.
Supply—Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1035.
Ways and Means—on M. to recommit Res., 1134.
Cost of Marine and Fisheries Dept. Rep. (*Ques.*) 1370.
C.P.R. Land Regulations, on Res., (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) 1999.

Tea Importation.
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Weldon*) 150.
M. for statement (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 158.
Ques. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 1371.

Tea, Vessels carrying, from China and Japan.
M. for Ret. (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 55.

Telegraph Subsidy Act Repeal B. No. 117 (*Mr. Langevin*).
1** , 1820 ; 2** , 1857 ; in Com., 1857 ; 3** , 1857.

Temperance Act, 1878, Constitutionality of.
Ques. (*Mr. Ross, West Middlesex*) 45.

Tenant Farmers, British, Expenses of Visit to Canada.
M. for statement (*Mr. Oliver*) 178.

Tenth Royal Regiment, Toronto.
M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 1629.

THOMPSON (Cariboo), Mr.
B.C. additional Supreme Ct. Judges, on Res., 120 ; B. 44 (*Mr. McDonald, Pictou*) on M. for 1^o, 278.
Prohibition of immigrants' landing, 204.
Election Act Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Bolduc*) on M. for 2^o, 231.
Immigration pamphlets, 815.
Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (*Mr. Béchard*) on M. for 2^o, 902.
Supply—Indians (B.C.) 1692.
Promissory Notes Duties Act Extension B. 108 (*Mr. Baby*) on M. for 2^o, 1856.

THOMPSON (Haldimand), Mr.
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on M. for 2^o (*Amt. 6 v. h.*) 296 ; on Amt. for 6 m. h. (*Mr. Jones*) 1394.
Supply—Militia (Brig. Majors) 1363.

Three Fathom Harbour Breakwater.
M. for Cor. and Reps. (*Mr. Kaubach*) 379.

TILLEY, Sir Samuel L.
Address, on the, 37, 42, 43.
Public Accounts (*presented*) 43.
Negotiations with France and Spain, on M. for instructions to Commissioners, 53.
C.P.R. contracts (*presented*) 55.
Time of taking the Census (*Ans.*) 128.
Financial Rets., on M. for Stand. Order (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 136, 289.
Importation of tea, 159.
Ont. N.W. Boundary, 174.
Insolvencies in 1878 and 1879, 177.
Public Officers' Security (B. 28, 1**) 180.
N.B. claims against the Dom. (*Ans.*) 198 ; on M. for Cor. (*Mr. Burpee, Sunbury*) 581.
Banking and Currency (*remarks*) 282, 283, 284.
Ways and Means—Budget Speech 509 ; on conclusion of Deb., Ques. of procedure, 925 ; on Res. 1, items 7 and 18, 927 ; item 47, 928 ; item 49, 929 ; on Res. 2, item 5, 930 ; item 9, 931 ; on Res. 3, item 6, 932 ; on M. to recommit for Amts., 1100, 1318 ; in Com., 1326 ; on Amt. (*Mr. Paterson, S. Brant*) embossed books, 1327 ; on M. to concur in Res., Books, 1327 ; Saw Logs, 1329. Customs and Excise Duties Act Amt. (B. 102, 1**) 1330. On Res. in Com., 1979.
Supply—on formal vote, 509 ; Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 1022 ; Ocean and River Service, 1677 ; Civil Govt. (Dept. of Finance) 1838 ; (Contingencies) 1842 ; (High Commissioner, contingencies) 1946, (Civil Service Board) 1946 ; Immigration and Quarantine, 1831 ; Post Office, 1909 ; Unprovided items, 1878-9. 1913. (B. 126, 1**) 1979.
Fractional currency (*Ans.*) 569, 785.
Free admission of Can. cattle into Newfoundland (*Ans.*) 570.
Can. Guarantee Co. (*Ans.*) 595.
Relief of the distress in Ireland (*remarks*) 745.

TILLEY, Sir Samuel L.—Con.
 Easter Adj. (*Res.*) 781.
 Mar. Prov. claims on Fishery Award, 787, 797, 1171.
 Dom. Savings Banks in B.C., 951.
 Customs and Excise Duties Act Amt. (*B.* 102, 1**) 1330; in *Com.*, 1852; on *M.* for 3**, 1853.
 Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation *B.* 30 (*Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier*) on *Amt.* (*Mr. Houde*) 1395.
 Quebec Tidal Dock Completion (*Res. in Com.*) 1659, (*B.* 109, 1**) 1660.
 Dom. Notes Act *Amt.* (*Res. in Com.*) 1723, (*B.* 114, 1**) 1752.
 Bank Act *Amt.* (*Res. in Com.*) 1752, (*B.* 115, 1**) 1772; on *M.* for 2°, 1980; in *Com.*, 1981.
 Use of guaranteed bonds as security in Bank Act (*Ans.*) 1788.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock (*Communication*) 1815.
 Civil Service expenditure, on *Res.* (*Sir R. J. Cartwright*) 1826.
 Can. Resident Agent in United Kingdom *B.* 88 (*Sir J. A. Macdonald*) on *M.* for 2°, 1859.
 Can. Central Ry. Agreement Ratification (*Res. in Com.*) 1887, (*B.* 122, 1**) 1888.
 Concurrence—Indians (*Ont. and Que.*) 1890
 Dom. Lands outside service, 1894; British High Commissioner (Contingencies) on *Amt.* (*Mr. Blake*) 1975.
 Customs and Excise *Rets.*, 1915.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock (*Res.*) 1921, (*B.* 125, 1**) 1934.
 Can. Temperance Act *Amt.* *B.* 112 (*Mr. Bowell*) on *Amt.* (*Mr. Boulton*) to *M.* for 3°, 1970.
 Supply (*B.* 126, 1**) 1979.
Timber Limits in Manitoba, etc. See "MANITOBA."
Timber Transmission Companies Act Amt. B. No. 8 (*Mr. White, N. Renfrew*). 1**, 59; *B.* wdn., 196.
Timber Transmission Companies Act Amt. B. No. 48 (*Mr. White, N. Renfrew*). 1**, 365; 2**, 607; in *Com.*, 607; 3**, 607.
Timber Transmission, Tariff of Tolls.
M. to refer *Res.* to *Com.* of *Wh.* (*Mr. White, N. Renfrew*) 313; in *Com.*, 365; rep. and agreed to, 365.
Tobacco, Canadian.
Ques. (*Mr. Bourbeau*) 785.
Tobacco seized in Charlevoix.
M. for statement (*Mr. Perrault*) 508.
Toronto Custom-house Defalcations.
M. for statement (*Mr. Paterson, S. Brant*) 176.
Toronto Custom-house Employés.
M. for statement (*Mr. Little*) 1376.
Toronto Field Battery.
M. for *Ret.* (*Mr. Wallace, W. York*) 1639.
Toronto Harbour Improvement.
Ques. (*Mr. Hay*) 380.
Toronto Inspector of Raw Hides, Charges against.
M. for papers (*Mr. Robinson*) 594.

Trent River Navigation Works.

M. for *O. C.* (*Mr. Keeler*) 156.
M. for *Reps.* (*Mr. Keeler*) 937.

Trois Pistoles, survey for wharf construction.

M. for *Rep.* (*Mr. Grandbois*) 179.

Trow, *Mr.*

Kaministiquia Riv., depth of water in, on *M.* for *Rep.*, 166, 167.
 Supply of lumber to the Welland Canal (*M.* for *Ret.*) 175.
 C.P.R. employés and supplies (*M.* for statement) 179.
 Immigration and Colonisation pamphlets (*M.* for statement) 501, (*M.* for copies) 808, (*explanation*) 1038.
 Can. Public Lands, on *Res.*, (*Mr. Charlton*), 1076.
 Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1338; Indians (provisions at annuity assemblies) 1696.
 Parly. printing contract, on *Amt.* (*Mr. Paterson, Essex*) to *M.* to concur in *Rep.* of *Com.*, 2016.
 Close of the Session, 2023.

Trust and Loan Co.

Correction of newspaper report (*Mr. Orton*) 1038.

Trutch, Hon. J. W., appointment to office of, in B.C.

M. for *Ret.* (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 937.

TUPPER, *Sir Charles.*

Address, on the, 41.
 Aid to *Ont. Pacific Junction Ry.* (*Ans.*) 45.
 C.P.R. contracts in *B.C.* (*Ans.*) 46.
 Georgian Bay Br., C.P.R., 47.
 Coteau du Lac Ry. Bridge, 48.
 Carillon Works contract, on *M.* to print, 51.
 C.P.R. route via Peace River Valley or Pine River Pass, 52, 53.
 Accidents on *I.C.R.*, 58.
 Railways and Canals *Rep.* (*presented*) 111.
I.C.R. dismissals and appointments, 137.
I.C.R. employés at *Moncton*, 139.
I.C.R. rolling-stock awaiting repair, 141, 149.
 Beauharnois Canal (*Ans.*) 155.
 Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co., 171.
 Supply of lumber to the Welland Canal, 176.
I.C.R. employés, 177.
I.C.R. connection at *Quebec* (*Ans.*) 198.
 G.T.R. uniform freight rates (*Ans.*) 198.
 New Ry. station-houses in *Prov. of Quebec* (*Ans.*) 307.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, on *M.* for *Ret.* (*Mr. Casey*) 324.
 Exchequer Ct., *Pets.* of *Right*, on *M.* for *Ret.* (*Mr. Guthrie*) 335.
 Shelburne Harbour, Light at *Surf Point*, 376.
 C.P.R. contracts, 382, 386.
 Huron and *Ont. Ship Canal* (*Ans.*) 416.
 Railway statistics (*remarks*) 417.
 Cedars Canal (*Ans.*) 484.
 Ry. stations in *Montmagny* (*Ans.*) 484.
I.C.R. Br. at *Lévis*, 486.
 C.P.R. Telegraph, 501.
 Immigration pamphlets, 502; on *M.* for copies (*Mr. Trow*) 810.
 Mails between *London* and *Evelyn P.O.*, 505.
 Ry. stations in *Lévis, Bellechasse* and *Montmagny*, 505.

TUPPER, Sir Charles.—Con.

- Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. surveys, 506.
 C.P.R. location by Marcus Smith, 506, (*Amt.*) 507.
Ways and Means—on the Budget, 547; on M. to recommit Res., 1104, 1131. On Res. in Com., 1978.
 Dom. Dam, Devil Lake, 571.
 P.E.I. Ry. communication, 578, 580, (*Ans.*) 596.
 I.C.R. Elgin Station (*Ans.*) 595.
 Riv. du Loup. Br. Purchase Confirmation (*B.* 81, 1^o) 782.
 Welland Canal, opening of navigation (*Ans.*) 784.
 Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 798.
 Coteau Bridge (*Ans.*) 935.
 C.P.R., running of trains at St. Boniface, Man. (*Ans.*) 936.
 Trent Waters Canal surveys, 938.
 Govt. Ry. coal contracts, 942.
 I.C.R., supply of nut-locks, 943.
 Shippegan Gully Channel, N.B., 947.
 Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^o, 973.
Supply—Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1030; Rys. (C.P.R., B.C., and I.C.R.) 1670, (C.P.R., Can. Central Extension) 1671, (Bridge at Winnipeg) 1671, (Pembina Br.) 1672, (I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry.) 1699, (Windsor Br. Ry.) 1906; Canals (Lachine) 1788, 1802, 1953, (Carillon) 1806, (Grenville) 1807, (Miscellaneous) 1808, (Welland) 1809; Collection of Revenues (I.C.R.) 1955.
 C.P.R., on M. for Com. of Supply (*Speech*) 1399.
 P.E.I. Ry. (*Ans.*) 1628.
 Ticket Agencies for Man, (*Ans.*) 1820.
 I.C.R. Stock on Lévis and Kennebec Ry. (*Ans.*) 1820.
 Civil Service expenditure, on Res. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1834.
Concurrence—I.C.R., 1895; C.P.R., 1896; Payment to Mr. Miall, 1900; Milner Land Arbitration, 1949.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, on *Amt.* (Mr. Blake) to Res., 1931.
 Investigations under Oath B. 113 (Mr. McDonald, Picteu) on M. for 2^o, 1935.
Two Creeks Harbour of Refuge, Kent, Ont.
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. Stephenson*) 128.
Unforeseen Expenses, H. of Com.
 M. for statement (*Mr. Charlton*) 179.
United States, Commercial Union with.
Ques. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 873.
Upper Can. Land Improvement Fund.
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. Hesson*) 948.
Usury Prohibition (Que.) B. No. 15
 (*Mr. Methot*).
 1^o, 114.
Vacancies in Representation.
 Speaker's announcement, 1.

VALLÉE, Mr.

- Encouragement of the Sale of Farm Produce (*B.* 12, 1^o) 79.
 Stadacona Bank winding-up (*B.* 16, 1^o) 151.
 Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co. (*M. for Cor.*) 167.

VALLÉE, Mr.—Con.

- St. Francis Riv. survey (*M. for Rep.*) 179.
 I.C.R. connection at Quebec (*Ques.*) 198.
 Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 316.
 Stratford Post-office, 370.
 Coteau Bridge (*Ques.*) 935.
Supply—Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Patent Record) 1331; Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1347.
 Official Rep. of Debates, 1816.
Vanasse, Mr.
 Return of, 2.
 Introduction of, 2.
VANASSE, Mr.
 Dismissal of Omer Allard (*M. for Ret.*) 508.
 Floating Cordwood on Riv. St. François du Lac Regulation (*B.* 75, 1^o) 608.
 Govt. Lands at Sorel (*Ques.*) 786.
 Yamaska Riv. navigation, 805.
 Harbour Commissions, revocation of (*Ques.*) 1371.
Vauv, Calvert, claim of. See "Parliament Grounds."
Ventilation of the Chamber.
 Remarks, 182.
Veterans.
 M. for statement (*Mr. Mousseau*) 508.
Victoria, B. C., to San Francisco, Mail Contract.
 Res. prop. (*Mr. Bunster*) 496.
 M. for Ret. (*Mr. DeCosmos*) 904.
Village Post-offices.
Ques. (*Mr. Laurier*) 1982.
Ville Marie Bank Winding-up B. No. 111 (*Mr. Desjardins*).
 1^o, 1665; 2^o, 1699; in Com., 1893; 3^o, 1893.
WALLACE (S. Norfolk), Mr.
 Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 226.
 Distribution of Defaulting Debtors' Estates (*B.* 89, 1^o) 1002.
 Dom. Notes Act *Amt.*, on Res., 1729.
 Bank Act *Amt.*, in Com. on Res. (*Amt.*) 1765.
WALLACE (W. York), Mr.
Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 720.
 Compensation to Mrs. Garrett for Rebellion losses in Man. (*Ques.*) 1628.
 Toronto Field Battery (*M. for Ret.*) 1639.
Wassall's Bridge Patent.
 M. for papers (*Mr. Longley*) 949.
Waterbury, D. H., Dismissal of.
Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 155.
WAYS AND MEANS.
 Resolution, 43.
The Budget Speech, 509; Res. in Com., 565; rep., 565; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 611, 626; Adj. Deb., 661, 692, 745, 822, 904; Rep. received, 925; M. to recommit for *Amts.*, 1100; Adj. Deb., 1230, 1262, 1284; Res. in Com., 1326; rep. with *Amts.*, 1326; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 1326; *Amt.* (*Mr. Paterson, S. Brant*) to place

WAYS AND MEANS.—*Con.*

embossed books on Free List, agreed to, 1326; in Com. and rep. with Amt., 1327; M. to concur in Res., 1327; Res. concurred in, 1330; B. 102 introduced and 1st, 1330. Resolutions in Com., 1977.

Weights and Measures Act, Receipts and Expenditures under.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, W. Middlesex*) 151.

Weights and Measures Inspectors.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Casey*) 313.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 379.

M. for Rep. (*Mr. Casey*) 806.

Weights and Measures Inspectors, refund of Superannuation Money.

Ques. (*Mr. Oliver*) 155.

Weights and Measures Inspectors' Superannuation Fund.

M. for statement (*Mr. Oliver*) 348.

WELDON, Mr.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^d, 108.

Drawback on ship material (*M. for Ret.*) 150.

Negro Point Breakwater (*M. for Ret.*) 150.

Grain imports (*M. for Ret.*) 150.

Coal and coke imports (*M. for Ret.*) 150.

Tea importation (*M. for Ret.*) 151.

Old rails sold by Govt. (*M. for Ret.*) 151.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 220, 221.

Supreme and Exchequer Cts. Acts Repeal B. 13 (Mr. Keeler) on M. for 6 m. h. (Mr. Blake) 258.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier) on Amt. (Mr. Mills) 590; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Williams) 593; on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Jones) 1394.

Fish Inspection, on Res. in Com. (Mr. Baby) 659.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 745.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 1216. Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) in Com., 1642; on M. for 3^d (*Amt. 6 m. h.*) 1643.

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.) in Com., 1878.

Welland Canal, opening of Navigation.

Ques. (*Mr. Mackenzie*) 783.

Welland Canal, Supply of Lumber.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Trow*) 175.

Welland Canal, Tenders for Secs. 33 and 34.

M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, W. Middlesex*) 349.

West Indies, Steam Communication with.

Ques. (*Mr. Domville*) 484.

WHITE (Cardwell), Mr.

Importation of tea (*M. for statement*) 158.

Indian Treaties at Forts Carlton and Pitt (*M. for O. C.*) 179.

Indian Treaty No. 1 (*M. for Ret.*) 179.

Legal expenses of Ont. Boundary Commission and Arbitration (*M. for Ret.*) 180.

Imports of sugar (*M. for statement*) 180.

Prohibition of immigrants' landing, 208.

WHITE (Cardwell), Mr.—*Con.*

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) in Com., 225; on M. to concur in Amt., 285; on Amt. (Mr. Blake) 287.

Red River and Assiniboine Bridge Co. Incorpor. (*B. 49, 1st*) 379.

Prevention of Crime B. 19 (Mr. Blake) on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Baker) 427.

Credit Valley Ry. Co. B. 53 (Mr. Haggart) on M. for 2^d, 586.

Immigration pamphlets, on M. for copies (Mr. Trow) 811.

Ways and Means—on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 822.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^d, 976.

Militia Acts Amt. B. 70 (Mr. Masson) on reception of Rep. of Com., 987, 988.

Can. Public Lands, on Amt. (Mr. Domville) to Res. (Mr. Charlton) (*Amt. m.*) 1084.

Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1341.

C.P.R., on Amt. (Mr. Blake) to M. for Com. of Supply, 1564.

Official Rep. of Debates, 1818.

Can. Temperance Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Bowell) on Amt. (Mr. Boulton) to M. for 3^d, 1969.

WHITE (E. Hastings), Mr.

Mortgage Regulation B. 11 (Mr. Orton) on M. for 2^d, 965, 968; on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Weldon) to M. for 3^d, 1643.

Supply—Canals, 1809.

Civil Service expenditure, on Res. (Sir R. J. Cartwright) 1828.

Indian Laws Amt. B. 90 (Sir J. A. Macdonald) on M. for 2^d, 1990.

Parly. printing contract, on Amt. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) to M. to concur in Rep. of Com., 2017, 2022.

White, Mr., Customs sub-collector at Alberton, P.E.I. See "Alberton."

WHITE (N. Renfrew), Mr.

Timber Transmission Companies Act Amendment (*B. 8, 1st*) 59.

Insolvency Acts Repeal B. 2 (Mr. Colby) on M. for 2^d, 104; in Com., 225.

Timber Transmission, Tariff of Tolls (*M. to refer Res. to Com. of Wh.*) 313; in Com., 365.

Timber Transmission Companies Act Amt. (*B. 48, 1st*) 365.

Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Incorpor. (*B. 71, 1st*) 594.

Insolvent Fire and Marine Insurance Cos. Winding-up B. 18 (Mr. Ives) on M. for 2^d, 892.

Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B. 56 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^d, 897.

Fishery privileges in Ottawa Riv., 1166.

Ways and Means—on M. to concur in Res. (saw-logs) 1329.

Supply—Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration) 1344; Canals, 1806.

Concurrence—Collection of Slide and Boom Dues, 1890.

Williamsburg Canal, Depth of Water in. M. for Ret. (*Mr. Ross, Dundas*) 174.

WILLIAMS, Mr.

Ont. and Pacific Junction Ry. Co. Incorp.
Act Amt. (B. 50, 1^{**}) 279.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister
Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques
Cartier) on Amt. (Mr. Mills) (*Amt. to Amt.*)
593.

Postmaster at Mount Pleasant (*M. för Ret.*)
1227.

Supply—Militia (Brig. Majors) 1362.

**Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Rail-
road and Steamship Co. Incorp.
B. No. 46** (*Mr. Bannerman*).

1^{*}, 305; 2^{**}, 395; in Com., 1470; 3^{**},
1470.

Winnipeg, Bridge over the Red River.

M. for Cor. (*Mr. Schultz*) 594.

Wood, Mrs., claim of.

M. for papers (*Mr. Macmillan*) 1659.

**Wrecks Removal Law Amt. B. No.
107** (*Mr. Pope, Queen's, P.E.I.*).

1^{*}, 1627; 2^{*}, 1855; in Com., 1913; 3^{**}
1915; Sen. Amta. concurred in, 1964.

WRIGHT, Mr.

Relief of the distress in Ireland, on Res., 127.

Stratford Post-office, on M. for papers (Mr.
Hesson) 369.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister
Legalisation B. 30 (Mr. Girouard, Jacques

WRIGHT, Mr.—Con.

Cartier) on Amt. 6 w. h. (Mr. Thompson,
Haldimand) 440.

Sudden death of Mr. Holton, 651.

Public Functionaries' Salaries Reduction B.
56 (Mr. Béchard) on M. for 2^{*}, 902.

Supply—Legislation (Extra Clerks) 1030;
Immigration and Quarantine (Immigration)
1351; Militia (Brig. Majors) 1362; Canals,
1806.

Ottawa Riv. fishery privileges, 1156, 1167.

Hull fire relief grant, 1670.

Close of the Session, 2023.

*Wright's contract for Pelee Island Mail
Service.*

M. for contract (*Mr. Oliver*) 499.

Yamaska River Navigation.

M. for Rep (*Mr. Gigault*) 804.

YEO, Mr.

Campbellton Br. Ry., P.E.I., 308.

Weights and Meas. Inspectors, 322, 330.

Alberton, P.E.I., sub-collectorship (*remarks*)
330, (*explanation*) 782.

P.E.I. Ry. communication, 576.

Mar. Provs. claims on Fishery Award, 794.

Young (Mrs.) Annuity B. No. 110
(*Sir J. A. Macdonald*).

Res. in Com., 1660; 1^{**}, 1661; 2^{**}, 1857;
in Com., 1357; 3^{**}, 1857.